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Manatee Middle School | Friends of the River of Grass

THANK YOU!
Project Description

• Multi-use trail
  • S.R. 951 (Collier Boulevard)
  • C.R. 92 (San Marco Road)
• Marco Loop Trail
  • SUNTrail
  • Spine Trail Network
  • Land Trail Opportunity Trail/Corridor
• Connects to
  • Marco Island Bike Path Master
  • NPC Paradise Coast Trail Vision
Purpose & Need

The purpose of the project is to enhance the regional bicycle and pedestrian network connecting Marco Island to the Shared-Use Nonmotorized (SUN) Trail facility along U.S. 41. Additionally, the project will improve bicycle and pedestrian safety in the study corridors.
Purpose & Need

Safety: Improve safety conditions

System linkage: Improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity

Social and economic demand: Enhance mobility choices and provide social benefits through outdoor recreation
Planning Process

Twelve-month planning effort which included research and analysis, field work, stakeholder input, and public outreach. The project was organized into the following five tasks:

- Task 1: Project Start Up
- Task 2: Research and Analysis / Existing Conditions
- Task 3: Alternative Assessment / Public Engagement
- Task 4: Development of Draft Trail Alternatives Evaluation Report
- Task 5: Final Trail Alternatives Evaluation Report
Issues

• Both corridors have limited space to construct multi-modal facilities

• Environmentally sensitive lands abut the roadways
Opportunities

- Bear Point Canoe and Kayak Launch – Review connection to facilities
- Old Goodland Bridge – Possible location for trail facilities
- Makeshift Boat Launch - Possible location for county amenities
- Trailheads
Summary of Public Engagement

- **Jerry Adams Chili Cook-Off**
  - Saturday, November 12, 2022

- **Marco Island Farmers Market**
  - Wednesday, December 7, 2022

- **Public Outreach Online Survey***
  - November 12th, 2022, through January 16th, 2023

* Included email blasts to HOA, Chamber of Commerce, City of Marco Island, Local Schools and CAT
Survey Results – Quantitative

Key takeaways:

• ~ 3 out of 4 walkers and 2 out of 3 bicyclists walk or bike 2 to 7 days out of the week
• ~ 7 out of 8 walkers and 6 out of 7 bicyclists walk or bike for exercise or leisure purposes
Survey Results – Quantitative

Considerations Impacting a Decision to Walk or Bike

Key takeaways:

Participants considered **Safety** and **Driver Behavior** the most important of these considerations when asked to rank the importance of these considerations in deciding whether to walk or bike.
Survey Results – Qualitative Challenges

• Greatest opportunities identified by participants related to safety (39 responses) and separated facilities (37 responses).

• Greatest challenges identified by participants related to right of way, land availability, and environmental constraints (50 responses) followed by cost (30 responses), safety and separated vehicle facilities (both 24 responses).

• Most desired trail elements and features identified by participants were more space/wider path (47 responses), separated vehicle facilities (43 responses), amenities such as shade, benches, water fountains, restrooms etc. (35 responses).
Desired Multimodal Improvement
S.R. 951 - Roadway

Option 1
No Build
0.39% Respondents

Option 2
7’ Buffered Bike Lane
7.75% Respondents

Option 3
5’ Sidewalk
17.44% Respondents

Option 4
10’ Shared Use Path
31.01% Respondents

Option 5
10’ Shared Use Path + 7’ Buffered Bike Lane
43.41% Respondents

Desired Multimodal Improvement for S.R. 951
Option 1, 0.39%
Option 2, 7.75%
Option 3, 17.44%
Option 4, 31.01%
Option 5, 43.41%
Desired Multimodal Improvement for the S.R. 951 Bridges

- **Option 1**: 1.6% Respondents
  - No Build
  - 2' Shoulder, 10' Drive lane

- **Option 2**: 8.4% Respondents
  - 7' Bike lane
  - 2' Shoulder, 3' Bike lane, 12' Drive lane

- **Option 3**: 42% Respondents
  - 5' Sidewalk + 7' Bike lane
  - 5 1/4' Sidewalk, 7' Bike lane, 3' Shoulder, 11' Drive lane

- **Option 4**: 48% Respondents
  - 10' Shared Use Path
  - 10' Shoulder, 11 1/4' Drive lane
Desired Multimodal Improvement
C.R. 92 - Roadway

Option 1
No Build
0.40% Respondents

Option 2
4' Bike Lane
3.56% Respondents

Option 3
7' Buffered Bike Lane
11.46% Respondents

Option 4
5' Sidewalk + 4' Bike Lane
25.3% Respondents

Option 5
8' Cycle Track
23.32% Respondents

Option 6
10' Shared Use Path
35.97% Respondents

Desired Multimodal Improvement for C.R. 92

Option 1, 0.40%
Option 2, 3.56%
Option 3, 11.46%
Option 4, 25.30%
Option 5, 23.32%
Option 6, 35.97%
Desired Multimodal Improvement
C.R. 92 Bridge

Option 1
- No Build
- 6.4% Respondents

Option 2
- 10' Shared Use Path
- 43.8% Respondents

Option 3
- 8' Shared Use Path
- 49.8% Respondents

Desired Multimodal Improvement for the C.R. 92 Bridge

- Option 1, 6.37%
- Option 2, 43.82%
- Option 3, 49.80%
Trail Alternatives Evaluation

Categories Analyzed:

• Purpose and Need
• Public Support
• Sociocultural Resources
• Floodplains and Wetlands
• Utilities
• Geotechnical and Contamination
• Drainage and Permitting
### Trail Alternatives Evaluation

**Comparative Alternative Evaluation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>No-Build Alternative</th>
<th>Build Alternatives</th>
<th>C.R. 92 (San Marco Road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.R. 951 (Collier Boulevard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T Buffered Bike Lane</td>
<td>5' Sidewalk</td>
<td>10' Trail + T Buffered Bike Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Multimodal Access to Destinations (N/No/No)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity (N/No/No)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Quality of Life and Support Economic Development (N/No/No)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Support Ranking (1 - High, 5 - low)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Natural/Cultural Environmental Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Sites Potentially Affected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Sites Potentially Affected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains (acres) Impacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands (acres) Impacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Physical Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Agency Owners Impacted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination Sites (M/H Levels Only)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Project Costs (per October 2021 LRE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$1,571,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construction Engineering and Inspection (30% of Construction Costs)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$407,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland and Mangrove Mitigation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$823,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$987,000</td>
<td>$2,587,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. The construction costs shown do not reflect project unknowns and are only calculated based on the features present in the typical sections.
2. For Public Support Ranking, a "**" means that this typical section was either developed after the public input and the ranking is based upon the most comparable typical section.
3. No construction costs are associated to alternatives that identify no roadway widening, as these improvements can be implemented during the next RRR project for the roadway.
4. Though there are utilities along the project corridor, no utilities are anticipated to be impacted based on the recommendations of this feasibility study.
5. Impacts for each alternative were calculated within the existing right of way.
Trail Alternatives Evaluation
Recommended Facilities for PD&E

S.R. 951

Option 3
5' Sidewalk

Option 4
10' Shared Use Path

Option 5
10' Shared Use Path + 7' Buffered Bike Lane

C.R. 92

Option 4
5' Sidewalk + 4' Bike Lane

Option 5
8' Cycle Track

Option 6
10' Shared Use Path

Option 6
10' Shared Use Path
Trail Alternatives Evaluation
Possible Amenities for Facilities

- Trailheads
- Wayfinding
- Transit Stops
- Signal Enhancements
- Midblock Crossings
- Lighting

- Call Boxes
- Trash Receptacles
- Trail Counts Stations
- Mile Marker Information in QR codes
- Mile Marker Symbols
- Shade
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