CONTEXT ANALYSIS

The following maps explore land use, land cover, and demographic conditions across St. Clair County. This is intended to provide a brief characterization of the county and help set the stage for the gap identification and prioritization discussed later in this report.
LAND USE PATTERNS

The majority of St. Clair County is rural with a matrix of agricultural and residential land uses. There are large areas of recreational lands, such as the Port Huron State Game Area or the St. John's Marsh State Wildlife Area in the southern end of the county. Industrial and commercial uses are primarily clustered in more urbanized areas along the St. Clair River.
LAND COVER

Planted and cultivated lands dominate the county overall, although large woodlands and wetland complexes extent through much of the center of the county. Areas adjacent to the St. Clair River from Marine City north to Fort Gratiot Township reflect the predominant areas of developed (urbanized) land areas.
POPULATION DENSITY (2017 ACS CENSUS TRACTS)
Total population for the county estimated to be approximately 160,000 based on the 2017 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates. The population has been relatively stable across the county, with the 2010 Census reporting 163,040 people and the Long Range Transportation Plan (2014) projecting 167,621 by year 2045.
NON-MOTORIZED PATTERNS AND COMMUTING

Of the 69,204 commuting workers in St. Clair County (2017 ACS survey), 1,283 reported walking or biking to work as their primary means of commuting. This activity is primarily concentrated closer to the county's denser city and urbanized areas.
The percentage of population aged 65 and older in St. Clair County was 14.5% in 2010, and this is projected to increase to 25% by 2040. This reflects a significant increase in older population brackets, and from a mobility and accessibility standpoint, underscores the attention that needs to be paid to providing safe, accessible alternatives to personal car use for county residents.
POPULATION UNDER 18
Youth population (under 18) totals approximately 31,400 or 19.6% of the total population (2017 ACS estimates). Similar to the population over 65, the mobility for those 18 and under include people below the legal driving age, who may rely more heavily on non-motorized travel for local trips.
JOB DENSITY

US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data (on the map) identifies employment numbers by census block. The greatest concentration of jobs are within the denser city areas. The largest five employment sectors (2011-2012 averages) include food service, health care service, nursing and residential care, hospitals, and general merchandise.
LABOR FORCE RATE

The labor force rate represents the portion of the total population that is available for work (which includes both employed and unemployed individuals). From the 2013-2017, St. Clair County’s overall labor force participation rate was 60.5%.
UNEMPLOYMENT RATE
Overall trends in St. Clair County suggest that unemployment rate is declining (i.e. 17.6% in 2009 to 12.2% in 2012), however the overall labor force has also been declining consistent with national trends.
POVERTY RATE
The 2017 ACS reports a poverty rate for St. Clair County of 12.4% overall - which is close to national averages (12.3%). Transportation expenses can be significant burden on household incomes, and lower income households are disproportionately impacted by transportation expenses.
GAP #1  Lighthouse Park to Lakeside Park

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING  PROPOSED
- Wide Shoulder
- Off Road
- Side Path
- Bike Lanes (Conventional)
- Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
- Protected Bikeway (2-way)
- Advisory Lane
- High Visibility Sharrows
- Signed Bike Route
- Intersection Improvement

SELECTED LAND USES
- Public / Institutional
- Commercial
- Parks / Recreation

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
**1A 300 FEET**

**LIGHTHOUSE PARK TO CONGER & LAKEVIEW**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Pave the shoulder beach side to create a clean sidepath edge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1B 400 FEET**

**CONGER & LAKEVIEW TO CONGER & BALLENTINE**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory lanes or slow road treatments</td>
<td>Local street and public space between the roadway and the water edge. Route sidepath around the existing utility poles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1C 0.6 MILES**

**CONGER & BALLENTINE TO CONGER & EDISON**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane (Narrow)</td>
<td>Narrow (24’) roadway. Remove parking and use advisory bike lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1D 1300 FEET

**CONGER & EDISON TO CONGER & HOLLAND**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen sidewalk on west side to side path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1E 800 FEET

**CONGER & HOLLAND TO HOLLAND & GRATIOT**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lanes</td>
<td>Advisory lanes. Create clear connection into the parking lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1F 0.9 MILES

**GRATIOT AVENUE (HOLLAND TO GARFIELD)**

City Owned

AADT 7400

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen a sidewalk on WEST side into a sidepath.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2A 300 FEET</th>
<th>Lighthouse Park to Garfield &amp; Gratiot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Owned</td>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED FACILITY**

- Sidepath

**IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

- Intersection improvements and widen sidewalk to sidepath. Wide setback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2B 0.3 MILE</th>
<th>Garfield &amp; Wright to Wright &amp; Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Owned</td>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED FACILITY**

- Advisory bike lane with parking on one-side

**IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

- Advisory bike lane with parking on one-side to remain Road 33' wide
- 8' - 5' - 15' - 5'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2C 400 FEET</th>
<th>Wright &amp; Church to Thomas Edison Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Owned</td>
<td><strong>Appendix</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED FACILITY**

- Sidepath

**IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

- Transition to sidepath at intersection. May need private property ROW
### GARFIELD & GRATIOT TO THOMAS EDISON PARK

City Owned

#### PROPOSED FACILITY | IMPLEMENTATION NOTES
---|---
Sidepath | Gratiot Sidepaths with connections down Garfield and Elmwood. Widen existing sidewalks.
GAP #3  Pine Grove Park to Keifer Park

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING  PROPOSED

Wide Shoulder
Off Road
Side Path
Bike Lanes (Conventional)
Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
Protected Bikeway (2-way)
Advisory Lane
High Visibility Sharrows
Signed Bike Route
Intersection Improvement

SELECTED LAND USES
Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation
### PROPOSED FACILITY

### IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

#### 3A 200 FEET

**BRIDGE TO BAY TRAIL TO MICHIGAN**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Existing link, needs improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3B 900 FEET

**MICHIGAN & KEARNEY TO MICHIGAN & LINCOLN**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen sidewalk into sidepath. Ample room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3C 400 FEET

**GLENWOOD TO BEERS THROUGH KEIFER PARK**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Sidewalk is too narrow. Widen into shared-use trail width (10')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAP #4 Port Huron Downtown

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING PROPOSED
Wide Shoulder
Off Road
Side Path
Bike Lanes (Conventional)
Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
Protected Bikeway (2-way)
Advisory Lane
High Visibility Sharrow
Signed Bike Route
Intersection Improvement
Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation

SELECTED LAND USES

Wide Shoulder
Off Road
Side Path
Bike Lanes (Conventional)
Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
Protected Bikeway (2-way)
Advisory Lane
High Visibility Sharrow
Signed Bike Route
Intersection Improvement
Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation
### 4A 300 FEET

**QUAY STREET**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Quay Street; Continue side path on South side. Narrow or eliminate a travel lane on Quay (1-way street)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4B 0.4 MILE

**QUARRY & HURON TO HURON & GLENWOOD**

State owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>Road diet opportunity. (5 to 3 lanes) 63’ pavement curb-to-curb. Parking remains with 2-way bikeway on east side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4C 0.5 MILES

**FORT STREET**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Sidepath in median from Beers to Grand River. Transition to sidepath on West side of the street (remove parking).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**PROPOSED FACILITY** | **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**
---|---
Sidepath | Expand sidewalk into sidepath on the southside of the road

**PROPOSED FACILITY** | **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**
---|---
Protected Bikeway | With road-diet, protected bikeway on east most lane

**PROPOSED FACILITY** | **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**
---|---
Protected Bikeway | Road diet opportunity. (5 to 3 lanes) 63' pavement curb-to-curb. Parking remains with 2-way bikeway on east side
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4G</strong> 1300 FEET</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIDGE TO BAY TRAIL TO MICHIGAN</strong></td>
<td>City Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED FACILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high visibility sharrows</td>
<td>Pending road re-construction. Add high visibility sharrows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4H</strong> 1000 FEET</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4TH STREET</strong></td>
<td>City Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED FACILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protected bikeway</td>
<td>Potential road diet or lane width reduction for protected bikeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4I</strong> 0.3 MILES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHIGAN STREET</strong></td>
<td>City Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSED FACILITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Low volume, no center line markings, commercial advisory street candidate w/ parking on one side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MICHIGAN STREET**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high visibility sharrows</td>
<td>Road being reconstructed with no room for dedicated facilities. Consider adding high visibility sharrows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAP #5 Blue Water River Walk to Electric

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE

EXISTING PROPOSED

- Wide Shoulder
- Off Road
- Side Path
- Bike Lanes (Conventional)
- Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
- Protected Bikeway (2-way)
- Advisory Lane
- High Visibility Sharrows
- Signed Bike Route
- Intersection Improvement

SELECTED LAND USES

- Public / Institutional
- Commercial
- Parks / Recreation

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, and the GIS User Community
**5A1 0.3 MILE**

**10TH STREET**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Existing sidepath - needs improvement, in poor condition. Crossings need more visibility and improvements. Work in buffers via adjusting curbs if possible. Existing pavement ~46’ wide at 4 travel lanes. Roadway only ~3,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5A2 0.4 MILE**

**ELECTRIC AVENUE**

State owned
AADT 4900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen sidewalk on Military into sidepath. Connected to trail tunnel with ramp access point. Existing pavement ~46’ wide at 4 travel lanes. Roadway only ~3,800 AADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAP #6 Marysville Connections

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING PROPOSED
- Wide Shoulder
- Off Road
- Side Path
- Bike Lanes (Conventional)
- Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
- Protected Bikeway (2-way)
- Advisory Lane
- High Visibility Sharrows
- Signed Bike Route
- Intersection Improvement
- Public / Institutional
- Commercial
- Parks / Recreation

SELECTED LAND USES

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, Aero mayor, Getmapping, and the GIS User Community
### 6A 0.3 MILE

**MUNICIPAL PARK TO HURON & RIVER**

City Owned  
AADT 1400

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sidepath          | Pickup / extend sidepath as needed along park edge.  
|                   | Improve crossing at Huron |

### 6B 800 FEET

**RIVER ROAD NEAR CHRYSLER BEACH**

City Owned  
AADT 1400

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sidepath          | Widen sidewalk on West side into a sidepath (too much conflict on east side).  
|                   | Add new mid-block crossing. |
**7A 2100 FEET**

**RIVER ROAD BIKEWAY NORTH END**

City Owned
AADT 800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen shoulder on one side of the road to make space for a side path or in-road bikeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7B 0.5 MILE**

**RIVER ROAD (DAVIS TO MACK)**

City Owned
AADT 800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>Recongure with 10' travel lane, 2' buffer, 8' sidepath (extend shoulder pavement east 4')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7C 0.3 MILES**

**RIVER ROAD TO RIVER & DAVIS**

County owned
AADT 300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Add a sidepath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7D 0.4 MILE

**DAVIS ROAD**

County owned  
AADT 300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen sidewalk on west side to side path. A conceptual budget of $404,513 for design, engineering and construction was prepared for this segment in 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7E 1.5 MILE

**BUSHA HIGHWAY**

State owned  
AADT 9900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Local street and public space between the roadway and the water edge. Route sidepath around the existing utility poles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7F 0.6 MILES

**CUTTLE ROAD**

City Owned  
AADT 1300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Narrow (24&quot;) roadway. Remove parking and use advisory bike lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROPOSED FACILITY** | **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**
--- | ---
Off Road | Sidewalk is too narrow. Widen into shared-use trail width (10')
### 8A 0.6 MILES

**YANKEE ROAD**

City Owned

#### PROPOSED FACILITY
Signed Bike Route

#### IMPLEMENTATION NOTES
recent repaving. Revisit sidepath connection and/or wider shoulders in the future.

### 9A 0.5 MILE

**RIVER ROAD (YANKEE TO N. RIVERSIDE DR )**

State owned  
AADT 6900

#### PROPOSED FACILITY
Protected Bikeway

#### IMPLEMENTATION NOTES
Existing 2-lane road with very wide paved shoulders (42’ wide pavement width)  
Widen shoulder on west side into sidepath / buffered trail

### 9B 1.0 MILES

**RIVER ROAD TO RIVERSIDE AVENUE**

State owned  
AADT 12300

#### PROPOSED FACILITY
Sidepath

#### IMPLEMENTATION NOTES
Planned road diet (4 > 3 lane) with conventional bike lanes. Widen western sidewalk into sidepath (8’ wide) off back of curb.
### RIVERSIDE AVE (VINE TO CLINTON)

**State owned**  
**AADT 11000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Planned road diet (4 &gt; 3 lane) with conventional bike lanes. Cross over Riverside and widen sidewalk on east side into a sidepath or use existing boardwalk (needs major improvements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RIVERSIDE / OAKLAND

**State owned**  
**AADT 8500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OAKLAND AVE (PALMER TO HATHAWAY)

**State owned**  
**AADT 8500**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Existing wide shoulders - repave and mark as dedicated bike lanes. Add bike buffers where existing shoulder is wider than 5'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Facility Implementation Notes

**9F 04 Mile**

**RIVER ROAD (HATHAWAY TO BREE)**

- County owned
- AADT 8500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>Widen shoulder on west side into a protected bikeway or side path if space can be secured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10A 0.7 Mile**

**CLINTON (CARNEY TO 6TH)**

- City owned
- AADT 6200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>Wide 2-lane road (34-feet no parking) Add protected bikeway on North side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10B 1300 Feet**

**CLINTON & 6TH TO RIVERSIDE**

- City owned
- AADT 6200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Transition bikeway into a wide sidewalk / sidepath on the north side. Intersection improvements at Riverside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11A 1.2 MILE
**URBAN & FRANCIS TO MARY & WOODWORTH**
City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Part of existing US Bike Route 20. 20’ pavement. Add advisory bikes lane markings 5’ - 10’ - 5’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11B 0.4 MILE
**MARY & WOODWORTH TO BROADWAY**
City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Part of existing US Bike Route 20 32’ pavement. Add advisory bikes lane markings with parking on one side 8’ - 6’ - 12’ - 6’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11C 0.3 MILE
**MARY & BROADWAY TO BROADWAY & WATER**
City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>Part of the US Bike Route 20 Existing ~52-54’ pavement. w/o center lane or median Has some on-street parking Expand existing sidewalk as a side path. Add conventional bike lanes + high visibility sharrows in-road for more confident riders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Images and diagrams are not transcribed in this text.*
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11D 0.4 MILE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY &amp; BROADWAY TO FAIRBANKS &amp; BUTLER</td>
<td>City Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Owned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AADT 2800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED FACILITY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen sidewalk to sidepath on north side of Fairbanks. Cross to southside on Frederick St. and connect to existing trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **11E 0.4 MILE**  |                      |
| BROADWAY & WATER TO WATER & BRIDGE  | City Owned  |
| City Owned  |                     |
| AADT 2800  |                     |
| PROPOSED FACILITY | IMPLEMENTATION NOTES |
| high visibility sharrows  | Commercial shared street. High visibility sharrow markings in the road. Other riders to use existing sidewalks |

| **11F 1200 FEET** |                      |
| WATER & BRIDGE TO MAIN & BROWN  | City Owned  |
| Existing wide shoulders - repave and mark as dedicated bike lanes. Add bike buffers where existing shoulder is wider than 5'  |                     |
| PROPOSED FACILITY | IMPLEMENTATION NOTES |
| Advisory Lane  | Advisory Bike lanes + high visibility sharrow |
### 11G 0.4 MILE

**S. BELLE RIVER AVE & WARD**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>22' Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add advisory lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11H 0.4 MILE

**BROWN / 3RD / CHARTIER**

City Owned

AADT 1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Add advisory bike lanes ~33’ wide roadway with parking on one side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11I 0.5 MILE

**N. BELLE RIVER / DEGURSE**

City Owned AADT 3000

Existing wide shoulders - repave and mark as dedicated bike lanes. Add bike buffers where existing shoulder is wider than 5’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Add advisory bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24’ and 32’ wide roadways respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chartier to Parker

**City Owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Planned off-street trail connection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parker Street

**State owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen and extend existing sidewalk into sidepath. Plenty of width throughout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### River Road

**State owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen and extend existing sidewalk into sidepath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAP #12  Marine City to Algonac State Park

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING  PROPOSED
Wide Shoulder
Off Road
Side Path
Bike Lanes (Conventional)
Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
Protected Bikeway (2-way)
Advisory Lane
High Visibility Sharrows
Signed Bike Route
Intersection Improvement

SELECTED LAND USES
Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation
## 12A 2.2 MILE

**RIVER & MARTINDALE TO RIVER & ROBERTS**

State owned  
AADT 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikelane / Sidewalk</td>
<td>Existing wide shoulder. Widen further on west side into protected bikeway / buffered sidepath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 12B 400 FEET

**ROBERTS CONNECTION TO EXISTING TRAIL**

State owned  
AADT 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>Connection to existing trail Sidewalk at edge of roadway in front of general store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add mid-block crossing to existing trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13A 1300 FEET

**MICHIGAN STREET (SHERWOOD TO CENTER)**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Existing wide shoulder. Widen further on west side into protected bikeway / buffered sidepath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13B 800 FEET

**MICHIGAN STREET (CENTER TO DIXIE)**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high visibility sharrows</td>
<td>High viz sharrows. Very narrow residential slow street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13C 0.4 MILES

**MICHIGAN STREET (DIXIE TO SMITH)**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Roadway 24-28' wide. Advisory lanes with parking on one side where width allow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SMITH FIELD PARK TO SAINT CLAIR RIVER

**City Owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Intersection improvement. Establish sidepath on the south side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ST CLAIR RIVER TO LIBERTY

**State owned**

**AADT 6200**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Utilize existing boardwalk trail with improvements. Or establish a new sidepath in the park space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POINTE TREMBLE ROAD

**State owned**

**AADT 11800**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen + expand sidewalk on the north / west side of the street into side path. Southside has more obstructions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 14A 3.1 MILE
**POINTE TREMBLE ROAD**

State owned  
AADT 11800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Expand sidewalk on the north side into a shared use path and fill in sidewalk gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14B 3.8 MILE
**DYKE ROAD**

State owned  
AADT 11800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>Transition sidepath to the south / west side of the road. Established a buffered sidepath / trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14C 5.4 MILE
**DIXIE HIGHWAY**

State owned  
AADT 18600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>Transition sidepath / buffered trail to the north side of the road way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

**14D 0.6 MILE**  
**DIXIE HIGHWAY TO IRA TOWNSHIP PARK**  
County owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>New sidepath connection to Ira township municipal center / park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14E 0.5 MILE**  
**DIXIE HIGHWAY TO WATERWORKS PARK**  
County owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed Bike Route</td>
<td>Signed route connection down Long Island Couty / Water Works Drive to Water Works Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15A  5.9 MILE

COUNTY LINE ROAD

County Owned
AADT 7000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>100-foot existing ROW w/ 2-lane road 5,000 - 7,000 AADT Extend sidepath on east side of the road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

**16A 0.8 MILES**

**GRATIOT & COUNTY LINE TO 32 MILE • DIVISION**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Planned off-street trail connection. Aligned with a major watermain easement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16B 1.2 MILE**

**DIVISION (OAK TO COUNTY LINE)**

County Owned
AADT 6500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Planned Richmond sidepath extension on the Southside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16C 0.5 MILES**

**DIVISION (COUNTY LINE TO GRATIOT)**

County Owned
AADT 6500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Planned Richmond sidepath extension on the Southside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**16D 0.9 MILE**

**GRATIOT AVE (DIVISION & COUNTRY LINE)**

County Owned  
AADT 7700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sidepath          | Proposed bike lanes from prior plan. Currently has wide, semi-paved shoulders.  
7,700 AADT PROPOSE: Sidepath Alternative: Wider shoulder on the south/east side, expand paving to ~14’ shoulder for a buffered trail |

**16E 0.5 MILE**

**MAIN STREET TO COUNTRY LINE**

State Owned. Road Diet planned (4-lane ends at Palmer) to add bike lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected bikeway</td>
<td>Typically 2-lanes, wide. Opportunity to rebuild north-side of roadway to have a sidepath or bikeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16F 0.4 MILE**

**MAIN STREET TO HOWARD STREET**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lane</td>
<td>Advisory Bike lanes + high visibility sharrow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED FACILITY | IMPLEMENTATION NOTES
--- | ---
high visibility sharrows | High viz sharrows. Very narrow residential slow street

### 16H 0.3 MILE

**OAK STREET (MAIN TO DIVISION)**
City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Existing wide shoulder. Widen further on west side into protected bikeway / buffered sidepath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**17A 10.6 MILE**

**DIVISION / FRED MOORE**

County Owned
AADT 3900 (FRED MOORE)
AADT 4100-8300 (DIVISION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>2-lanes, 28’ paved, Narrow gravel shoulders. Extra ROW on Southside of road. Create sidepath in additional ROW OR expand shoulder on southside into a buffered trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18A 12.8 MILE**

**GRATIOT AVE**

County Owned
AADT 3700-5700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>2-lanes, 42’ outside of shoulder to shoulder. Expand south shoulder into a buffered trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**19A 0.6 MILES**

**GRATIOT UNDERPASS**

County Owned
AADT 3600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Add continuation of sidepath below the overpass. New Gratiot crossing needed west of bridge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING PROPOSED
Wide Shoulder
Off Road
Side Path
Bike Lanes (Conventional)
Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
Protected Bikeway (2-way)
Advisory Lane
High Visibility Sharrows
Signed Bike Route
Intersection Improvement
Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation

GAP #20 Fort Gratiot Preserve to Lakeshore

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
### PROPOSED FACILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Existing link, needs improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen sidewalk into sidepath. Ample room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Sidewalk is too narrow. Widen into shared-use trail width (10')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAP #21  Lakeport State Park to Fort Gratiot

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community

BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE
EXISTING  PROPOSED
Wide Shoulder
Off Road
Side Path
Bike Lanes (Conventional)
Protected/Buffered Bike Lanes
Protected Bikeway (2-way)
Advisory Lane
High Visibility Sharrows
Signed Bike Route
Intersection Improvement
Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation

SELECTED LAND USES

Public / Institutional
Commercial
Parks / Recreation
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

#### 21A 1.6 MILE

**LAKESHORE (SHOREWOOD TO FORT GRATIOT COUNTY PARK)**
State Owned  
AADT 13500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>paint 3’ buffer on each side with 5’ bike lane (no additional pavement needed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 21B 2.8 MILE

**M25 TO FORT GRATIOT COUNTY PARK**
State Owned  
AADT 13500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>paint 3’ buffer on each side with 5’ bike lane (no additional pavement needed) OR create buffered trail/sidepath on side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 21C 2.6 MILES

**HISTORIC DUNE**
State Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Potential off-street route through historic dune features. Conservation opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED FACILITY | IMPLEMENTATION NOTES
---|---
Off Road | Off-street trail connection through Lakeport State Park
### PROPOSED FACILITY

1. **Protected Bikelane / Sidepath**

   **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

   Existing wide shoulders. Build sidepath on the north side of the roadway. Possible bike lane addition on main roadway as well.

### PROPOSED FACILITY

2. **Sidepath**

   **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

   Transition to south side of the road at Michigan. Establish sidepath on the southside of the road. Option to continue bike lanes.

### PROPOSED FACILITY

3. **Protected Bikeway**

   **IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

   2-lanes in one direction with extra wide parking lane. Remove parking and install separated bikeway.

   40’ pavement curb-to-curb.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>34’ roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory lanes with parking OR protected bikeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23E 0.6 MILE

#### 7TH STREET

City Owned
AADT 6200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>North side of Rail Corridor. Off-street path on the north side of the rail corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New bike-ped bridge at 24th street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 24F 0.5 MILES

#### GRISWOOD TO LAPEER

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Off-street path on the north side of the rail corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposed Facility Implementation Notes

## 24G 0.8 Mile
### Lapeer to Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>~32’ pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add advisory bike lanes with parking on one side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 24H 0.4 Mile
### Water Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikeway</td>
<td>4-lanes, ~10,000 AADT Road Diet candidate Add protected bikeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 24I 0.5 Miles
### 32nd Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Add sidepath along the roadway - likely on the West side of the street. Crossing improvements needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED FACILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Facility</th>
<th>Implementation Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Add sidepath to the east and south side of the Lapeer Connector roadway. Separate from roadway as much as possible given travel speeds and volumes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 25A 0.4 MILE

**ASPEN**

City Owned  
Existing median.  
AADT 6900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Use median for side path.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25B 700 FEET

**JACK PINE LN**

City Owned  
Road Diet planned (4-lane ends at Palmer) to add bike lanes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Lane</td>
<td>Small on-street connection. Use Advisory bike lanes or high visibility sharrows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25C 700 FEET

**CATALPA CT**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>New off-street trail connections on school properties and top of bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

#### BLACK RIVER TO GRATIOT

**City Owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>New off-street trail connections on school properties and top of bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BLACK RIVER TO PINE GROVE AVENUE

**City Owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>New off-street trail connections on school properties and top of bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PARKWAY DRIVE

**City Owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>No existing sidewalks. Build sidepath on the west side of the road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROPOSED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION NOTES

#### 25G 0.4 MILES
**SANBORN PARK**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Path through the park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 25H 0.3 MILES
**PINE GROVE AVE**

State Owned
AADT 26600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Continue existing sidepath further south</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 25I 0.8 MILES
**HANCOCK TO GRATIOT**

State Owned
AADT 10000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>Widen existing sidewalk on south + west sides into a sidepath (Hancock, 10th, and Elmwood)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BRIDGE CONNECTOR

**25J 0.1 MILE**

**State Owned**

**PROPOSED FACILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidepath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

Provide a sidepath spur under the overpass to connect to the existing Two Bridges Trail.

## LAKESIDE PARK

**25K 0.5 MILE**

**City Owned**

**PROPOSED FACILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidepath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

Sidepath on the west side of the road. Bridge does not need center turn lane.

## KRAFFT ROAD

**25L 0.8 MILES**

**City Owned**

**PROPOSED FACILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidepath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTATION NOTES**

Sidepath opportunity on the Soutside of Krafft
### 25M 1.7 MILE

**FAIRWAY / 10TH STREET**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikelane / Sidepath</td>
<td>Sidepath along Fairway (long-term) and advisory bike lanes (short-term).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 25N 1300 FEET

**RAMBLEWOOD DR**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidepath</td>
<td>New off-street trail connections on school properties and top of bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 250 1.7 MILE

**10TH STREET / HOLLAND**

City Owned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Bikelane / Sidepath</td>
<td>Sidepath along 10th street and Holland (long-term) and advisory bike lanes (short-term).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

MEETING PRESENTATIONS
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS
COUNTYWIDE NON-MOTORIZED STRATEGY + ACTION PLAN

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1  NOVEMBER 7, 2018

AGENDA
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. Project Overview
3. Project Goals
4. Greenway and Trail Benefits
5. Existing Conditions
6. Economic Asset Mapping
7. Gap/Route Mapping
8. Next Steps
PROJECT OVERVIEW
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS

PROJECT PURPOSE

Develop a countywide non-motorized strategy and action plan
- Identify existing gaps in countywide trail networks
- Identify preferred alternatives to eliminate the gaps
- Prioritize the timing for completing the needed connections

Cuyahoga County Greenway Plan
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1

GREENWAYS & URBAN TRAILS

Greenways are dedicated, linear spaces that provide opportunities for recreation, non-motorized transportation, and natural features.

- Typically includes shared-use trails, landscaping, natural amenities, and site furnishings.
- Typically off-street.
- Designed for all ages and all abilities

Urban Trails are dedicated facilities that provide non-motorized connections through and between communities for recreation and access to jobs to community assets.

- Typically located within public rights-of-way or other constrained spaces.
- Typically includes bicycle facilities and/or pathways separated from vehicle roadways.
- Designed for all ages and all abilities.
- May include additional landscaping, natural features, and site furnishings.

BENEFITS OF GREENWAYS & URBAN TRAILS

Generates economic activity

- Adds to property value, attracts businesses and residents, contributes to tourism

Enhances cultural awareness and community identity

- Connects to local heritage, interpretive opportunities, and community destinations

Increases mobility and transportation options

- Connect jobs, commercial areas, institutions, and residents

Improves community health through active living

- Creates attractive, safe, accessible places to walk, bike, hike, run and more

Provides environmental benefits

- Manages stormwater, protects and restores habitat, improves air and water quality
DESIGN FOR ALL AGES

Interested but Concerned
51%-56% of the total population

Often not comfortable with bike lanes, may bike on sidewalks even if bike lanes are provided, prefer off-street or separated bicycle facilities or quiet or traffic-calmed residential roads. May not bike at all if bicycle facilities do not meet needs for perceived comfort.

Somewhat Confident
5-9% of the total population

Generally prefer more separated facilities, but are comfortable riding in bicycle lanes or on paved shoulders if need be.

Highly Confident
4-7% of the total population

Comfortable riding with traffic, will use roads without bike lanes.

LOW STRESS TOLERANCE

LOW STRESS BICYCLE FACILITIES

Shared Street design w/ Advisory Bike Lanes

1-way Protected Bike Lane

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1

PROJECT AREA

8 cities, 23 townships + numerous villages and unincorporated communities

STRUCTURE + ROLES

- **Core Team** - primary contact for this project responsible for providing guidance, direction and decision-making

- **Steering Committee** - responsible for providing perspective on important state, regional and community trail and greenway issues

- **Public Engagement** - responsible for providing perspective on important trail and greenway issues from their respective communities
  - Public meetings/workshops
  - Surveys
  - Project website / portal
PROJECT GOALS

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS

- Develop a regional connected trail network providing access to essential assets and destinations within and external to St. Clair County.

- Use trails as an economic development and reinvestment driver for St. Clair County communities.

- Leverage existing plans and initiatives to encourage collaboration and effective use of resources.

- Enhance community health, public safety, and green infrastructure through trail design and management.
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1

EXISTING CONDITIONS
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS
MAJOR TRAIL INITIATIVES

- Bridge-to-Bay Trail
- Great Lake-to-Lake Trail (route #1)
- Wadhams to Avoca Trail
Facility Inventory

Trail Type (SEMOG_BikePed)
- 8'-0" Shared-Use Path
- 8'-0" Shared-Use Path
- Planned Shared-Use Path
- Planned Unimproved Path

County Bike (SEMOG_BikePed)
- Mapped/Dirt Bike Route
- Planned Back-Road Bike Route
- Planned Bike Route

On Road (SEMOG_BikePed)
- Bike Lane Existing
- Bike Lane Existing

Bike Path (SEMOG_BikePed)
- 8'-0" Bike Path

PARK & OPEN SPACE
- Public Parks
- Open Space
- Private Club Open Space

Land Use
- Public / Institutional Land Uses
- Commercial Land Uses

Bridge to Bay (Highlight)
- Bridge to Bay

Lake to Lake (Highlight)
- Lake to Lake

Municipal Boundaries
- Municipal Boundaries

Demographic Mapping

Population Density

Population Over 65

Population Under 18

SMITHGROUP
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1

DEMOGRAPHIC MAPPING

JOB DENSITY

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

% IN LABOR FORCE

MINORITY POPULATION %

POVERTY RATE

% NON-MOTORIZED COMMUTE
DATA ANALYSIS

NEXT STEPS

- Are there other important pieces of data or information to collect?
- What topics or factors are important to you?
- What questions do you have that you’d like an answer to?
GROUP MAPPING SESSION

Break out into small groups and complete three tasks working in a small group:

#1 - BLUE DOTS / MARKS = Assets and Destinations
Mark destinations like parks, commercial centers, job hubs, and other assets using blue markers and dots

#2 - RED DOTS / MARKS = Challenges & Obstacles
Mark/outline challenges or obstacles using red markers and dots

#3 - GREEN DOTS / MARKS = Trail Opportunities
Mark planned or proposed trails, new route ideas, trailheads, needed connections, etc. using green markers and dots

LEAVE A COMMENT WITH EVERY DOT/MARK
CONSIDER POTENTIAL AlIGNED PROJECTS, PARTNERS, FUNDING

NEXT STEPS
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS
### SCHEDULE

#### NEXT STEPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Team Meetings/Calls</strong></td>
<td>Oct 22, Nov 29, Dec 6, Dec 13, Dec 20, Dec 27, Jan 3, Jan 10, Jan 17, Jan 24, Jan 31, Feb 7, Feb 14, Feb 21, Feb 28, Mar 7, Mar 14, Mar 21, Mar 28, Apr 4, Apr 11, Apr 18, Apr 25, May 2, May 9, May 16, May 23, May 30, Jun 6, Jun 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task One</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Present Team Organization</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Steering Committee #1</td>
<td>3/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Two</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Context Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Non-Motorized Network Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting #1 (two mtgs.)</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Three</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee #2</td>
<td>wk of 3/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting #2 (two mtgs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Four</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Preferred Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td>wk of 2/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee #4</td>
<td>wk of 2/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting #3 (two mtgs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Feb 28, 3/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Public Meetings December 11, 2018**
- **Steering Committee #2 – TBA (week of Jan 14th)**

---

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS

**COUNTYWIDE NON-MOTORIZED STRATEGY + ACTION PLAN**

**NOVEMBER 7, 2018**
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #1

SOME IMAGES FROM THE INTERNET – WADHAMS TO AVOCA TRAIL

SOME IMAGES FROM THE INTERNET – BRIDGE TO BAY TRAIL
AGENDA
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

1. Welcome/Introductions
2. Project Overview
3. Goals and Process
4. Existing Conditions
5. Feedback Activities
6. Next Steps
PROJECT OVERVIEW
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN

PROJECT PURPOSE

Develop a countywide non-motorized strategy and action plan

- Identify existing gaps in countywide trail networks
- Identify preferred alternatives to eliminate the gaps
- Prioritize the timing for completing the needed connections
PROJECT AREA

- 8 cities, 23 townships + numerous villages and unincorporated communities
- 26 of 54 miles of the Bridge to Bay Trail system complete. Easy parts are already done.
- Build on prior planning efforts:
  - St. Clair County Trails and Routes Action Plan (2009)
  - The Blueways of St. Clair
  - 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (2014)
  - SEMCOG Regional Bike & Pedestrian Plan (2014)
  - US Bike Route 20

WHO IS INVOLVED?

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS

Trail Plan Consultant

Smithgroup

Other Partners

PSC
Public Sector Consultants
TRAILS

Trails are dedicated, linear non-motorized corridors that provide opportunities for recreation, non-motorized transportation, and natural features.

- Typically includes shared-use trails, landscaping, natural amenities, and site furnishings.
- Typically off-street.
- Designed for all ages and all abilities.

BIKEWAYS

Bikeways are dedicated bicycle infrastructure that provide connections through and between communities for recreation and access to jobs to community assets.

- Typically located within public rights-of-way or other constrained spaces.
- Desire for bicycle infrastructure and pathways to be separated from vehicular roadway.
- Designed for all ages and all abilities.
- May include additional landscaping, natural features, and site furnishings.
**BENEFITS OF TRAILS & BIKEWAYS**

Generates **economic activity**
- Adds to property value, attracts businesses and residents, contributes to tourism

Enhances **cultural awareness and community identity**
- Connects to local heritage, interpretive opportunities, and community destinations

Increases **mobility and transportation options**
- Connects jobs, commercial areas, institutions, and residents

Improves **community health through active living**
- Creates attractive, safe, accessible places to walk, bike, hike, run and more

Provides **environmental benefits**
- Manages stormwater, protects and restores habitat, improves air and water quality

**PROJECT STRUCTURE + ROLES**

- **Core Team** - primary group for this project responsible for providing guidance, direction and decision-making
  - St. Clair County Parks, St. Clair County Metropolitan Planning Commission, Great Lake to Lake Trails

- **Steering Committee** - responsible for providing perspective on important state, regional and community trail and greenway issues

- **Public Engagement** - responsible for providing perspective on important trail and greenway issues from their respective communities
  - Public meetings/workshops
  - Surveys
  - Project website / portal
PROJECT GOALS

1. Develop a **regional connected trail network** providing access to essential assets and destinations within and outside of St. Clair County.

2. Use trails as an **economic development and reinvestment** driver for St. Clair County communities.

3. Leverage existing plans and initiatives to encourage **collaboration, partnerships** and effective use of resources for project implementation.

4. Enhance community **health, public safety, and green infrastructure** through sound trail design and management.
PLANNING PROCESS
FOCUS ON GAPS & LINKING TO ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

STEP 1  Fall 2018
- What are the needs and opportunities? Identify:
  - Key destinations to access
  - Community demographics and economics
  - Existing trails and bicycle infrastructure
  - Trail and bikeways opportunities

* Engages stakeholders
* Leverages technical analyses

STEP 2  Jan-March 2019
- What are the options and priorities?
  - What are the critical gaps?
  - What benefits are provided?
  - Explore alternatives
  - Land access, space availability, costs, funding, etc.

* Engages stakeholders
* Leverages technical analyses

STEP 3  April 2019
- Trail Framework and Action Plan
  - Identify project implementors
  - Funding

DESIGNING FOR ALL AGES

Interested but Concerned
51%-56% of the total population
Often not comfortable with bike lanes, may bike on sidewalks even if bike lanes are provided; prefer off-street or separated bicycle facilities or quiet or traffic-calm residential roads. May not bike at all if bicycle facilities do not meet needs for perceived comfort.

Somewhat Confident
5-9% of the total population
Generally prefer more separated facilities, but are comfortable riding in bicycle lanes or on paved shoulders if need be.

Highly Confident
4-7% of the total population
Comfortable riding with traffic, will use roads without bike lanes.

LOW STRESS TOLERANCE
HIGH STRESS TOLERANCE

Image Credit: Toole Design Group
LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS)
RELATES TO TYPE OF USER

- LTS Based on:
  - Speed of road
  - Number of travel lanes
  - Vehicle traffic volume
  - Intersection conditions
  - Presence + Width of bike lanes or shoulders
  - Physical separation
  - Size of vehicles

Image Credit: Alta

BASIC BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

"Sharrow" Markings (Share the road)

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 3 + 4 i.e. higher stress for most bicycleriders

Conventional bike lanes
LOWER STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Shared Street design w/ Advisory Bike Lanes

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 2

Buffered bike lanes

New York, NY

Bike boulevard / slow street / shared street

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 1 or 2

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)

1-way Protected Bike Lane

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)
PUBLIC MEETING #1

LOW STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 1

Side Paths

Trails (separate from roadways)

MAKING SPACE FOR TRAILS & BIKEWAYS

ROAD DIETS
(Decrease travel lanes)

Existing

Skinny Streets
(Narrow travel lanes)

Existing

Widen Sidewalks into Sidewalks
(10’ wide shared use paths)

Existing

SmithGroup
MAKING SPACE FOR TRAILS & BIKEWAYS

WIDEN SHOULDERS
(8’ for buffered bike lanes)

REMOVE PARKING
(Add bike lanes or bikeway)

RECONSTRUCT STREETS
(Protected Bike Lanes or Bikeways)

Existing

Existing

Existing

Widen Shoulders

Remove On-street Parking

Reconstruct Streetscape

EXISTING CONDITIONS

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN
PUBLIC MEETING #1

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAILS
MAJOR TRAIL INITIATIVES

- Bridge-to-Bay Trail
- Great Lake-to-Lake Trail (route #1)
- Wadhams to Avoca Trail

EXISTING FACILITIES
- Off Road
- Side Path
- Shoulder
- On Road Bike Lane

PROPOSED FACILITIES
- Off Road
- Side Path
- On Road Bike Lane

IDENTIFIED GAPS
- Trail Gap

PARK & OPEN SPACE
- Public Parks
- Conservation Lands
- Private/Grob Open Space

LAND USE
- Public/Institutional Land Uses
- Commercial Land Uses

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES

BIKE ROUTE (Highlight)
- County
- Regional
- USDOT20

Initial identification of gaps
PUBLIC MEETING #1

CONTEXT MAPPING

MINORITY POPULATION %

POVERTY RATE

% NON-MOTORIZED COMMUTE

DATA ANALYSIS

NEXT STEPS

- Integration of destinations and asset mapping from Blueways of St Clair, Steering Committee, Public Workshops
- Refined trail inventory and opportunity map
- Analysis summary of demographic and economic needs & opportunity relative to trails
  - Additional data and analyses as needed
OPEN HOUSE MAPPING SESSION

Please leave the following types of feedback on the map boards:

#1 - **BLUE DOTS / MARKS** = Assets and Destinations
Mark destinations like parks, commercial centers, job hubs, and other assets using **blue markers and dots**

#2 - **RED DOTS / MARKS** = Challenges & Obstacles
Mark/outline challenges or obstacles using **red markers and dots**

#3 - **GREEN DOTS / MARKS** = Trail Opportunities
Mark planned or proposed trails, new route ideas, trailheads, needed connections, etc. using **green markers and dots**

**LEAVE A COMMENT WITH EVERY DOT/MARK!!**

***FILL OUT A SURVEY FORUM (OR TAKE ONLINE)***
PUBLIC MEETING #1

NEXT STEPS
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN

PROJECT SCHEDULE

October
1: Project Initiation
• Project team organization
• Community engagement strategy
• Project schedule

November - December
2: Assess Trail Network
• Context analysis
• Non-motorized network assessment
• Community Meeting

January
3: Alternative Solutions
• Alternatives analysis
  - Access to assets/destinations
  - Regional connectivity
  - Opportunities/constraints
• Community Meeting (TBD)

February
4a: Preparing the Plan
• Preferred route
• Priority and phasing
• Community Meeting (TBD)

March
4b. Final Report
• Funding strategies
• Obstacles/potential mitigation
• Model zoning regulations
THANK YOU

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN
AGENDA
SCCOTS MEETING 2019-02-13

1. Project Overview
2. Design Approach
3. Starting Ideas
4. Next Steps
PROJECT PURPOSE

Develop a countywide non-motorized strategy and action plan

- Identify existing gaps in countywide trail networks
- Identify preferred alternatives to eliminate the gaps
- Prioritize the timing for completing the needed connections
SCCOTS MEETING

PROJECT AREA

- 8 cities, 23 townships + numerous villages and unincorporated communities
- 26 of 54 miles of the Bridge to Bay Trail system complete. Easy parts are already done.
- Build on prior planning efforts:
  - St. Clair County Trails and Routes Action Plan (2009)
  - The Blueways of St. Clair
  - 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (2014)
  - SEMCOG Regional Bike & Pedestrian Plan (2014)
  - US Bike Route 20

PROJECT GOALS

1. Develop a **regional connected trail network** providing access to essential assets and destinations within and outside of St. Clair County.

2. Use trails as an **economic development and reinvestment** driver for St. Clair County communities.

3. Leverage existing plans and initiatives to **encourage collaboration, partnerships** and effective use of resources for project implementation

4. Enhance community **health, public safety, and green infrastructure** through sound trail design and management.
PROJECT STRUCTURE + ROLES

LEAD ORGANIZATIONS

Core Team - primary group for this project responsible for providing guidance, direction and decision-making
- St. Clair County Parks, St. Clair County Metropolitan Planning Commission, Great Lakes to Lake Trails

Steering Committee - responsible for providing perspective on important state, regional and community trail and greenway issues

Public Engagement - responsible for providing perspective on important trail and greenway issues from their respective communities
- Public meetings/workshops
- Surveys
- Project website / portal

PLANNING PROCESS
FOCUS ON GAPS & LINKING TO ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

STEP 1 Fall 2018
- What are the needs and opportunities? Identify:
  - Key destinations to access
  - Community demographics and economics
  - Existing trails and bicycle infrastructure
  - Trail and bikeways opportunities
  * Engages stakeholders
  * Leverages technical analyses

STEP 2 Jan-March 2019
- What are the options and priorities?
  - What are the critical gaps?
  - What benefits are provided?
  - Explore alternatives
  - Land access, space availability, costs, funding, etc.
  * Engages stakeholders
  * Leverages technical analyses

STEP 3 April 2019
- Trail Framework and Action Plan
  - Identify project implementors
  - Funding

SMITHGROUP
BIKE FACILITY GUIDANCE
BEST PRACTICES, CASE STUDIES

FHWA (2016)
- Advisory bike lanes
- Bike boulevards
- Rural roadways

FHWA (2015)
- Protected bikeways
- Intersection design

NACTO (2014)
- Full range of bike facilities

Alta Planning (2017)
- Advisory bike lanes
- Case study review
BIKE FACILITY GUIDANCE
BEST PRACTICES, CASE STUDIES

NACTO (2017)
- All ages & abilities

MUTCD Allowed treatments
- Bike lanes up to & through intersections
- Buffer separated bike lanes
- Counter-flow & left-side bike lanes

MUTCD interim approved treatments
- Green pavement
- Bike bikes
- Bike signals

MUTCD Experimental treatments
- Two-stage turn boxes
- Dashed/advisory bike lanes
- Green sharrow markings

TRAILS & BIKEWAYS
WORKING DEFINITIONS

Trails refer to shared-use pathways that are separate from roadways and public rights-of-way and that serves all ages and abilities.

Bikeways refer to dedicated bicycle facilities within public roadways with a desire to serve all ages and abilities.
SCCOTS MEETING

TYPES OF BIKE RIDERS & LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

- **Strong & Fearless** (7%)
  - 100% of these riders are very comfortable on non-residential streets without bicycle lanes.

- **Enthused & Confident** (5%)
  - 100% of these riders are very comfortable on non-residential streets with bicycle lanes.

- **Interested, But Concerned** (51%)
  - 62% of above riders.
  - Comfortable to some degree using protected bicycle lanes on non-residential streets.

- **No Way, No How** (37%)
  - 38% of above riders.
  - Unwilling, unable or uncomfortable biking anywhere.

**LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS)**

- **LTS 4**
  - 11% of riders comfortable
  - Strong & Fearless
  - Riding in busy traffic
  - No bicycle lanes

- **LTS 3**
  - 15% of riders comfortable
  - Experienced Riders
  - Conventional and buffered bike lanes

- **LTS 2**
  - 20% of riders comfortable
  - Most Adults
  - Protected bicycle lanes
  - "Dutch Standard"

- **LTS 1**
  - 50% of riders comfortable
  - All Age & Abilities
  - Slow, low-volume streets
  - Separated bikeways

- **LTS N/A**
  - Off-street
  - Shared use trails and pathways
  - No traffic stress


---

**BASIC BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE**

**“Sharrow” Markings** (Share the road)

- **Conventional bike lanes**

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 3 + 4
i.e. higher stress for most bicyclers
BIKE Lanes / Wide Shoulders

Conventional Approaches

8' Parking Lane  5'-6' Bike Lane  10'-12' Travel Lane  10'-12' Travel Lane  5'-6' Bike Lane

Optional Buffer

Lower Stress Bicycle Infrastructure

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 1 or 2

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)

1-way Protected Bike Lane

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)
SCCOTS MEETING

BUFFERED BIKE LANE (OR SHOULDERS)

BUFFER CAN BE STRIPED ONLY

PROTECTED BIKEWAY

TYPICALLY 2-WAY BIKE FACILITIES WITH PHYSICAL BARRIERS
RAISED BIKEWAY
VERTICAL SEPARATION FROM THE ROADWAY, OFTEN AT SIDEWALK LEVEL

LOWER STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 2

Shared Street design w/ Advisory Bike Lanes

Buffered bike lanes

Bike boulevard / slow street / shared street
SCCOTS MEETING

ADVISORY (DASHED) BIKE Lanes

LOW SPEED, LOW VOLUME STREETS
STILL ACCOMMODATES 2-WAY VEHICLE TRAVEL

LOW STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 1

Side Paths

Trails
(sparate from roadways)

smithgroup.com St. Clair County Trail Plan
SIDE PATHS
TYPICALLY DESIGNED AS SHARED-USE TRAILS

PRELIMINARY IDEAS
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN
CHARTING A PATH FORWARD
BRIDGING GAPS

- **STEP 1: Gap Identification**
  - Inventory existing trail/bikeway data, destinations, assets, and opportunities.
  - Identify key gaps in the network and desired linkages.

- **STEP 2: Gap Alternatives**
  - Review each gap in detail through field-visits and GIS mapping.
  - Develop potential solution(s) to the gap based on design approach.
  - Assess alternative treatments or routes for bridging gaps.

- **STEP 3: Prioritization & Implementation**
  - Prioritize individual projects based on needs, opportunities, and implementation considerations.

---

**GAP IDENTIFICATION**
STEP 1

- 27 gaps identified related to:
  - Bridge-to-Bay Trail
  - Great Lake to Lake Trail
  - Wadhams to Avoca Trail
  - Other key connections

---

SMITHGROUP
GAP IDEA PLANS

STEP 2

GAP #4  Port Huron Downtown

GAP #8,9,10  St. Clair Connections

Making Space for Trails & Bikeways

STEP 2

Road Diets
(Remove travel lanes)

Existing

Skinny Streets
(Narrow travel lanes)

Existing

Widen Sidewalks into Sidepaths
or Create New Side Paths
(10’ wide shared use paths)

Existing

Existing wide shared use paths

Smithgroup.com  St. Clair County Trail Plan
FEEDBACK & INPUT

Review hard copies or electronic versions of gap idea plans.

In small groups by geographic area, discuss route options.

Provide reaction to the idea identifying any issues or concerns or other missed possibilities.
NEXT STEPS
FOCUS ON GAPS & LINKING TO ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

STEP 1  Fall 2018
- What are the needs and opportunities? Identify:
  - Key destinations to access
  - Community demographics and economics
  - Existing trails and bicycle infrastructure
  - Trail and bikeways opportunities

* Engages stakeholders
* Leverages technical analyses

STEP 2  Jan-March 2019
- What are the options and priorities?
  - What are the critical gaps?
  - What benefits are provided?
  - Explore alternatives
  - Land access, space availability, costs, funding, etc.

* Engages stakeholders
* Leverages technical analyses

STEP 3  April 2019
- Trail Framework and Action Plan
  - Identify project implementors
  - Funding
THANK YOU
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN
AGENDA
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #2

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Presentation
   - Updates
   - Recap goals
   - Recap design approaches
   - Overview of gap maps
3. Discussion of Great Lake-to-Lake Trail Extension
4. Overall questions
5. Feedback at map boards
PROJECT OVERVIEW

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN

PROJECT PURPOSE

Develop a countywide non-motorized strategy and action plan

- Identify existing gaps in countywide trail networks
- Identify preferred alternatives to eliminate the gaps
- Prioritize the timing for completing the needed connections
PROJECT GOALS

1. Develop a **regional connected trail network** providing access to essential assets and destinations within and outside of St. Clair County.

2. Use trails as an **economic development and reinvestment** driver for St. Clair County communities.

3. Leverage existing plans and initiatives to encourage **collaboration, partnerships** and effective use of resources for project implementation.

4. Enhance community **health, public safety, and green infrastructure** through sound trail design and management.

PROJECT STRUCTURE + ROLES

- **Core Team** - primary group for this project responsible for providing guidance, direction and decision-making
  - St. Clair County Parks, St. Clair County Metropolitan Planning Commission, Great Lake to Lake Trails

- **Steering Committee** - responsible for providing perspective on important state, regional and community trail and greenway issues

- **Public Engagement** - responsible for providing perspective on important trail and greenway issues from their respective communities
  - Public meetings/workshops
  - Surveys
  - Project website / portal
PLANNING PROCESS + UPDATES

STEP 1  Fall 2018
- What are the needs and opportunities? Identify:
  - Key destinations to access
  - Community demographics and economics
  - Existing trails and bicycle infrastructure
  - Trail and bikeways opportunities

ACTIVITIES
- Public Meeting December 11, 2018
  - Reviewed gaps
  - Generated additional ideas for resolving gaps

STEP 2  Jan-March 2019
- What are the options and priorities?
  - What are the critical gaps?
  - What benefits are provided?
  - Explore alternatives
    - Land access, space availability, costs, funding, etc.

RECENT ACTIVITIES
- SCCOTS meeting held on February 21st
  - Technical review of ideas and options
- Municipality review + input period
- Developed cross-section concepts for gaps

STEP 3  April 2019
- Trail Framework and Action Plan
  - Identify project implementors
  - Funding

DESIGN APPROACH
ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN
BIKE FACILITY GUIDANCE
BEST PRACTICES, CASE STUDIES

FHWA (2016)
- Advisory bike lanes
- Bike boulevards
- Rural roadways

FHWA (2015)
- Protected bikeways
- Intersection design

NACTO (2014)
- Full range of bike facilities

Alta Planning (2017)
- Advisory bike lanes
- Case study review

---

BIKE FACILITY GUIDANCE
BEST PRACTICES, CASE STUDIES

NACTO (2017)
- All ages & abilities

MUTCD Allowed treatments
- Bike lanes up to & through intersections
- Buffer separated bike lanes
- Counter-flow & left-side bike lanes

MUTCD Interim approved treatments
- Green pavement
- Bike bikes
- Bike signals

MUTCD Experimental treatments
- Two-stage turn boxes
- Dashed/advisory bike lanes
- Green sharrow markings
TRAILS & BIKEWAYS
WORKING DEFINITIONS

Trails refer to shared-use pathways that are separate from roadways and public rights-of-way and that serves all ages and abilities.

Bikeways refer to dedicated bicycle facilities within public roadways with a desire to serve all ages and abilities.

TYPES OF BIKE RIDERS & LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

- **7%** Strong & Fearless
- **5%** Enthusiast & Comfortable
- **51%** Interested, but Concerned
- **37%** No Way, No How

LTS 4: 11% of riders comfortable
- Strong & Fearless: Riding in busy traffic. No bicycle lanes.

LTS 3: 19% of riders comfortable
- Experienced Riders: Conventional and buffered bicycle lanes.

LTS 2: 32% of riders comfortable
- Most Adults: Protected bicycle lanes "Dutch Standard".

LTS 1: 9% of riders comfortable
- All Age & Abilities: Slow, low-volume streets. Separated bikeways.

LTS N/A: 10% of riders uncomfortable
- Off-street: Shared-use trail and pathways. No traffic stress.

Source: [Dill J. and McNeil N., Revisiting the Four Types of Cyclists. Findings from a National Survey, Journal of the Transportation Research Board]
BASIC BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

“Sharrow” Markings (share the road)  
Austin, TX

Conventional bike lanes

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 3 + 4  
i.e. higher stress for most bicycle riders

LOWER STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 1 or 2

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)

1-way Protected Bike Lane

2-way Protected Bike Lane (cycletrack)
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PROTECTED BIKEWAY

Urban context, 2-way bike facility, parking on one side can typically fit within existing curb-to-curb dimensions.

PROTECTED/BUFFERED BIKEWAY

Rural, 2-way bike facility implemented by widening - paving shoulder on one side. Use where there is not room for a separate sidepath.
LOWER STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Shared Street design w/ Advisory Bike Lanes

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 2

Buffered bike lanes

New York, NY

Bike boulevard / slow street / shared street

ADVISORY (DASHED) BIKE LANES

LOW SPEED, LOW VOLUME STREETS (RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL)
STILL ACCOMMODATES 2-WAY VEHICLE TRAVEL
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LOW STRESS BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE

Typically Level of Traffic Stress 1

Side Paths

Trails (separate from roadways)

SIDEPATH

SHARED USE TRAIL OUTSIDE OF ROADWAY (PEDESTRIANS + BICYCLISTS)
RURAL / ARTERIAL ROAD CONTEXTS
MAKING SPACE FOR TRAILS & BIKEWAYS

STEP 2

ROAD DIETS
(Remove travel lanes)

SKINNY STREETS
(Narrow travel lanes)

WIDEN SIDEWALKS INTO SIDE PATHS OR CREATE NEW SIDE PATHS
(10’ wide shared use paths)

Existing

Widen Sidewalks into Sideway
Shared-use Trail

Existing

SMITHGROUP

MAKING SPACE FOR TRAILS & BIKEWAYS

STEP 2

WIDEN SHOULDERS
(8’ for buffered bike lanes)

REMOVE PARKING
(Add bike lanes or bikeway)

RECONSTRUCT STREETS
(Protected Bike Lanes or Bikeways)

Existing

Widen Shoulders

Remove
On-street Parking

Reconstruct Streetscape

Existing

SMITHGROUP
CHARTING A PATH FORWARD
BRIDGING GAPS

- **STEP 1: Gap Identification**
  - Inventory existing trail/bikeway data, destinations, assets, and opportunities.
  - Identify key gaps in the network and desired linkages.

- **STEP 2: Gap Alternatives**
  - Review each gap in detail through field-visits and GIS mapping.
  - Develop potential solution(s) to the gap based on design approach.
  - Explore alternative treatments or routes for bridging gaps.

- **STEP 3: Prioritization & Implementation**
  - Prioritize individual projects based on needs, opportunities, and implementation considerations.
**GAP IDENTIFICATION**

**STEP 1**

- 27 gaps identified related to:
  - Bridge-to-Bay Trail
  - Great Lake-to-Lake Trail Route #1
  - Wadhams to Avoca Trail
  - Other key connections

**GAP IDEA PLANS**

**STEP 2**

**OVERALL GAPS**

**ROUTE OPTIONS FOR GAPS**

**GAP #11 Marine City Connections**

**DESIGN APPROACHES**

- Sidewalk (Residential Residential)
- Enhanced Sidewalk (Commercial Commercial)
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PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
STEP 3

Factors affecting prioritization
- Connection to existing trails or bike facilities (regional vs. local)
- Destinations accessed + community benefits (economics, equity)
- Transportation needs addressed
- Overlap with other capital projects / opportunities
- Attractiveness + impact of proposed facility
- Ease of construction (available land, properties, ROW space)
- Balancing other transportation/ROW needs + values
- Cost of construction and available funding

GREAT LAKE-TO-LAKE TRAIL ROUTE #1
GAP #17 AND #18

- Two options:
  - 17A: Division + Fred Moore from Richmond to King Rd. Trail (St. Clair)
  - 18A: Gratiot Ave from Richmond to I-94 and existing Gratiot Sidewalk

- Richmond has a plan to extend trail through their community
GREAT LAKE-TO-LAKE TRAIL ROUTE #1
GAP #17 AND #18

- Two options:
  - **17A**: Division + Fred Moore from Richmond to King Rd. Trail (St. Clair)
  - **18A**: Gratiot Ave from Richmond to I-94 and existing Gratiot Sidewalk

---

GREAT LAKE-TO-LAKE TRAIL ROUTE #1
DESIGN APPROACHES FOR EITHER OPTION

**BUFFERED BIKEWAY**
WIDEN SHOULDER ON ONE SIDE

**BUILD SIDEWALK SEPARATE FROM ROADWAY**
GREAT LAKE-TO-LAKE TRAIL ROUTE #1
PROS AND CONS OF ROUTE OPTIONS

17A: DIVISION + FRED MOORE
- Provides a connection to St. Clair (additional community connected)
- Additional ROW on south side of road, more room for sidepath construction
- Sidepath creates better rider experience
- ~140 properties adjacent to roadway
- Shorter length of project (10.6 miles)
- Fewer ped. Bridges may be needed
- Lower estimated construction cost ($9.3M)

18A: GRATIOT AVE
- Does not connect to St. Clair – but more direct route to terminus (Lighthouse Park)
- Narrower ROW overall
- More of route may have to be buffered bikeway (less desirable rider experience)
- ~200 properties adjacent to roadway
- Longer length for this project (13.1 miles)
- More ped. bridges may be needed
- Higher estimated construction cost ($13.3M)

Planning team recommends Division + Fred Moore Option

FEEDBACK & INPUT
Boards show detailed gap maps and typical cross-sections for key route options.

Please review and provide comments on sticky notes
NEXT STEPS

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN

- Report draft late April 2019

- Steering Committee Meeting #3
  - Review and refine route prioritization
  - Early May 2019 meeting

- Public Meeting #2
  - May 2019, TBD

- Final Report
STEEING COMMITTEE MEETING #2

THANK YOU

ST. CLAIR COUNTY TRAIL PLAN
APPENDIX

SURVEY RESPONSE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question 1: Are there specific trail opportunities or connections you’d like to see in St. Clair county or to adjacent areas? Please write-in suggestions below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Bridge to Bay trail in Port Huron needs better signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fred Moore Hwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wadhams trail paved all the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Connect Meijer Pond with Metcalf rd bike trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wta to downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;Extend the WTA to Yale Connect the Fort Gratiot Trail to the Burchville Trail Make a connection to the Macomb Orchard Trail&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Connection from MOT to Bridge to Bay. Fred Moore highway is way to busy and narrow for me to Bike (avid cyclist) a larger paved shoulder would solve problem, using St Clair highway to King same problem but less bust. I feel that making sure MOT connects to area in St Clair city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Would love to see a connection to the Macon’s Orchard Trail or an extension of the Wadhams trail into Port Huron or even better, beyond Avoca!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I bike to work China to Marysville. Trails great some of the crossing are challenging but much better then I’m used to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I’d like to see something that goes close to Black River up near Comstock Hills. A bike path that follows along the River would be great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Better connections to shopping areas in Fort Gratiot and connecting Fort Gratiot to Port Huron. Specifically - bike lanes along Lakeshore Rd/Gratiot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Connecting Wadham trail to other trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Finish connecting the WTA to the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Connecting cycle routes between Lexington and Algonac. Connecting the Wadhams to Avoca Trail to downtown Port Huron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Connect the bike trail that ends at Yankee Rd to the trail next to the junior high. Connect the trail that runs along River Rd and ends north of St Clair with the trail that ends at Yankee Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Connect port huron and lexington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ORV trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Connect Burotchville and Fort Gratiot. Better trail signage south of Port Huron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sanilac county needs something like the bike path that runs from Port Huron west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question 1: Are there specific trail opportunities or connections you’d like to see in St. Clair county or to adjacent areas? Please write-in suggestions below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The trail in Burtchville (state to Norman to Metcalf) connected to Metcalf County Park, downtown Lakeport (so along Burtch Rd) and connected to the paths behind Meijer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Clay township has a poor, undeveloped, hard to access trail system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>More in the Algonac area that are not adjacent to M-29 so you can enjoy your walk without the roar of traffic in your ears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Connections to schools and neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I would be forever grateful if the trail system in Avoca reached Yale. We love using the trails, but we don’t have a way to transport our bicycles to it. We also don’t have daytime transportation. We would use a Yale trail quite frequently for running, walking, and bicycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Trail on Busha in Marysville stops at 2500 Busha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A trail that connects and run through Beards Hills would be wonderful. It’s the only place in the area that is good for hill repeats and the narrow road is unsafe especially for cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bridge to Bay completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>“Bridge to Bay Great Lake to Lake Trail”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mainly the projects that have already been started to be finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>“Extend the WTA to Yale connect to the Macomb Orchard Trail connect the Fort Gratiot Trails to Burtchville Twp Park”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Connect St. Clair to Macomb Orchard Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>“Would like a link to Macomb Orchard Trail would like blueways linked together-to many breaks now”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>“Extension of bike path off I-94/Water Street more direct/safe pathway ph--&gt;Marysville”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>“I would like to see more bike trails in Port Huron Twp i would like to see the trails connected”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>“St. Clair boat harbor Palmer Park Legacy field”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>In Ira township on M-29 the trail is using shoulders of M-29. The shoulder is falling apart. Drivers are all over the shoulder while they are on the phone talking or texting. I live on M-29 and used to ride between New Baltimore and Algonac but I no longer feel safe on the shoulder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>More trails along the water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>South Metcalf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 1: Are there specific trail opportunities or connections you’d like to see in St. Clair county or to adjacent areas? Please write-in suggestions below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wafhams to Avoca needs to connect to Bridge to Bay trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would be nice to update &amp; repave the Marine city trail. Been on it lately ??? If you have you know what I’m talking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The Burtchville Twp. trail should, at least, be connected with the Fort Gratiot Trail (behind Meijers/Walmart). Include a safe access route to Gratiot Avenue, for a safe passage to the Blue Water Bridge and downtown Port Huron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-25 should have a safe route to connect with Lexington, MI. At a minimum, a safe route could include riding up the State Parks (day and camping sites).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Lakeshore (by Keewahdin Elementary School) is a concern, the road has a narrow shoulder with cars backing out of homes, and the speed is 45 miles per hour until Gratiot/Krafft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At this time, M-25 is too dangerous for most bikers. Cars seem unsure if they can cross the white lines and zoom in and out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look at the the Little Traverse Wheelway around Petoskey. I think the Blue Water Area could create something similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anything along the St. Clair River would be great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please bring a SAFE way to recreate by why of a Trail Plan on Harsens Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion of the bridge to bay bike trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike path on Harsens Island was split with a little on each side of road. It’s too narrow. When repave next put it on one side only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Lakeside Beach to Lighthouse Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect the trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- interpretive signage along trails, &quot;you are here&quot; maps (thinking of Marquette)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- add amenities to trails (lights, emergency phones, benches) (thinking of tart trail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- make 1 set of consistent maps available to all communities, chamber, discover the blue&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>connectivity with Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- where feasible, have shared greenway of blueways facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Macomb orchard trails (great lake to lake trail) connection to bridge-to-bay&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capitalize on connection to Ontario at Algonac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- southern end of st. clair county connect to Macomb orchard directly to lake st. clair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- harsens island&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question 1: Are there specific trail opportunities or connections you’d like to see in St. Clair county or to adjacent areas? Please write-in suggestions below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect to St. Clair little league facilities along the Fred Moore Hwy. Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Connecting the St. Clair little league field to bike path on King/Fred Moore to allow safe access to little league connecting Macomb orchard trail to bike paths in St. Clair/connection to bike path heading south”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From my perspective 1st priority - finish all the connections - Bridge to Bay; and priority connection B.T.B trail to Macomb orchard. Develop signage maps along trail so it is clear all the different route/trail options. Spaced restroom facilities and water fountains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ira Township has no Bridge to Bay trail. It seems to be a missing link to the Macomb County trails to the South and the rest of the County to the North. The Township is in dire need of recreational opportunities that the trail system could provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beards Hill, Bob Wiley Land, off road/off pavement, Mountain bike trails through Twp, County, and State owned land. (As a destination) (they can be family friendly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect WTA to Bridge-to-Bay trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Access to St. Clair little league access to downtown St. Clair access to Algonac via Marine City access to Port Huron via St. Clair access to East China Twp via St. Clair”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“St. Clair little league park St. Clair Plaza Pine River/ St. Clair harbor-camping, fishing, kayaking, canoeing St. Clair Inn”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Close up the gaps on Bridge to Bay. Macomb orchard trail to be connected with Bridge to Bay.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer separate trails (paved) or bike paths with separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please don’t forget that us horse owners want to continue to have trail access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A trail running east and west along Krafft or Keewahdin Rd to bring bike riders over to lakeshore to be able to connect to the Bridge to Bay trail. Traffic on both of those roads can be scary to mingle in with a bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would enjoy more nature trails. I am just getting into biking. I do enjoy the current trail between Marysville and St. Clair. I plan to explore the Avoca trail more this summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I live to run and it’s nice being on dirt roads but getting to the trail from King Road down Meisner isn’t the safest especially with kids and the winding road”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beards Hill area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A better path from the Blue Water River Walk through Port Huron out to Edison Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk or bike path down Marsh Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question 1: Are there specific trail opportunities or connections you’d like to see in St. Clair county or to adjacent areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No trail in ira twp that’s useable. M29 is too dangerous to ride on shoulder. Too many people killed doing that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Connect east china trail to downtown st.Clair...Trail stops at bree rd, i am not willing to cross the river road with my kids on bikes. We would ride to the library/downtown if the trail connected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have the bridge to bay trail completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safe route from algonac st park to harsen’s island ferry landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hardens island a most attractive site for biking and walking trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A trail on marine city hwy would be wonderful!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question 2: Do you have other feedback you’d like to share with the project team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any progressive area has bike trails. If you want income earners you must have the infrastructure that attracts them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just an attaboy and a thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’ve lived all over the country. It is so great to live in a bike friendly community. Thank you for all that you do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biking trails are getting crowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The trails could use some maintenance minor patch work bikes and ankles don’t have suspension systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good to reinforce the message that cyclists can share the road with cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St clair county wadhams to avoca trail needs better and clean facilities. I am embarrassed to say i live hete. Take a look at richmond’s trailhead for macomb orchard trail. They have done it right respecting those that want to use trails!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep the path away from 50mph plus roads. Car pollution is a hindrance, even if the trail is completely separate from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harsens island is a wonderful place to create a linear park (aka bike trail) the natural resources of the area can not be reproduced anywhere, a flat riding experience for all levels of bike riders, and the scenic nature of the area is not copied anywhere locally. There is currently no where, on the island, designated to walk or bike ride safely!!!! With the new kayak park coming to the island, i see this as a perfect opportunity to incorporate a trail plan with in the parks and recreations master plan for this spot. I think it is cost effective to use the new park as a bike trail starting point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great job so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trail to marine city is very bumpy. Needs repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs lots if work in algonac and clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We love the trails and use them when we can. Thank you!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First i would like to say thank you so much! I love the trail. I recently moved here and it was my goal to live in a bike friendly community. I bike china to marysville to work on my gravel bike. My observations: crossings at 4 way stops and cross traffic difficult in saint clair. Maybe signs? Range is also challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know this is more about paved pathways, but i would like to see more cross country running and mountain biking trails. Trails where you can have elevation and directional change, something to break up the monotony of going in a strait flat line like wadhams to avoca trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep up the good work on our parks and trails!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Just how can i help and be more involved. Paper survey results&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Path/trail west to connect w/ southern links trail in lapeer co. Paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question: Do you have other feedback you’d like to share with the project team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I think it needs to be more evident in the display of information that this is for everyone-not just bikes if you want to &quot;connect&quot; the communities, you can't leave out St. Clair. paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;also there is not public transportation in this southern part of the county so good safe bike paths would help people get to jobs and/or buses in Macomb co. coordinate with road commission when roads are being redone to get more bike trails would be helpful. paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;how are you using &quot;&quot;bikeways&quot;&quot; and cycling. are you using a recreation model or transportation model? you need to get clearer on this distinction. paper survey results&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;inventory St. Clair County/city/township/village existing ordinances % master plans that relate to roads, trails, recreation and identify priorities or lack prioritization of biking/hiking/walking (i.e. road widths, etc.) - establish consistent/one umbrella for a adopt a trail program &quot;&quot;county wide&quot;&quot; paper survey result &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;very glad to have opportunity for input. St. Clair County has forward looking leadership paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;engage St. Clair County, Road Commission (road design criteria grossly inadequate for cycling and walking) paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;as mentioned, caps should also id trails in sub standard repair paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;the more trails the better-safety a factor. paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;the more paths, the better! very exciting! paper survey result&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please keep paving of trails at Wadhams and south. North - keep gravel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like trail in Ira Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We love the trail access in our neighborhood!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ira township needs path to new Baltimore and Algonac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M-29 needs to be more attractive regardless of additional trails/bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A connection from the industrial road at the corner of 26 Mile &amp; County Line to the trail would be great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question: Are you involved in any recreational groups, advocacy groups, or other organizations involved with trails or bikeways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra club. Slow roll and slow paddle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rails to trails member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro planning &amp; community foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mpc parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue water outdoor club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have been involved with the trail towns and safe routes to school initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of the saint clair river watersheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinton river area mountain bike association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedal across lower michigan, see trails committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chain gang, league of my cyclists, rails &amp; trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chain gang bicycle club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League of michigan bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of the st. Clair river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of the st. Clair river/the yakabouts (kayaking)/blueways of s.C.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber of commerce, sc harbor commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of st. Clair river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chain gang bike club. I ride 2,000 miles per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST. CLAIR CHAMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blueways of st. Clair, friends of the st. Clair river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Question: Are you involved in any recreational groups, advocacy groups, or other organizations involved with trails or bikeways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - port huron township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rails-to-trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of richmond, macomb orchard trail commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of st, clair river, bluewater outdoor club, blue water club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sce parc, scr trails committee, clay twp recreation, mparks, nerpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - st. Clair county commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Clair run club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>League of mi bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imba, cramba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends of the st. Clair river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community foundation of st. Clair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I ride my bike almost daily down my road only. Can't bike on palms or m29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blue water outdoor club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>