

My preference:

Short term (Option 1)

- Split the path width 50/50 between bikers and pedestrians.
- Focus, reduce and relocate signs to get bikers to dismount (the current rule)
- The BFRT section will not be a “legal” width in the short-term, but requiring bikers to walk their bikes will increase safety for all

Long term: Option 3

- Maintains usability of JP for pedestrians
- Provides safe passage for bikers, riding on BFRT to the west of JP

COMMENTS:

Option 1: short-term--Separate lanes through JP

Pro

- No change to landscaping or path layout
- Club Car patrons have the most space to enjoy the park and stone wall

Con

- Insufficient space for pedestrians/parents with strollers to use the park
- Loss of use of bench on west side of park by pedestrians
- Hard/dangerous for WCGT to access gardens on the west side for maintenance
- Kids coming from Rt 62 to White Hen are likely to cut through pedestrian lane
- Physical barrier will reduce usable width for all users

Option 2 & 3: long-term--Relocate BFRT to west of JP

Pro

- No /minor change to landscaping or path layout—loss of shrubs
- Club Car patrons have the most space to enjoy the park and stone wall
- Pedestrians/parents with strollers have full ability to use and enjoy the park
- No loss of use of benches

Con

- MBTA must agree to giving 4-6 feet of their property
- Loss/redesign of Club Car parking spaces

Option 4: long-term--Relocate BFRT to western portion of JP

Pro

- No MBTA involvement
- Pedestrians/parents with strollers have full ability to use and enjoy the park
- No loss of use of benches

Con

- Relocation of retention basin
- Loss of landscaping—including space where retention basin is relocated
- Loss of mature tree at south end of JP

Options 5,6,7

Con

- Complex configuration may discourage use by bikers and pedestrians

- Hard/dangerous for WCGT to access gardens for maintenance in some options