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The Players

...and communities across South Dakota
Applications
(November, decision in early December)
Applicants vs Grantees
Student/Community Visioning Meetings (mid- to late January)
On-Site Built Environment Assessments (mid- to late January)
## Street Assessments: Peds

### Street Assessments: Peds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Segment Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Study Area</strong></th>
<th><strong>Notes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segment Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surface type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Obstacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Buffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Pedestrian Facility (if any present)
- **Type(s) of pedestrian facility**
  - Footpath (worn dirt path)
  - Paved Trail
  - Sidewalk
  - Pedestrian Street (closed to cars)

The rest of the questions in section B refer to the best pedestrian facility selected above.

### 5. Path Material (all that apply)
- Asphalt
- Concrete
- Paving Bricks or Flat Stone
- Gravel
- Dirt or Sand

### 6. Path Condition/maintenance
- Poor (many bumps/cracks/holes)
- Fair (some bumps/cracks/holes)
- Good (very few bumps/cracks/holes)
- Under Repair

### 7. Path Obstructions (all that apply)
- Poles or Signs
- Parked Cars
- Greener
- Garbage Cans
- Other
- None

### 8. Buffers between road and path (all that apply)
- Fence
- Tress
- Hedges
- Landscape
- Grass
- None

### 9. Path Distance from Curb
- At edge (1)
- > 5 feet (3)

### 10. Sidewalk Width
- < 4 feet (1)
- Between 4 and 6 feet (2)
- > 6 feet (3)
# Park Assessments: PARA

## Physical Activity Resource Assessment Instrument (PARA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball court</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer court</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play equipment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandboxes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts lighting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB courts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking path</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical fitness areas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trashcans</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Anxiety Rating**
  - 0 = Excellent
  - 1 = Good
  - 2 = Fair
  - 3 = Poor

### Comments
- Any additional comments or observations can be added here.
Data Assessment and Preliminary Ideas
(February)
Feedback Meetings
(early March)
Formal Recommendation Development
(March and April)
Formal Closing Meeting
(late April or early May)
Typical Recommendations

- Improve Active Transportation Infrastructure
  - Sidewalk connectivity
  - Bike routes
  - Recreational trails and paths
Typical Recommendations

- **Create and Connect Destinations**
  - Parkland service areas
  - Live/work/play
  - Shopping, health care, and other locations
Typical Recommendations

- Educate the Public
  - Community wayfinding
  - Health benefits
Typical Recommendations

- Community Development
  - Beautification initiatives
  - Improving the pedestrian environment
  - Providing places for chance encounters
Typical Recommendations

- Funding Strategies and Resources
  - DOT grants
  - Private foundations
  - Fundraising and partnerships
By the Numbers

5 years

29 community applicants

42 applications

6 granted partnerships

52 student participants

35,555 South Dakota residents served
Conclusions

- Small rural communities desire and need planning consultancy
- These communities can often not afford professional services
- Students can provide a fresh look and great ideas with guidance
- Partnerships foster a *win/win/win* relationship
- We need ways to expand the program to serve more communities