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1.0 Introduction

Hillsborough County and the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) have prioritized the development of a new shared-use trail connecting the South Coast Greenway Trail with the Tampa Bypass Canal Trail. Once developed, this new shared-use trail (part of the South Coast Greenway Trail) will be a major contribution to the greenways and trails system in eastern Hillsborough County providing additional mobility options for the Palm River, Clair Mel, Progress Village, and Gibsonton areas. Figure 1 displays the project area along with the northern and southern connection points.

Additionally, the trail is included in the Florida Shared-Use Nonmotorized (SUN) Trail Network, authorized under 339.81, Florida Statutes. As part of the SUN Trail program’s Gulf Coast Trail, the South Coast Greenway Trail (SCG Trail) will generally be required to be a 12-foot off-road multi-use path. The purpose of the SCG Trail Alignment Study is to identify feasible alignments for a trail connection from Symmes Road to Adamo Drive and develop concept designs for the future layout. The connector will link previously identified phases of the SCG Trail with the Tampa Bypass Canal Trail. Hillsborough County recently advertised Phase 3 of the SGT Trail for engineering services.

This report is divided into the following sections:

- **1.0 Introduction**: Provides an overview of the study
- **2.0 Alternatives Evaluation**: Summarizes the process for developing the alignment alternatives
- **3.0 Public Involvement**: Summarizes the public involvement aspect of the study
- **4.0 Conceptual Design**: Presents the conceptual designs and preliminary cost estimates for the finalized alignment alternatives
- **5.0 Next Steps**: Synthesizes key issues to be studied further
1.1 SUN Trail Program

The SUN Trail program was adopted by the Florida Legislature in 2015 with the intention of forming a statewide network of nonmotorized trails known as the Florida Greenways and Trails System (FGTS). The FGTS will allow nonmotorized vehicles and pedestrians to access a variety of origins and destinations with limited exposure to motorized vehicles. The SUN Trail program is managed by the Office of Greenways and Trails (OGT) through the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). For purposes of funding and maintaining projects within the network, the department allocates a minimum of $25 million annually.

Trails that are part of the SUN Trail system need to meet the following characteristics:

- Multi-use or shared-use path typically 12 feet wide (but may vary from 10 feet to 14 feet) physically separated from motor vehicle traffic
- Identified as an FGTS priority or opportunity trail (a map of FGTS west central region shown in Figure 2)
- Constructed with asphalt, concrete, or another hard surface
- Provides connections to destinations such as: communities, conservation areas, state parks, beaches, and other natural or cultural attractions for a variety of trip purposes including work, school, shopping, and other personal business, as well as social, recreational, and personal fitness purposes
- Network components do not include sidewalks, nature trails, or loop trails
- May include limited on-road facilities that are no longer than 0.5 mile when connecting two or more nonmotorized trails where off-road facilities are infeasible

![SUN Trail Program](image1.png)

**Figure 2. FGTS West Central Region Map**

Source: Florida Greenways and Trails System Plan and Maps, FDEP OGT
1.2 SCG Trail Background

The SCG Trail has been recognized in the Hillsborough County Greenways Master Plan (1995) and the Greenway and Trails Master Plan Update (2016), where it was also identified as a "key regional and countywide trail concept". In addition, the SCG Trail is included in the Priority list of trails identified in the Tampa Bay Area Transit Authority’s Long Range Transportation Plan and the Hillsborough MPO’s 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

1.3 SCG Trail System Connections

The SCG Trail is identified as a key component in the Hillsborough County trail network and will function to provide a north/south connection to the Selmon Greenway Connector and the proposed Tampa Bypass Canal Trail to the north, and the South County Greenway Connector to the south.

Selmon Greenway Connection

The northern terminus of the SCG Trail is intended to travel over the Maydell Drive Bridge and connect to the Selmon Greenway Connector, which provides networks to the West Tampa neighborhood through Downtown Tampa through Ybor City. The Selmon Greenway Connector is also eligible for SUN Trail funding.

FIGURE 3. SELMON GREENWAY CONNECTOR

Source: Hillsborough County Greenway and Trails Master Plan Update (2016)

Tampa Bypass Canal Trail

Additionally, the northern terminus of the SCG Trail will connect to the future Tampa Bypass Canal Trail. The Tampa Bypass Canal Trail will be a 17-mile multiuse trail connecting the Flatwoods Park in New Tampa through Wilderness and Trout Creek Parks, and the Selmon Greenway.

The greatest challenge to this project is crossing the major roadways along the trail included: I-75, US 301, I-4, Fletcher Avenue, Fowler Avenue, Harney Road, and Alamo Drive.

The guiding principles of the Tampa Bypass Canal Trail include:

- Safe and comfortable crossings of roadways
- Availability for all non-motorized transportation users
- West side alignment preferred
- Regional amenity, local access
- Phasing

The next steps of the Tampa Bypass Canal Trail include:

- Collaboration and support with the Parks, Recreation, and Conservation Department for implementation
- Identification of trail amenities (water, benches, trees, etc.)
- Partnership with historical societies for marker placement
- Funding and Project Design & Engineering

FIGURE 4. TAMPA BYPASS CANAL TRAIL (SOUTH)

Source: Tampa Bypass Canal Multi-Use Trail Master Plan and Feasibility Study (2013)
South County Greenway Connection

The southern terminus of the SCG Trail begins at the Tampa Electric Company (TECO) utility tract on Symmes Road. According to the Hillsborough County Greenway and Trails Master Plan Update, there are three elements remaining to complete the trail to Manatee County:

1) Continue the trail down the TECO utility tract and connect to US 301 using 19th Ave.

2) Continue south along US 301 (a portion of this connection is underway along with capacity improvements to US 301).

3) Connect to Manatee County via ELAPP corridor between Willow and Saffold Road.

The next steps for the South County Greenway Connector include:

- Coordination with FDOT for a PD&E regarding a shared-use path along US 41
- Initiating a new PD&E study to determine trail alignment across the Little Manatee River into Manatee County
- Coordination with Manatee County for trail alignments

**Figure 5** displays a portion of the South Coast Greenway (western green dotted line) connecting through to Manatee County (yellow line). The project area for this study begins about 4 miles north of the SCG connection shown on the map.

The South County Greenway Connector to Manatee County is also SUN Trail eligible.
1.4 Socioeconomic Characteristics

An Area of Interest (AOI) study and Socioeconomic Data Report (SDR) was conducted using the Efficient Transportation Decision Making (ETDM) database, which uses US Census and American Community Survey (ACS) data. The results of the SDR report for the AOI is summarized in this section, and the full report is in Appendix D.

The AOI utilized was a 0.25-mile buffer area (shown in Figure 6) from the initial general alignment of the SCG Trail obtained from the Hillsborough MPO. The following summarizes the results of the ETDM report.

Land Use
Residential Low Density (less than 2 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), Residential Medium Density (2-5 du/ac), Commercial and Services, Open Land, and Hardwood Conifer Mixed were the five major existing land uses.

Households
There are 2,419 total households with a population of 7,092 people within the project area. The median household income is $32,318. Approximately 29% of the households are below the poverty level, with 3.7% of the households receiving public assistance income.

Population Age
Over 26% of the population is under the age of 17, and about 15% of the population is between the ages of 18 and 29. Approximately 10% of the population is aged 65 and older.

Housing
The housing characteristics include: single family units (64%), mobile home units (26%), multi-family units (10%). Of these housing units, 56% are owner occupied, 35% are renter occupied, and 9% are vacant.

The average housing density is 0.98 units per acre. The median housing value is $83,700, which is significantly less than the median housing value for Hillsborough County ($170,000).

Race and Ethnicity
Approximately 59% of the population identifies as ‘White Alone’, and 25% of population identifies as ‘Black or African American Alone’.

In addition to race identification, around 37% of the population specified having ‘Hispanic or Latino of Any Race’ ethnicity. The ethnicity question was added to the US Census in 2000 in addition to race. More information defining race and ethnicity is provided in the SDR in Appendix D.

Minority Population
Minority calculations were derived using both race and ethnicity responses. The SDR report defined the minority population as those individuals who list a race other than White and/or list their ethnicity as Hispanic/Latino. Approximately 65% of the population is considered minority. Concentrations of minority populations are in the Progress Village and Palm River-Clair Mel areas.

Educational Attainment
Over 76% of the population aged 25 and over consists of High School Graduates or Higher education, with approximately 16% with a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher.
2.0 Alternatives Evaluation

A major component of the study was to identify potential trail alignment options and evaluate their feasibility. The alignment options (alternatives) were established in coordination with the steering committee and the consultant team. The steering committee was comprised of representatives from the Hillsborough MPO, the City of Tampa, and Hillsborough County.

Due to the length of the corridor (approximately 8 miles), the project area was divided into three sectors: north, central, and south. The sector limits are displayed in Figure 7 and described below.

- **Southern Sector:** Symmes Road to Riverview Drive (shown in green in Figure 7). Includes Gibsonton, Bullfrog Creek, and the Alafia River.

- **Central Sector:** Riverview Drive to Madison Avenue (shown in purple in Figure 7). Includes Progress Village Area and Larry Sanders Sports Complex.

- **Northern Sector:** Madison Avenue to Maydell Drive Bridge (shown in blue in Figure 7). Includes the Palm River and Clair Mel areas. Most developed and densely populated sector.

Additionally, a cursory review of existing conditions was conducted including: transportation infrastructure (sidewalks, bike lanes, roadway conditions, signalized intersections, etc.), potential connections (schools, parks, grocery stores, retail etc.), and trail environment (e.g. adjacent to a roadway, powerline easement, along a creek) to yield segment alternatives for each sector (N1, N2, N3, C1, C2, S1, S2).

The next phase of the alternatives evaluation was to develop a quantitative method for evaluating the segments. A scoring criteria was created where each segment could be scored based on various attributes contributing to the overall feasibility of the segment.
2.1 Sector Alternatives

The trail alignments are described briefly in this section. More details can be found in the CADD renderings for S1 and S2 in Appendix A.

Southern Sector

The South Sector contains two water crossings (Bullfrog Creek and the Alafia River), which limits alternative flexibility. Two alternatives were developed for this sector, both use US 41 to cross the Alafia River and turn east on Riverview Drive. However, the route variations start at the TECO utility tract on Symmes Road and converge at US 41 and Gibsonton Drive. The two alternatives are displayed in Figure 8.

**S1 (US 41 Alternative, green):** Starting from the TECO utility tract at Symmes Road, the alignment travels west on Symmes Road and turns north on US 41. The route uses the US 41 bridge across Bull Frog Creek, and provides access to the Gardenville Recreation Center and businesses along US 41.

**S2 (Utility Tract Alternative, purple):** This alignment continues north along the TECO utility tract starting from Symmes Road to Gibsonton Road, adjacent to Gibsonton Elementary School. The trail travels west along Gibsonton Road to connect to US 41. This alternative requires a new pedestrian bridge across Bull Frog Creek.

**Lula Alternative (yellow dotted line):** FDOT District Seven recently completed a Project Development & Environment (PD&E) Study of the roadway, which recommended widening US 41 to six lanes. Due to limited right of way (ROW) on US 41, the study proposed the trail be routed along Lula Street, which was the vision of the 1995 Greenways and Trails Master Plan. This deviation off US 41 could be explored more in future studies but has challenges including open drainage, limited Right of Way, and environmental constraints.
Central Sector

Two alternatives were developed for the Central Sector. The route through the Central Sector follows the TECO utility line north from Riverview Drive to the vicinity of the Larry Sanders Sports Complex (county owned), just west of South 78th Street. The two alternatives developed either follow the utility line north on the eastern side of the Sports Complex to Madison Avenue, or continue further west to a more centralized tract of the Sports Complex eventually leading up to Madison Avenue. The two alternatives are displayed in Figure 9 and further detailed below.

C1 (East Alternative, purple): Continues north along utility tract connecting to Madison Avenue just east of 78th Street. This alternative travels near the main entrance of the Larry Sanders Sports Complex and is in the vicinity of Lamb Elementary and Progress Village Middle Magnet.

C2 (West Alternative, green): Travels northwest along a cleared tract close to the center of the Larry Sanders Sports Complex property. This alternative connects to Madison Avenue further west than C1, and travels near the Literacy Leadership Tech Academy.
Northern Sector

Initially, two alternatives were created for the northern sector (N1 and N2). N1 followed the initial alignment submitted by the Hillsborough MPO along Maydell Drive. N2 was a new alignment following a creek between two neighborhoods west of 78th Street. The steering committee suggested a third northern alternative (N3) be added, which was further east near Frost Elementary and Giunta Middle School. The three alternatives are depicted in Figure 10 and further described below.

**N1 (Maydell Alternative, blue):** Travels the furthest west down Madison Avenue from the Central alternatives. The route turns north along 66th Street up to Bing Elementary, where it jogs west on 36th Avenue. The route then continues north along Maydell Drive to the northern project limits across the Maydell Drive Bridge.

**N2 (Creek Alternative, green):** Travels west along Madison Avenue and turns north on 70th Street to 36th Avenue South. The route then travels north on South 74th Street to meet up with a creek between two neighborhoods. This creek is currently owned and maintained by Hillsborough County. The trail follows the creek north to Dowdell Middle, Clair Mel Elementary, and Winston Park connecting to Palm River Road, where it travels west to Maydell Drive.

**N3 (East Alternative, purple):** Travels north from the TECO utility tract the Central routes travel, eventually turning east on Camden Field Parkway. The route turns north along an easement adjacent to Giunta Middle and Frost Elementary to eventually connect to Palm River Road, traveling west, and meeting up with Maydell Drive.
2.2 Scoring the Alternatives

Once the alternatives for each sector were established, a scoring system was developed based on criteria relating to trail development, trail feasibility, and SUN Trail requirements allowing for a quantitative evaluation and comparison of each alternative. The scoring system is summarized in this section and further detailed in Appendix B. Costs were not directly considered at this stage.

Scoring Criteria

The scoring criteria used included the following measures:

- **Ownership:** If the land is publicly, utility, or privately owned.
- **Right-of-Way (ROW) Required:** Land required to build a 12’ multi-use path on a subjective low, medium, high scale.
- **Trail Construction Barriers:** If a road crossing, bridge crossing, or roadway realignment needed.
- **Public Transportation:** Proximity to HART stops.
- **Schools:** Proximity to K-12 public schools.
- **Healthy Food:** Proximity to healthy food source.
- **Community Facility:** Proximity to community facilities.
- **Parks and Natural Land:** Proximity to greenways or parks.
- **Population Served:** Population density per square mile.
- **Equity:** Proximity to Environmental Justice (EJ) areas.
- **Trail Scenery:** Surrounding area aesthetics including shade or other scenic elements along the route.
- **Trail Comfort:** If the trail is adjacent to a major roadway, local roadway, utility corridor, or through a natural area.
- **Safety:** Proximity to bicycle and pedestrian crash locations.

### Scoring Results: Northern Sector

The Northern Sector scoring results are displayed in Table 1. The N2 (Creek) Alternative scored the highest with a total of 40 points out of 50, and the N1 (Maydell) Alternative scored the lowest with 13 points.

- **N1 (Maydell) Alternative:** Higher scores were in the Safety and ROW categories. Lower scores were in the Ownership, Construction Barriers, Healthy Food, and Comfort categories.
- **N2 (Creek) Alternative:** Higher scores were in the Safety, Environmental Justice, Trail Scenery, Public Transportation, and Community Facilities categories.
- **N3 (East) Alternative:** Scored high in the Public Transportation, Healthy Food, and Community Facilities categories. Scored low in Ownership and ROW categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>N1 (Maydell)</th>
<th>N2 (Creek)</th>
<th>N3 (East)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (ROW) Required</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Barriers</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Natural Lands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Scenery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice (EJ)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Results: Central Sector
The scoring results for the Central Sector are displayed in Table 2. The C1 (East) Alternative scored highest with 19 points, and the C2 (West) Alternative scored 9 points. Both alignments had similarly high scores in Comfort and Safety categories, and low scores in the Population Density category and several of the connections categories. However, the C1 Alternative offers fewer ROW and Construction Barriers while providing more connections to schools and healthy food.

- **C1 (East) Alternative**: High scores in the Ownership, Comfort, Safety, and EJ categories. Low scores in the ROW, Public Transportation, Community Facilities, Parks and Natural Lands, and Population Density categories.

- **C2 (West) Alternative**: Low scores in the ROW, Construction Barriers, Public Transportation and Healthy Food categories.

**TABLE 2. CENTRAL SECTOR SCORING RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>C1 (East)</th>
<th>C2 (West)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (ROW)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Barriers</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Natural Lands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Scenery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Results: Southern Sector
The scoring results for the Southern Sector are displayed in Table 3. The S2 (Utility) Alternative scored highest with 23 points, and the S1 (US 41) Alternative scored 14 points. The alternatives scored similarly in the Public Transportation, Trail Scenery, and Environmental Justice categories. However, the S1 Alternative scored lower in the Ownership, Schools, and Comfort categories.

- **S1 (US 41) Alternative**: High scores were in the ROW, Healthy Food, and Parks/Natural Lands categories. Low scores were in the Ownership, Schools, Safety, and Comfort categories.

- **S2 (Utility) Alternative**: High scores in Ownership, Schools, Comfort, and Safety categories. Low scores in the Healthy Food and Parks/Natural Lands categories.

**TABLE 3. SOUTHERN SECTOR SCORING RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
<th>S1 (US 41)</th>
<th>S2 (Utility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (ROW)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Barriers</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Natural Lands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Scenery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Public Involvement

Another major component of the SCG Trail Alignment Study was the public involvement element. In addition to reviewing existing conditions, steering committee meetings, and the alternatives analysis, public opinion of future trail alignments is crucial. Therefore, the project team hosted two open house community meetings in April 2018, and held an additional meeting in June 2018 to further fine tune the alternatives and receive supplementary feedback on the Northern Sector alternatives.

3.1 April Open House Meetings

Two community meetings were hosted by the Hillsborough MPO, Hillsborough County Public Works, and the project team on the evenings of Tuesday, April 3, 2018 from 6:00 PM to 7:45 PM and Wednesday, April 4, 2018 from 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM. The Tuesday meeting location was within the Northern Sector at the 78th Street Community Library, and the Wednesday location was held within the Southern Sector at the Gardenville Recreation Center.

To spread the word about the meetings, over 10,000 post cards were mailed to residents before the meeting. As a result, over 50 people attended.

Meeting activities included: aerial maps for comments, “Thought Boards” with questions for participants to respond to, visual preference boards to allow participants to identify what type of trail environments or trail amenities they prefer, and general comment forms. The results are summarized in this section.

Aerial Maps

Two large aerial maps of the study corridor and potential alignments were placed on tables for the participants to write comments on using post-its and markers. The following summarizes the map comments:

- **Northern Sector (N1/N2):** N2 appeared to be more popular than N1 among the attendees. However, another popular opinion was combining N1 + N2 to form a continuous loop. N3 was not yet developed by the steering committee at the time of this meeting.

- **Central Sector (C1/C2):** C1 was trending as the preferred alternative due to the connection to Lamb Elementary and the access to parks.

- **Southern Sector (S1/S2):** A modified S2 crossing the Alafia (and not turning west along Magnolia) appeared to be the favored option for the attendees. The community was interested in finding another way to cross the Alafia River than using US 41.
Thought Boards
Two questions were displayed on a “Thought Board” for the meeting participants to respond to via sticky notes to determine how the participants would use the South Coast Greenway, and where they would like the South Coast Greenway to connect.

Question 1: How would you use the South Coast Greenway?
There were 47 responses to this question over the two meetings. The most frequent response was Biking with 17 responses, accounting for more than 35% of the total votes. The other popular responses were Walking (14 responses, 30%), Other (7 responses, 15%), Recreation (5 responses, 11%), and Transportation (4 votes, 9%). The ‘Other’ category includes running, golf carts, fishing, skating, transit, and bird watching responses. Figure 11 displays the response distribution.

Question 2: Where would you like the South Coast Greenway to connect?
There were 41 responses to this question over the two meetings. The most frequent response was Parks, with over 40% of the responses. Three of the Parks responses were specified as a dog park. Other popular responses included Schools (9 responses, 22%), and Shopping (6 responses, 15%). The Other category includes restaurants, transit, doctor/clinic, library, and post office, which all received one vote each. Meeting participants also mentioned Beach/Waterfront and Other Trails as additional desirable connections. Figure 12 displays the response distribution.

Figure 11. Question 1 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Question 2 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach/Waterfront</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visual Preference Boards (April)

Visual preference boards were provided to poll the meeting participants on their preferred trail environments and trail amenities. One side of the board showed images of four existing trails built along different settings throughout the U.S. (major road, local road, creek, power line) representing the trail alternatives. For example, S1 is along US 41, which is a major road; a picture of an existing trail in Pasco County along US 301 was provided as an example trail environment. The other side of the board showed images of eight potential trail amenities (bike repair station, enhanced crossing, exercise equipment, etc.). The meeting participants were given two dots for the trail environments side and four dots for the trail amenities side.

Trail Environment: 80 total dots were placed on the trail environment side of the board. The two most popular environments were Creek (similar to N2) with 39% of the votes, and Local Road (N1) with 36% of the votes. The Major Road (S1) environment received the fewest votes (11%). Figure 14 to the right displays the response distribution.

Trail Amenities: 160 total dots were placed on the trail amenities side of the board. The three most popular amenities were Bike/Ped Bridge (30 votes, 19%), Benches (28 votes, 18%), and Water Fountains (24 votes, 15%). The two least popular amenities were Bike Repair Station (7 votes, 14%) and Enhanced Crossing (9 votes, 6%). There was one write-in trail amenity for a ‘doggie waste center’. Figure 13 displays the trail amenities response distribution.

Comment Forms (April)

Three comment forms were received at the meetings, and one was emailed to the project team the day after the meetings. Comments received regarding the trail were distributed among the following: safety (2), roadway maintenance/debris (1), adding a dog park and/or other dog friendly amenities, and using trails through Golden Aster Preserve (1).
3.2 June Open House Meeting

After the April meetings, it was determined by the steering committee that the public outreach effort should be enhanced, with a focus on the northern alignments. Therefore, an additional meeting was held on June 11, 2018 from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM at the 78th Street Library and a survey/comment form was mailed to residents requesting feedback on which of the three routes they preferred.

To spread awareness for the meeting, approximately 720 mailings were sent to those directly along each of the three northern routes. Included with the mailing were stamped, self-addressed envelopes with space to comment to provide residents an additional avenue to send feedback other than physically attending the meeting.

As a result, approximately 8 members of the public attended the meeting. The format of the meeting was similar to the April meetings. Materials at the meeting included the aerial plot to write comments on and maps of the regional and county trail systems for context.

In addition to meeting attendance, 30 comment forms were received via mail and email responding to the trail alignments. The most favored alternative was Alternative B, which is also known as N2 or the Creek alignment.

Mailing Results

Nine comment forms were received in response to the mailing. The results were distributed as follows:

- **Option A (N1, Maydell):** 9 votes
- **Option B (N2, Creek):** 12 votes
- **Option C (N3, Powerline):** 6 votes
- **Opposed:** 3 votes

In addition to selecting options, some respondents included comments regarding the three alternatives:

- **Option A (N1, Maydell):** Supporters of this option mentioned reasons such as: ‘beautiful area’, would serve Palm River Elementary, and the shade will be nice for the summer heat. The respondents that were against this option cited safety concerns by having a trail so close to the road due to the volume and speed of cars.

- **Option B (N2, Creek):** The respondents supporting this option included reasons such as: safety, that it would benefit the neighborhood, and that lots of people would be very close. The respondents not supporting this option indicated visibility and safety concerns (crime).

- **Option C (N3, Powerline):** Supporters of this option mentioned: it was the ‘cheapest and easiest’ option, no cars, and convenience. The respondents not supporting this option indicated visibility and safety concerns (crime), concern about ‘exposure to electric power lines’.

- **Opposed:** The respondents that were against building the trail or were against all three alternatives indicated that they felt resources should be spent elsewhere (specifically to focus on motor vehicle roadway improvements).
Visual Preference Board (June)
The same visual preference boards provided in the April meetings were also provided in the June meeting. The meeting participants were also given two dots for the trail environment side and four dots for the trail amenities side. Sixteen total votes were cast on the visual preference board during the June meeting.

**Trail Environment:** Four total votes were cast on the trail environments side of the board. Three of the votes were for the Creek (N2) alternative, and one vote was for the local road (N1) alternative. No votes were cast for the Major Road (S1) or Power Line (S2) alternatives.

**Trail Amenities:** Twelve total votes were cast on the trail amenities side of the board. The two most popular amenities were Lighting (4 votes) and Water Fountains (3 votes). Bike Repair Stations, Exercise Equipment, and Wayfinding Signage did not receive any votes.

Visual Preference Board Combined Totals
The combined results of the visual preference boards from the April and June meeting are summarized below. 256 total votes were cast between both meetings, with 84 votes for the trail environments and 172 votes for the trail amenities.

**Trail Environment:** The two most popular trail environments were Creek (N2) with 40% of the total votes, and Local Road (N1) with 36% of the votes. The least popular trail environment was Major Road (S1), with only 11% of the votes.

**Trail Amenities:** The top four trail amenities were fairly close in votes. Benches and a Bike/Ped Bridge had 30 (19%) and 31 (19%) votes, respectively. Water Fountains and Lighting both had 17 votes (17%). The two least popular amenities were Bike Repair Stations (7 votes, 4%), and enhanced crossings (11 votes, 7%).
4.0 Alignment Concepts and Cost Estimates

The final concepts for the SCG Trail Study were developed based on the results of the alternatives evaluation, the public involvement responses, and guidance from the steering committee. In order to better illustrate the creek alignment (N2), before and after concept renderings were developed prior to the June community meeting.

4.1 Creek Rendering (N2)

In addition, concept renderings were developed for areas where the SCG Trail would cross major roadways. Regardless of the alignment chosen, there are several locations where enhanced crossings of major roadways would be desirable. These locations, at a minimum, include Causeway Boulevard, Madison Avenue, Riverview Drive and Gibsonton Drive.
4.2 Causeway Boulevard Crossing (Alternative N2)

Two options were conceptualized for crossing Causeway Boulevard in the creek alignment. The first option features a 17-foot high pedestrian overpass displayed in Figure 19. The second option is a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon Crossing (HAWK) displayed in Figure 20. Included with both figures is a 70-foot pedestrian bridge crossing the canal north of Causeway Boulevard.

Option 1: Pedestrian Overpass Alternative

The pedestrian overpass alternative includes a continuous 245-foot long ramp (or longer, depending on design needs) with 5-foot wide landings placed every 30 feet to the overpass structure. The slope of the ramp would be approximately 8.3%. The pedestrian overpass will be approximately 100 feet long across Causeway Boulevard with a minimum of 17 feet in height to the bottom of the structure. With this option, a portion of the trail could be located above the canal/creek, thereby minimizing the need for ROW acquisition.

FIGURE 19. CAUSWAY PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS ALTERNATIVE
Option 2: Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon Crossing (HAWK)

The HAWK crossing includes replacing the existing light pole at the crossing with a pedestrian hybrid beacon. Additional lighting can be added to the top of the beacon pole. HAWK midblock crossings would be installed with appropriate ADA ramps and high visibility crosswalk markings. This alternative also includes the reconstruction of the northern sidewalk and bike lane to accommodate combined use for bicyclists and pedestrians. There would be challenges to getting a 12-foot wide trail on the north side of Causeway Boulevard, and ROW acquisition of several parcels south of Causeway Boulevard may be needed.

FIGURE 20. CAUSEWAY HAWK ALTERNATIVE
4.3 Madison Avenue west of Palm Drive (Alternative N2)

The concept below depicts a mid-block crossing with rapid rectangular flashing beacons (RRFB). Note that Hillsborough County plans to widen Madison Avenue to four lanes. Depending on the roadway configuration and traffic volumes, a HAWK intersection may be desirable.
4.4 Palm River Road at 78th Street (Alternative N3)

The intersection depicted below is an area of concern with Alternative N3. 78th Street is a relatively well travelled corridor, and has an interchange connecting to the Selmon Expressway approximately 1/2 mile north of the intersection. Moreover, there is minimal ROW along Palm River Road, as the roadway widens out at the intersection to accommodate turn lanes. Additional analysis would be required, but it appears that ROW acquisition would be necessary to get a 12-foot wide trail through the area.
4.5 Causeway Boulevard at 86th Street (Alternative N3)

In Alternative N3, the utility easement crosses Causeway Boulevard just west of 86th Street. The proposed SCG Trail alignment would move to the eastern edge of the utility easement, such that crossing would occur at the intersection. This is currently an unsignalized intersection, and a pedestrian hybrid beacon (HAWK) is recommended.
4.6 Madison Avenue west of 78th Street (Alternative N3)

As noted in Section 4.3, Madison Avenue is expected to be widened to four lanes in the future. Because the current roadway widens to four lanes just east of the proposed SCG Trail crossing, a pedestrian hybrid beacon (HAWK) is illustrated below. More detailed analysis of the road configuration and traffic volumes may show that installing rapid rectangular flashing beacons (RRFB) is sufficient.

Pedestrian hybrid beacon midblock crossing with ADA ramps and high visibility crosswalk markings. Construction of median refuge with landscape median with detectable edge.

12'-wide shared use path

Signage and striping to be placed per MUTCD guidance.

Tie existing sidewalk into proposed shared use path.
4.7 Riverview Drive at US 41 (all alternatives)

The trail alignment along Riverview Drive applies to all of the alternatives evaluated in this study. The proposed concept depicted below allows the SCG Trail crossing to be separated from the rail crossing and US 41 intersection. Moreover, crossing east of the rail line affords the opportunity for the trail to be integrated into the park on the south side of Riverview Drive. Additional analysis would be necessary to evaluate any impacts of installing a mid-block crossing less than 400 feet from the US 41 signalized intersection.
4.8 Gibsonton Drive at US 41 (Alternative S2)

As shown below, special attention should be given to the SCG Trail alignment at the US 41 / Gibsonton Drive intersection. It is recommended that the curb radii be tightened and that the trail be constructed perpendicular to the rail line.
4.9 Preliminary Cost Estimates

Preliminary cost estimates were developed for three different options, based on the CADD conceptual design files. FDOT Long Range Estimates (LRE) were calculated for the trail and bridge components, along with Maintenance of Traffic (MOT), mobilization, and initial contingency. All three options are based on implementing Alternative S2 and Alternative C1. As shown on Table 4, the first option includes Alternative N2 with the Causeway Boulevard overpass. Option 2 also includes Alternative N2, but with an at-grade crossing of Causeway Boulevard. The third option is based on Alternative N3, again with an at-grade crossing of Causeway Boulevard. In addition to the LRE information, general FDOT cost estimates for enhanced crossings were obtained, and both are detailed in Appendix C. Additional costs were identified for drainage and trail enhancements, and ROW acquisition/easements. The ROW costs vary for each option, based on the amount of properties that may be impacted. Finally, a 20% contingency of calculated construction costs was included, and 15% additional costs for design and construction engineering inspection (CEI) were applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Components</th>
<th>Option 1 Alignment N2 Overpass</th>
<th>Option 2 Alignment N2 At Grade</th>
<th>Option 3 Alignment N3 At Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRE Trail Component</td>
<td>$3,712,900</td>
<td>$3,712,900</td>
<td>$3,896,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE Bridges Component</td>
<td>$2,173,900</td>
<td>$851,800</td>
<td>$655,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE MOT / Mobilization</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td>$730,400</td>
<td>$757,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE Initial Contingency (1%)</td>
<td>$68,700</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>$53,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$6,935,500</td>
<td>$5,348,100</td>
<td>$5,362,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Crossings</td>
<td>$240,000 (2)</td>
<td>$360,000 (3)</td>
<td>$360,000 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage &amp; Trail Enhancements</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Contingency (20%)</td>
<td>$1,635,100</td>
<td>$1,341,600</td>
<td>$1,344,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (CST) SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$9,810,600</td>
<td>$8,049,700</td>
<td>$8,066,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Cost (15% of CST)</td>
<td>$1,471,600</td>
<td>$1,207,500</td>
<td>$1,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEI Cost (15% of CST)</td>
<td>$1,471,600</td>
<td>$1,207,500</td>
<td>$1,210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Acquisitions / Easements</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,493,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,464,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,336,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Next Steps

This study evaluated a series of potential alignments for the South Coast Greenway Trail (SCG Trail). Further analysis of these alignments, and others, should be conducted to more fully understand the opportunities, challenges, impacts, and costs of completing the trail. Key issues for further study include the following:

- Availability of the TECO utility corridor, as well as potential costs or mitigation offsets for utilizing the corridor
- Potential bridging of Bull Frog Creek along the TECO utility corridor, or providing a trail across the Bull Frog Creek Bridge on US 41
- Providing a trail as part of a new Alafia River Bridge, and addressing minimal ROW south of the Alafia River on US 41
- Constructing a trail in the maintenance easement of the Hillsborough County drainage canal west of 78th Street
- Connecting the SCG Trail to the planned Tampa Bypass Canal trail, and possibly to an extended Selmon Greenway trail

These issues, and others, would likely be evaluated in a PD&E Study, which would also include more detailed environmental and engineering analyses, as well as additional public involvement. The PD&E Study would be followed by design, ROW acquisition (if needed), and construction. Finally, as discussed at the beginning of this report, the SCG Trail is part of the larger SUN Trail network. Hillsborough County and its community partners should continue working with state agencies, including FDOT and FDEP, to potentially secure SUN Trail funding for portions of the corridor.
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