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TRI-COUNTY TRAIL

INTRODUCTION

UFL was retained by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of Pinellas and Pasco Counties in the spring of 2013 to prepare a trail planning study to assist with the development of a regional trail network and the analysis of the project’s preliminary engineering feasibility. The study was intended to identify potential trail corridors on which to build a multi-use trail network, including by-pass routes for highly traveled and highly successful existing trails, the Starkey Blvd/ Wilderness Park Trail in Pinellas County, and the Trinity Trail System located in Pinellas County, while satisfying the surrounding community's needs for improved bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

This Tri-County Trail corridor study is consistent with the Pinellas County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) multi-modal travel improvements and Greenways, Trials and Blueways (GTT), as well as the Pasco County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)实施方案. The result of this study will result in the identification of a preferred corridor for the development of the trail to the Starkey Blvd Trail System.

The project’s purpose was to present a preliminary, the public, the project’s purpose and the project’s preliminary engineering feasibility. Since the proposed trail would provide a connection between the existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure of Pinellas and Pasco Counties, it is being called the Tri-County Trail.

The project’s purpose was to present a preliminary concept for a new multi-use trail network, including a by-pass route for the Starkey Blvd Trail System, which connects with the Starkey Wilderness Park Trail and the Scrivner Trail.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study for the Tri-County Trail examines potential alternatives for providing a trail connection between the intersection of Starkey Boulevard at State Road (SR) 54 at the intersection of East Lake Road and Keystone Road. The preferred trail width is 24 feet wide and is a dedicated trail away from motorized traffic. This is the greatest width that will be allowed by the surrounding communities and the existing Starkey Boulevard Trail System.

The study area is generally subdivided in routes and is located where the southern boundary of Pinellas County meets the northern boundary of Pasco County, and where the communities of Pinellas and Pasco Counties interact. The preferred corridor is a 24 feet wide, dedicated trail away from motorized traffic. The study area was chosen to assist with the development of the passport trail along the northern boundary of Pinellas County, and the Trinity Trail System.

The refined route Option 1 is identified as the most appropriate route, followed by Option 2 and Option 3. These options were selected following a detailed evaluation of the characteristics of each route and the preferences of the surrounding communities, and the existing Starkey Boulevard Trail System.

The refined route Option 1 was evaluated as the most appropriate route, followed by Option 2 and Option 3. These options were selected following a detailed evaluation of the characteristics of each route and the preferences of the surrounding communities, and the existing Starkey Boulevard Trail System.
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REGIONAL & STATEWIDE CONTEXT

The Coast-to-Coast Connector Trail plan, prepared by the Office of Greenways and Trails, identifies the Tri-County Trail segment as the “Starkey Gap.” Identification as one of the critical gaps in the proposed Coast-to-Coast Trail places the Tri-County Trail in the spotlight of the statewide trails system. This has advantages in terms of project prioritization and potential funding sources.

When completed, the Tri-County Trail link will contribute to a continuous 275-mile, multi-use trail stretching through Central Florida from St. Petersburg to Titusville, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic Ocean.
The Tri-County Trail Study investigated alternative alignments through south west Pasco County and northern Hillsborough County including the Trinity community. Duke Energy’s right-of-way along the Keystone/275 corridor, US 41 and the Old Tampa Bay area were also evaluated.

The trail area is described as the area bounded by US 41, north to the Old Tampa Bay, west to the Hillsborough River, east to the Hillsborough County line and south to the US 41/275 intersection. The area is illustrated as the STUDY CONTEXT AREA and presented in Map 2.

The study area included consideration of:

- Utilization of the right-of-way of Keystone-Bay Road and the Old Tampa Bay Road corridor from the Hillsborough County line to Old Tampa Bay Road. The study area can be generally described as the corridor bounded by SR 54 on the south, the Duke Energy corridor and Hillsborough County on the east, Little Road on the west and Keystone Road on the south. See attached Study Area Map. The study area included consideration of:

PLANNING & DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

The feasibility and predicted success of route alternatives and associated costs were analyzed and evaluated by assessing the following considerations:

- Land ownership, adjacent uses, compatibility issues
- Environmental: habitats, federal wildlife management
- Physical Constraints – geology, hydrology, accessibility
- Construction – materials, access, coordination, phasing
- Permitting – environmental, right-of-way, construction
- Utilities – coordination, avoid conflicts, wastewater, services
- Natural Assets – preserves, scenic qualities
- Roadside – visual impacts, pedestrian traffic, surveillance
- Potential Trail amenities – furnishings, signs, landscaping
- Trail Access (community connection)
- Duke Energy Corridor: Electric Transmission Right-Of-Way Requirements For Shared Use Paths/Trails

**LAND OWNERSHIP**
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The Tri-County Trail spans two counties with proximity to a third county (Hillsborough County) and their inherent local communities’ interests and jurisdictional differences. Therefore, the exploration of the route alternatives has been approached and presented herein from the perspective of each County, the Tri-County Trail materialistically, will benefit from the dynamic partnered efforts of two highly engaged Metropolitan Planning Organisations (MPO), supportive trail advocates and engaged citizens who have cooperated to find the most advantageous route for the trail through both counties.

Criteria established at the on-set of the study were used to determine potential routes:

- 15’ wide and off road to the greatest extent possible
- Make valuable connections to local communities
- The safest route with the least vehicular conflicts
- The most direct route that satisfies all other criteria
- The most attractive route with potential for varied trail experiences
- Avoid purchasing land by utilizing public or other managed lands where possible
- Avoid negative impacts to existing private property owners (i.e. Fox Hollow Golf Club and residents).

Three potential routes were identified and explored. These will be described in this section beginning with the connection point in Pasco County at the north limit of the study area, proceeding through the Pasco-Pinellas County line to the connection points in Pinellas County.
The line will connect. Avenue at north. terminus where corridor. Hollow of the Golf Club service Boulevard road within Town the crossing will take place. This line was on the map.

ROUTE OPTIONS 1A AND 1B

Beginning on Brittle Boulevard and proceeding south through the Duke Energy corridor would lose the trail proceeding across SR 54 through the Duke Energy corridor and hugging the east corridor boundary all the way to South Fork Road. After site visits and discussions with Duke Energy, it was determined that extending the corridor past the north corridor on SR 54 was problematic due to excessively varied topography, limited access space and conflict with utilities. The crossing of SR 54 would also be unsafe due to traffic signals and an increased pedestrian crossing could not be built due to conflict with the electrical transmission lines there. The upshot is to propose extending the line within Town Avenue and the trail planned to proceed south on the west side of Starkey Boulevard. See Route Option 1A. This alignment can take advantage of the existing signed intersection for a safer crossing of SR 54. In addition, pedestrian improvements can be incorporated into the future construction of the Mitchell Boulevard Extension.

The Mitchell Ranch property south of SR 54 and the proposed Mitchell Boulevard Extension extending through this property to Little Road provides the opportunity for two additional route options. Route Option 1A, 2A and 2B begins at SR 54 and proceeds south on the east side of the Mitchell Boulevard Extension for approximately the first quarter mile.

ROUTE OPTION 1A

Avenue would avoid the Mitchell Boulevard Extension alignment and proceeds through the undeveloped land permitting an existing wetland and continues to the edge of the Duke Energy corridor. It then follows the corridor east to the Mitchell property until the corridor expands. At this point the trail crosses the Duke Energy corridor to the east side of Starkey Boulevard. See Route Option 1A. This alignment was planned to use the corridor only where necessary. The Mitchell property owners have expressed approval of this approach. Fox Hollow Golf Club operations will not be impacted by this route option.

ROUTE OPTION 2

Route 1B follows the Duke road a little further before crossing onto the Duke Energy corridor to proceed due south on the east corridor boundary. Route 1A and 1B utilize the Duke Energy corridor as the direct route south to the county line. Based on on-site conditions, access issues and adjacent land uses, the east edge of the corridor is more suitable for trail construction. For Fox Hollow Golf Club operations will not be impacted by this route option.

ROUTE OPTION 1B

Route 3 would follow the full length of the Mitchell Boulevard Extension corridor to connect with Little Road. On Little Road the trail would be incorporated with an existing shared path corridor to Trin-County. Route 3 would proceed west in the right-of-way of Trin County to the north end of the Pinellas County Preserve and then proceed through the Pinellas County Preserve land that abuts Trinity Boulevard. Entering the preserve through an existing easement of the former Pinellas County facility, the trail would proceed south to the Orange Road and west along Orange Road to East Lake Road and the Trin-County trail junction. See the Pinellas County section for further alignment of the trail through that area.

The route through Route Option 3 less desirable to the PASCOSO County.

1. The timing for the construction of the future Mitchell Boulevard Extension has not been determined. 2. There is insufficient right-of-way on Trinity Boulevard to add a separate trail so the trail becomes a side path. 3. Adding a trail or side path on Trinity Boulevard would not currently be accommodated by drainage ditches pasting the roadbed.
**PINELLAS COUNTY**

**ESTABLISHING THE CONNECTION POINTS**

From the Pinellas County portion of the proposed Tri-County Trail, the route option has to cross Keystone Road and paralleled west on the south side of Old Keystone Road.

The consideration is on the west side of the Keystone ravine to the road that will cross Keystone Road, the available space, the drainage considerations and the number of intersecting streets and driveways.

The primary advantage of placing the trail on the north side of Keystone Road is that there is no space for a trail on the north side of Keystone Road and a subtle idea is reducing it at a downstream point.

The Keystone Road crossing of Woodfield Road on the south side of Keystone Road will require special attention to the free-flowing light traffic. These will need improvements such as signage and stripping and making that safer for pedestrians and bikers, as there are three additional neighborhood streets, community entrance and the need to cross on the south side of Keystone Road.

This route option will require signage to caution trail users to look at the intersecting streets.

**ROUTE OPTION 2**

ROUTE OPTION 2 includes the Brooker Creek Preserve from the west side of the Old Keystone Road and Pinellas County and follows the road to the north side as an existing paved road. This option follows the signs and preserve of ease in order to add it to the route. The difficulty with this option is that it involves a more extended time with a less disturbed area of the preserve that can use for cattle grazing, wildlife and agricultural work. This phase throughout the preserve was not favored by Preserve County preserve managers.

When Route Option 2 makes Keystone Road it continues west for a short distance to the same as Option 1. However, it stays on the north side of Keystone Road.

Keystone Road is necessary to connect the trail with the Brooker Creek Environmental Education Center. It also makes Keystone Road, continuing west to pass the East Lake Youth Sports Complex and runs to the north or south side of Keystone Road. As described above in Option 1, there is no reason to put a trail along the north side of Keystone Road for the last 1/2 mile of the route. The area is not used for the road. There is no reason to use the north side of Keystone Road because there is no additional connection of the Keystone Trail by trail values.

There are also two negative issues with the Keystone and Old Keystone portion of this route option.

First, although making a connection to recreation and sports fields is a positive attribute for a trail, Local Parkland at Keystone Road is very sensitive to the road widening on the west side of Keystone Road.

The right-of-way is narrow and the area is occasionally wet. There are dead-end driveways and preserve of the sports complex on the right-of-way. All of the areas for the trail, increases the cost and makes a less a kayak.

**ROUTE OPTION 3**

ROUTE OPTION 3 is travel the western half of the Brooker Creek Preserve. It is very thought that it could enter the preserve through a Pinellas County facility that no longer in operation and proceed through what appeared to be more undisturbed or at least access on the east half of the preserve. It was found that the area is very much in use for Pinellas County municipal utilizes and is not open for use. Comments from citizens at public meetings have stated that there are a few road trails that make the current situation.

This option is considered to be very much in favor of Pinellas County municipal utilizes and is not open for use. Comments from citizens at public meetings have stated that there are a few road trails that make the current situation.

This option is considered to be very much in favor of Pinellas County municipal utilizes and is not open for use. Comments from citizens at public meetings have stated that there are a few road trails that make the current situation.
One of many Cypress wetland areas that dot the landscape throughout the Hillsborough County ELAPP lands as well as in the Brooker Creek Preserve.

View from proposed trail looking east at Lake Coos (part of the Hillsborough County ELAPP lands).

Typical high and broad wearing Booker Creek Preserve from the hillsborough County ELAPP lands.

Typical existing paved road that was used for accessing wells found throughout the Brooker Creek Preserve.

Mature live oak stand that lines along the proposed trail route could provide shade.

View looking east along the north side of Keystone Road within the Brooker Creek Preserve.

View looking south at the entrance to the Booker Creek Preserve Environmental Education Center.

South side of Keystone Road looking east.

View looking north at the entrance to the East Lake Sports Complex located on Old Keystone Road.

View looking south at the intersection of Keystone Road and East Lake Road. View is looking south along East Lake Road.

Intersection of Keystone Road and East Lake Road. View is looking south along East Lake Road.
The adjacent graphic shows the three different route options in context of the overall project study area. The map was a helpful tool for the public involvement phase and allowed the project team to discuss the various pros and cons of each option to the stakeholders and general public. The combination of the public involvement site analysis, field observations, and stakeholder input helped direct the project team to the most appropriate route option for the Tri-County Trail.
The Tri-County Trail is a proposed Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail that will link the Pinellas Trail in conjunction with this project.

Manny Lajmiri, Pasco County MPO Project Manager, Ph. (727) 847-8140, mlajmiri@pascocountyfl.net

For more information contact:

Susan Miller, Pinellas MPO Project Manager, Ph. (727) 464-8200, smiller@pinellascounty.org

April 18, 2013, 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.
Jay B. Starkey Wilderness Park
10500 Wilderness Park Blvd.
New Port Richey, FL 34655.

YOU ARE INVITED!

PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

Participation by the general public, neighborhood groups, and stakeholders was facilitated by a series of public and stakeholder meetings held in both Pasco and Pinellas Counties. These sessions included strategic planning meetings through the entire planning process. Individual stakeholder meetings were also held to gather information and feedback from stakeholders. These meetings were continued throughout the process. Input from these meetings was incorporated into the preferred Tri-County Trail alignment and associated details about the trail could be designed and constructed.

During the public involvement process it became clear that the proposed Tri-County Trail was well received by the public as well as stakeholders and agencies. Very few concerns regarding the preferred trail alignment were voiced during the public involvement process.

Participants in these meetings included the general public and representatives of the following organizations who expressed their support for the proposed route:

- Pasco County Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Hillsborough County Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Pasco County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Pinellas County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Pasco County Parks and Recreation
- Pinellas County Parks and Conservation Resources
- Hillsborough County Parks and Recreation
- Pasco County Engineering
- Pinellas County Engineering
- Pinellas County Planning and Development
- Friends of Brooker Creek Preserve
- Pinellas Trails, Inc.
- Duke Energy
- Mitchell Property Development
- Council of Hills County Neighborhoods, Inc.
There were also a series of meetings and site visits conducted with Duke Energy and Mitchel Property. Development regarding the potential route of the Tri-County Trail. Various route options were studied, and the final route was determined by the overall need to minimize potential conflicts and provide additional benefits. The final route would be a co-location of the trail within the Duke Energy corridor and through the Mitchel Property. During a September 28, 2013 meeting, both Duke Energy and Mitchel Property. Development noted that they looked forward to partnering with the Pasco County MPO for the planning and development of the important regional and state trail.

Duke Energy expressed a willingness to help keep the costs of co-locating the trail in the power corridor down and noted that there will be requirements for emergency servicing and routine maintenance that must be addressed and planned for as part of trail alignment and construction.

Duke Energy is currently finalizing system-wide “master agreement” with requirements for Shared Use Paths. Trails which will most likely serve as a basis for the design, construction, maintenance and use of the Tri-County Trail within the Duke Energy corridor. Mitchel Property Development noted that they are willing to work with Duke and that it would be an amenity for the Mitchel Property and expressed a desire to be fully involved on the trail plans for coordination purposes of the Mitchel Property development.

Graphics on the facing page were used to explore route options within the Duke Energy and Mitchel Properties. There were many factors that influenced the placement of the proposed route. In addition, there were many trail users who had concerns all the way to environmental challenges. All of these concerns and challenges were addressed during the stakeholder meetings with Duke Energy and Mitchel Properties. It was understood that Duke Energy will still require detailed engineering plans to properly evaluate the proposed route and ensure that there will be no conflicts with their facilities and operations.
Based upon site analysis, field observations, public involvement sessions and stakeholder meetings, a preferred route was determined. The route stands out as preferred for the following points:

- Offers the greatest potential for a trail away from motorized traffic (through Duke Energy corridor & Brooker Creek preserve) where the trail can be 15’ wide and the safest in terms of traffic conflict avoidance.
- There are other trails through power corridors in the region (precedents for co-location) and this would seem to be a compatible use of corridor land to benefit the community.
- Has the least conflicts with other uses of managed preserve land so the trail can be 15’ wide and the safest in terms of traffic conflict avoidance.
- Provides opportunity for varied trail character as it would travel through different habitats in the Brooker Creek preserve, thereby raising the quality of the trail environment and trail desirability.
- Connects to the Hillsborough ELAPP land – Lake Dan Preserve where future recreation will be developed.
- On the south side of Keystone Road at East Lake Road (for the 1,000’ or so) there is space in the right-of-way for the trail.
- Provides a highly visible easily watched extension of the Pinellas Trail.
- Provides a highly visible easily watched extension of the Pinellas Trail.
- Allows for the location of two trailheads in desirable locations.
PASCO COUNTY

The trail would begin where the Stanley Boulevard/Wilderness Park Trail ends on the east side of Stanley Boulevard at Tom Avenue as shown by the yellow connection point symbol on the adjacent graphic. The endpoint wide sidewalk would continue along the east side of Stanley Boulevard to a location where the trail would cross SR 54 at a mid-block crossing that would extend south to the intersection with SR 54. Due to the fact that there is already an existing traffic light at SR 54 and Stanley Boulevard, a trail crossing at this intersection would provide the best location for a crossing of SR 54. Additional pedestrian signals and high-visibility crosswalks would provide for safety at the crossing.

According to Pasco County, it is anticipated that turn lanes will be added to the intersection, thus crossing SR 54 in this location seemed to be the safest alternative. Once the trail crosses SR 54 it will follow the nature grade and for 110' width and would be located within the right of way of the existing Stanley Boulevard. The placement of a potential trail head that would focus a small amount of parking could be located between the Duke Energy corridor and the future Mitchell Boulevard Extension just south of SR 54. This would be highly visible from SR 54. The trail would follow along the east side of the future Mitchell Boulevard Extension for approximately 1000' to where it would head south along the west side of an existing wetland area. A trail head to the edge of this wetland area could then be provided as a potential future development within the Mitchell Property. The trail would stay on the Mitchell property as much as possible to reduce the impacts within the Duke Energy corridor.

When the trail enters the Duke Energy corridor it would continue to follow the nature grade across 110' width and immediately cross to the eastern edge of the intersecting road to be part of any spur structures. There are many considerations with co-locating the trail within the Duke Energy corridor and of Duke Energy’s trail guidelines will be followed. Duke Energy’s trail guidelines are included in the appendix section of this report. A discussion of the potential impacts of this development of the property will illustrate potential conflicts with Duke Energy corridor and any solutions that would avoid those types of conflict or determine the trail's presence within the preserve.
TRINITY BLVD PROPOSED TRAIL CROSSING (FOR EXISTING 2-LANE ROAD)

TRINITY BLVD PROPOSED TRAIL CROSSING (FOR FUTURE 4-LANE ROAD)

TRAIL CROSSING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED AT SR 54 AND STARKEY BOULEVARD

APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF FUTURE MITCHELL BLVD EXTENSION RIGHT-OF-WAY
STARKEY BOULEVARD - LONGLEAF COMMUNITY

DUKE ENERGY CORRIDOR
Once the trail crosses Pasco County and enters Hillsborough County (Brooker Creek Preserve) it would continue to follow the national grant line to 15' in width and turn immediately to the west to extend towards the Hillsborough County line. This trail would have a fence on the western edge of the trail to separate it from the adjoining areas as some of the existing fence line within the Preserve. This would physically separate the trail from the existing fence on the Preserve, such as Tampa Bay Water wellheads, cable gaining, and other agricultural or County/Preserve activities. Once the trail extends to the Hillsborough County line, it would follow the trail and stay with Florida's multi-use trail system. A fence on the east side of the trail that separates it from other Preserve uses. There is currently an existing paved road that roughly runs along the edge of the preserve in this area. The intent would be for the trail to follow this alignment to the greatest extent possible to minimize disturbance of the Preserve. The existing road would be widened to meet the standards of a 15' wide trail. This section of the trail will be adjacent to the Land Don property owned by Hillsborough County. There could be a pedestrian connection to that property, but it would need to be permitted in nature and subject to the ELAPP policies governing trails and uses. The trail would continue south along the east side of the Preserve until it reaches Keystone Road at which point it will transition to the west along the north side of the road. Again a fence on the north side of the road. The intent would be for the trail to continue south along the trail subject to the Brooker Creek Preserve Management Plan. The trail would continue along the north side of Keystone Road for approximately 2,000' to where there would be a multi-use trail crossing of Keystone Road. Since the speed limit along Keystone Road is 40 mph, it would be ideal to utilize a pedestrian activated crossing. The intent would be for the crossing to be used by users crossing the road. A graphic is included in the following pages that shows how this crossing would be implemented. A site discussion during the stakeholder meetings that this crossing may also be able to serve as a future grade separated wildlife crossing for the Preserve.

Once the trail crosses Keystone Road it would turn to the west and run along the south side of the road. The trail would be located with the Keystone Road right-of-way near the current public trailhead and the existing multi-use trail system. There is about 12' to 15' in width depending upon the site conditions. There is an existing paved road that could be used to access the Preserve and Environmental Education Center. The access road is primarily a one-way system and has a posted speed limit of 15 mph and would be shared with bikes and pedestrians. The trail would cross to the west side of the road to continue south along the south side of Keystone Road.
KEYSTONE ROAD PROPOSED TRAIL CROSSING

ACCESS TO BROOKER CREEK PRESERVE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER

TRI-COUNTY TRAIL

BROOKER CREEK PRESERVE
PINELLAS COUNTY

The trail would continue along the south side of Keystone Road past both interchanges with Keystone Road until it enters Pinellas County. At this point there would need to be pavement markings and advance signage installed along the trail across Woodfield Boulevard and the associated entry and exit drives. Since there are additional curvatures there will be less area for the trail and it may need to be narrowed down, but would retain less than 10’ wide at any park. At roughly 600 feet past the entrance to Woodfield the trail would then widen back to a 10’ width and continue on the south side of Keystone Road in Pinellas County until it intersects with Saint Lake Road. The trail in this section would follow the natural grade and be 12’ in width, as the right of way varies quite a bit. This would allow the trail to again be as close as possible to the right of way line and away from the roadway. Due to the fact that there is already existing traffic light at Keystone Road and there are no cross streets in this location then at any other point along Saint Lake Road. Additional pedestrian signs and high-visibility crossteeds should be added to facilitate the trail crossing at the intersection. A graphic on the following pages depict the condition at this intersection.
Section 1 – Starkey Boulevard (Pasco County)
This section would include the following items:
- Approximately 1,000 linear feet (308.66 meters) of trail at $650 a linear foot
- Trailhead and associated improvements and amenities at $188,850 per section

Subtotal Section 1 $1,377,000

Section 2 – Keystone Road (Pasco County)
This section would include the following items:
- Approximately 1,305 linear feet (403.75 meters) of trail at $750 a linear foot
- Trailhead and associated improvements and amenities at $50,000 per section

Subtotal Section 2 $1,395,000

Section 3 – Duke Energy Corridor (Pasco County)
This section would include the following items:
- Approximately 1,900 linear feet (580 meters) of trail at $500 a linear foot
- All crossings at $5,000 each

Subtotal Section 3 $1,900,000

Section 4 – Bunker Creek Preserve (Pinellas County)
This section would include the following items:
- Approximately 2,460 linear feet (750 meters) of trail at $400 a linear foot
- Trailhead and associated improvements and amenities at $495,000 per section

Subtotal Section 4 $2,495,000

Section 5 – Keyser Road (Pinellas County)
This section would include the following items:
- Approximately 2,560 linear feet (780 meters) of trail at $700 a linear foot
- Trailhead and associated improvements and amenities at $1,000,000 per section

Subtotal Section 5 $2,770,000

SUBTOTAL SECTIONS 1-5 $8,542,000

Design (10%) $854,200
Contingency (15%) $1,281,300
Construction Engineering and Inspection (5%) $421,050

GRAND TOTAL $9,246,550

NOTE: These costs are generic in nature and not based on actual construction drawings. The costs also do not take into account any right-of-way takings or additional drainage improvements that may be required based on a comprehensive drainage analysis.
The Tri-County Trail will provide a critical link between the Pinellas Trail and the Starkey Boulevard/Wilderness Park Trail. Once constructed, it will allow users to travel from St. Petersburg to the Suncoast Trail corridor and eventually to the east coast of Florida via the Coast to Coast Connector. Multi-use trails have a track record of providing opportunities for economic growth for communities as well as providing a reliable mode of transportation, increased property values and tourism and recreation-related spending on items such as bicycles, or in-line skates, lodging, and dining. The Tri-County Trail will also provide a safe, inexpensive avenue for regular exercise for people living in the surrounding communities. The Trail will provide what many Americans seek; close-to-home recreational opportunities, educational experiences, natural landscapes and beautification. The trail will help the surrounding communities build pride by ensuring that their neighborhoods are good places to live, so that children can safely walk or ride to a park, school, or to a neighbor’s home. In December of 2013, the plan gained approval from both the Pinellas County and Pasco County MPO Boards on the recommended route. The next step will be to produce detailed engineering plans that will be used to construct the trail. Additional coordination with Duke Energy and Mitchell Properties will need to occur to facilitate the co-location of the trail within their respective properties. Potential funding sources will also need to be identified. These sources could potentially include state level funding, such as those being proposed for use on the Coast to Coast Connector project. It is anticipated that Pasco County will begin preparation of detailed engineering plans in 2014 and that a dedicated funding stream for construction will be available starting in 2015. At this time, Pasco County is in the process of determining a schedule for preparation of detailed engineering plans and construction. Pasco and Pinellas Counties will continue to coordinate with each other on design and construction to ensure the success of the Tri-County Trail.

"Find a path or make one." –SENECA, Roman statesman, 4 BC—AD 45
Electric Transmission Right of Way Requirements for Shared-Use Paths/Trails

This set of Duke Energy Transmission Right of Way (ROW) requirements governs the use of Duke Energy’s Right of Way (ROW) for the construction of Multi-Use Paths or Shared-Use Paths. These guidelines are provided for the purpose of minimizing the impact to Duke Energy facilities and reducing the potential for future issues. It is the responsibility of the trail owner to ensure that all requirements have been satisfied.

1. The trails must not exceed a total of 10 feet in width, regardless of the surface construction material.
2. A minimum separation of 25 feet is required between the trail and its associated easement, to any Duke Energy electrical transmission or distribution facility. These separations shall be measured from the centerline of the trail to the centerline of the associated easement.
3. The owner of the trail shall be responsible for safety and liability associated with its construction or use thereof.
4. Bollards shall be installed per Duke Energy specifications, with Duke Energy locks, where the trailheads connect with roads/avenues.
5. Culverts shall be installed where the trails cross creeks, ditches, etc. These culverts shall be capable of supporting 80,000 pounds and shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide. Signage must indicate the maximum load of the crossing at culvert.
6. No structures including, but not limited to, lights, signs, benches, exercise equipment, and irrigation systems shall be located within the Duke Energy easement.

Definition: For purposes of this document the term “trail(s)” shall be used to refer to Multi-Use Paths or Shared-Use Paths as defined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

Compliance with these Duke Energy Shared-Use Path/Trails requirements, or approval of any such plans by Duke Energy, does not allow the development of any private easement. Approval of plans by Duke Energy is subject to change at any time and without notice. Duke Energy reserves all rights conveyed to it by the right-of-way agreement applicable to the subject property. An application for a new trail, a change in an existing trail, or any other request for a change in any of the requirements or factors that may need to be addressed. You should contact the Asset Protection Right of Way Specialist if you have additional questions or concerns. This list of requirements and guidelines is subject to change at any time and without notice. Duke Energy reserves all rights conveyed to it by the right-of-way agreement applicable to the subject property.

Proof that the property owners have signed an easement agreement with the owner of the trail must be supplied to Duke Energy. Prior to the installation of a shared-use trail, a “Trail Encroachment Agreement”, which includes “hold harmless” language, shall be executed with Duke Energy. In addition, deed information of all property owners that the trail affects must be supplied to Duke Energy. Approval of any plans by Duke Energy does not mean that the requirements of any local, county, state, or federal government or other applicable agency have been satisfied.

Guidelines/Restrictions or approval of any plans by Duke Energy does not mean that the requirements of any local, county, state, or federal government or other applicable agency have been satisfied. Any drainage feature that allows water to pond, causes erosion, directs storm water toward the rights of way, or limits the corridor for Duke Energy heavy equipment crossings. These trail reinforcement areas shall consist of a 20-foot-long, 10-foot-wide, drainage apron, which is added to the trail on both sides. No portion of such trail reinforcement area shall be located within 25 feet of any electrical facility.

No portion of the trail or shoulder, or associated grading, shall be located within 25 feet of any electrical facility. Fences shall not parallel the centerline within the rights of way but may cross from one side to the other at any angle not less than 30 degrees with the centerline. No portion of such facility or corresponding easement shall be located within 25 feet of Duke Energy’s transmission right of way, are not allowed within the right-of-way limits. Transformers, telephone/cable pedestals (and any associated equipment), and irrigation heads are not permitted. Attachments to Duke Energy structures are prohibited.

A minimum separation of 25 feet is required between the trail and its associated easement, to any Duke Energy electrical facility. These separations shall be measured from the centerline of the trail to the centerline of the associated easement.

3. The owner of the trail shall be responsible for safety and liability associated with its construction or use thereof.
4. Bollards shall be installed per Duke Energy specifications, with Duke Energy locks, where the trailheads connect with roads/avenues.
5. Culverts shall be installed where the trails cross creeks, ditches, etc. These culverts shall be capable of supporting 80,000 pounds, and shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide. Signage must indicate the maximum load of the crossing at culvert.
6. No structures including, but not limited to, lights, signs, benches, exercise equipment, and irrigation systems shall be located within the Duke Energy easement.

Definition: For purposes of this document the term “trail(s)” shall be used to refer to Multi-Use Paths or Shared-Use Paths as defined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

Compliance with these Duke Energy Shared-Use Path/Trails requirements, or approval of any such plans by Duke Energy, does not allow the development of any private easement. Approval of plans by Duke Energy is subject to change at any time and without notice. Duke Energy reserves all rights conveyed to it by the right-of-way agreement applicable to the subject property. An application for a new trail, a change in an existing trail, or any other request for a change in any of the requirements or factors that may need to be addressed. You should contact the Asset Protection Right of Way Specialist if you have additional questions or concerns. This list of requirements and guidelines is subject to change at any time and without notice. Duke Energy reserves all rights conveyed to it by the right-of-way agreement applicable to the subject property.
LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) - PASCO COUNTY

GREENWAYS, TRAILS, & BLUEWAYS (GTB) - PASCO COUNTY