

# REDWOOD PATHWAYS STRATEGY: AN ACTION PLAN FOR TRAIL DEVELOPMENT

## CHAPTER 5. SELECTION OF PRIORITY PROJECTS



A component of the Redwood Pathways Implementation Strategy project was to select two “priority project” for further development by the project team. “Preliminary Plan Packages” were to be developed for these two projects which included project descriptions, conceptual designs, initial environmental information, construction cost estimates and similar information needed before the projects can be submitted for grant funds for permitting, engineering, and construction. These “packages” compose much of the following two chapters.

It was stressed during interactions with agencies, community organizations, and the public that the selection of two projects *did not preclude other efforts to development or implement the remaining projects on the list*. In fact, one of the goals of the project was to encourage residents, community organizations, and agencies to pursue these projects.

### SELECTION OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

The Redwood Pathways Project team developed a set of preliminary criteria to be used in prioritizing potential projects generated from public input, research of previous public input efforts and existing documents, team site investigations, and surveys. The selection criteria were reviewed at public meetings, and several additional criteria were added by the public.

The project team met on several occasions to sort and rank the projects listed. Sorting and ranking the projects using the Project Description forms was quite challenging, primarily due to the lack of complete information regarding some of the proposed projects. (Budgetary and timeline limitations precluded researching each of the 32 proposed projects fully.) For instance, some of the projects were proposed *after* the public meetings, and no clear information on community support was available. Therefore, the team was sometimes required to estimate and assign information to projects based on previous interactions with the public, initial meetings with agency representatives, and their professional trail development experience.

Each project was reviewed using the 16 criteria which follow. A visual method of tabulating the ranking was initially used—assigning a full circle, half circle, or empty circle (●, ◐, ○) for each criteria. It was hoped that a clear visual pattern would emerge when all of the assigned values were combined into one chart. When no clear visual pattern emerged, a numerical value was assigned (2 for ●, 1 for ◐, and 0 for ○), and the results tabulated. The

projects with the highest scores were then reviewed using several added criteria to insure that, in combination, the final two projects would meet Redwood Pathway project goals.

## **PRIORITY PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA**

---

1. Public support for the project is (**substantial, moderate, minimal.**)
2. Trail users can access north- and south-bound roadways (**without crossing traffic, at a safe crossing site, challenging crossing/no access.**)
3. The proposed project has (**no, some, many**) mid-trail road crossings.
4. The project is (**very, moderately, not**) likely to be funded.
5. The anticipated time to implementation is (**short, moderate, long**).
6. Support of involved agencies is (**substantial, moderate, unknown/non-existent**).
7. There is (**a known, a possible, no**) identified management entity.
8. The proposed project has (**substantial support, some/unknown support, active opposition**) of landowners.
9. The proposed project has (**substantial support, some/unknown support, active opposition**) of adjacent landowners.
10. (**Many, moderate amount number, few**) user groups will be accommodated by the project.
11. The project (**significantly, moderately, minimally**) likely to stimulate the local economy.
12. The needed improvements will have (**minimal/beneficial, moderate, significant**) environmental impacts.
13. The construction for the proposed project is (**minimal, moderate, significant**).
14. Physical or geographical features will (**have no effect on, slightly impede, prohibit**) the improvement.
15. The project can be utilized (**year round, seasonally, periodically**).
16. The project brings users (**into, close to, no change/away from**) local communities.
17. The project is (very, moderately, not) consistent with community priorities listed in the Redwood Pathway questionnaires.
18. The project is (very, moderately, not) consistent with agency input.
19. The Redwood Pathways Project Team (strongly supports, supports, opposes) selection as a priority project.

### **In combination, with the other potential priority project, the project...**

- serves a diversity of users (**well, moderately, poorly**).
- serves more than one geographic area (**well, moderately, poorly**).
- has met a (**wide, moderate, limited**) distribution of the selection criteria.
- includes (**at least one, one, no**) project along the Avenue of the Giants.

## **RANKING RESULTS**

---

The final two projects selected were the: 1) South Fork High School Trail and 2) Garberville-Benbow River Trail.

Selection of Priority Projects .....	29
Priority Project Selection Criteria.....	30
Ranking Results .....	30