

Pedestrian Bridge and Connecting Trail Over Arizona Avenue, NW

Public Comments

How many were received

- **124 total comments** were received
- 23 (approx. 19%) were submitted at the April 10 public meeting (Title VI forms, comment sheets, and sticky notes)
- 101 (approx. 81%) submitted by email after the meeting through June 8

Where do they live (includes only email responses, as no other respondents provided addresses)

- **64 are Palisades residents** (provided an address, or stated they lived in the Palisades)
- **37 are not** Palisades residents; of these, **5 work or recreate** in Palisades but do not live there

What was said about the trail

- About two-thirds or **66% support** some level of trail improvements
- About **25% do not support** any type of trail improvement
- The remaining approx. **9% do not mention the trail**, or do not express a preference

What did *residents* say about the trail and surface (includes only email responses)

- **24 want no change** to the trail and are not supportive of improvements
- **29 support** some level of improvement and changes to trail surface. **7 of these 29** commenters stated a specific material preference, which included crushed stone, loose gravel, or pervious material.
- **9 do not want 'paving' or asphalt.** This could mean: (a) they are supportive generally, but do not want asphalt, or (b) that they believe asphalt is the only option proposed and they are therefore not supportive. There is insufficient information to know if each person meant (a), (b), or something else entirely.
- **2 made no reference to the trail** or surface type.

What did they say about drainage (includes mentions of stormwater, water, drainage, or runoff)

- **14 say proposed changes would improve** drainage/runoff and characterized that potential as positive and a reason to support the improvements.
- **5 say changes would worsen** and negatively impact drainage/runoff and characterized that as a reason to not support the improvements.
- **2 are unsure** of any impacts and/or do not have enough information.

Pedestrian Bridge and Connecting Trail Over Arizona Avenue, NW

Other general observations

- Generally, **those that express opposition** seem to either (a) want to retain the natural state and current limited use, or (b) do not want cyclists on the trail segment. The vast majority of opposition comments are from residents, but not all residents entered opposition comments.
- Generally, **those that express support** are either (a) residents/neighbors who want a more accessible surface, or (b) are recreational or commuting cyclists (majority of whom are not residents).
- **Comments supporting aspects of the project may mention** potential to improve neighborhood use of the trails through improved safety and greater accessibility for more people, overall usability and ADA compliance, potential to reduce downhill stormwater issues, address erosion and drainage, fixing the bridge, improving access to park/recreation center
- **Comments against aspects of the project may mention** leaving the trail and bridge as they are with no changes at all, no additional lighting, discouraging any non-pedestrian use through surface choice, slowing speeds of cyclists, wanting funds redirected to other areas of the city, potential to disrupt wildlife/flora, opposition to one of the ramps (both east and west were mentioned), need for greater detail (more than 30% plans), width of trail (too wide), maintenance of plantings,
- **Comments of support that include additional or extending requests** include, more fencing on ramps to prevent thrown objects (e.g., kids' toys), extension of sidewalk to Carolina Place, use a different trail surface (e.g., loose gravel, asphalt), bridge type and color preferences (e.g. a bow string truss bridge in black or parallel chord box truss in grey), implement bicycle traffic calming to keep speeds low, will trail connect to Georgetown