

6 Alternatives Evaluation

The first item to consider as part of the evaluation is whether an alternative is consistent with the project goal of creating a safe and continuous bicycle and pedestrian facility between South Orleans and Orleans Center that can be used and enjoyed by the public. If the alternative is consistent with the project goal, then the next step is to consider the detailed factors related to feasibility, practicality, and cost that need to be taken into account when selecting a recommended alternative.

A low/medium/high ranking has been assigned to the general performance measures and detailed evaluation criteria to help compare the merits of the different alternatives. In general, an alternative that scores high in the general performance measures is preferable. Conversely, an alternative that scores low in the detailed evaluation criteria is preferable.

At the end of this section is a summary table outlining the opportunities and constraints and trade-offs of each alternative. Consideration of each of these factors becomes the basis for selecting the recommended alternative that best balances the Committee's goal.

6.1 General Performance Measures

The key performance measures to be considered in determining the desirability and effectiveness of each alternative alignment include the following:

Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections

Some of the alternatives under consideration are more suited to bicyclists whereas others are intended for pedestrians. Therefore, the extent to which each alternative provides a connection between the facility and surrounding areas may vary greatly depending upon the proposed facility type.

Accessibility

Easily accessible connections are a key component of any bicycle or pedestrian network. An alternative that is closer to, or has easier access to all likely origins and destinations shall be given greater consideration. Accessibility should also consider the ease by which this distance can be traveled and extent to which the facility serves users of varying abilities and skill levels.

Directness

Bicyclists and pedestrians, for the most part, both desire a direct and quick route to destination points. Studies have shown that most bicyclists will not even use a highly designed facility if it greatly increased the travel distance or trip time.

Consistency

Providing consistent facility types should be a goal when planning and designing bicycle and pedestrian networks. Consistent facilities tend to reinforce user expectations and provide for better operations. Switching between facility types can create conflict points and be confusing to users.

Route Attractiveness

Bicycle and pedestrian networks or portions of the network should encompass such factors as separation from motor vehicle traffic, visual character/aesthetics, and connections to business and recreation areas. These factors tend to encourage novice and recreational users to view bicycling and walking as viable modes of transportation and enhance the effectiveness of the overall network.

Ease of Implementation

Right of way, environmental, engineering and funding constraints must all be considered during the planning process to ensure that implementation of the recommended alternative is actually feasible. “Constructability” (construction methods, access, utility coordination, etc.) is also of particular importance.

Safety/Security

The design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities needs to consider personal security and traffic safety as key design elements. Safety is an important part of any plan and includes education, enforcement, encouragement and design of facilities. Safety conscious design should guide the development of all bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In addition, personal security issues need to be addressed, especially when dealing with facilities through remote areas.

An expanded matrix showing the ranking assigned to the performance measures for each alternative is included in Appendix E

6.2 Detailed Evaluation Criteria

The detailed evaluation criteria to be taken into account when selecting a recommended alternative include the following:

Environmental Impacts

One of the design objectives should be to avoid and minimize environmental impacts to the extent feasible. This approach will respect the concerns of regulatory agencies and streamline the permitting process. The anticipated impacts to wetland & water resources, endangered species habitat, cultural & historic resources, and protected and recreational open space should be considered along each alternative alignment.

Construction Impacts

Clearly, existing conditions will be altered within the proposed construction footprint. Along some of the alternatives, disturbances will be minimal due to the alignment location and type of facility proposed. In other areas, disturbances will be more substantial. Construction impacts to consider include impacts to vegetation, topography, drainage patterns, roadside features, etc.

ROW Impacts

The availability of right of way (ROW) is one of the most important factors to consider when evaluating alternatives. Adequate ROW must be secured to allow for the construction of the proposed bicycle/pedestrian facility. The ownership of each property impacted by an alternative will dictate the approvals and/or form of ROW acquisition that will be required (i.e. temporary or permanent easements, fee takings, lease).

Engineering Constraints

Each alternative has a number of associated engineering design issues that range in complexity. For example, the existing topography will make it difficult for certain alternatives to meet ADA guidelines. Other alternatives present safety concerns associated with proposing new midblock crossings of local roadways and increasing bicycle/pedestrian use in otherwise industrial areas. When reviewing alternatives, it is important to consider how these critical design issues will individually and collectively impact the feasibility of each alternative.

Aesthetics

Overall visual quality is an important part of a pedestrian or bicyclist experience and should be considered when evaluating alternatives. Equally important is the impact that the proposed facility will have upon existing aesthetic resources within the project area.

Conceptual Costs

The conceptual cost of certain alternatives may outweigh the advantages or seem prohibitive for the Town's fiscal budget. The costs developed for each alternative will help the Town determine its preparedness for implementation and formulate an action plan to secure the necessary project funding.

Potential Funding Sources

Project funding will need to be secured from local, state, or federal sources. There are a number of factors to consider when evaluating sources of funding assistance. Most importantly, the Town must assess if the project meets the eligibility requirements of the funding source. With respect to bicycle and pedestrian facilities, certain programs require that the project emphasis be transportation-oriented whereas other programs focus on recreation-related.

An expanded matrix showing the ranking assigned to the detailed evaluation criteria for each alternative is included in Appendix F.

6.3 Evaluation Summary

Below is a summary of the opportunities and constraints listed in the detailed matrices included in Appendices E and F. By comparing the general performance measures and key design considerations side by side, the trade-offs associated with various alternatives become clear. The summary of each alternative is presented in the following sections.

6.3.1 Section 1: South Orleans Village to Watershed Limits

Alternative 1A: Route 28 Corridor

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct route between South Orleans and points north. • Would improve bike and/or pedestrian access and safety along the heavily used Route 28 corridor. • Highly visible location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flexibility within State Highway layout. • Roadside location is not as desirable as other alignments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located along a developed roadway corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flexibility within State Highway layout. • Impacts to abutting properties with frontage along Route 28. • Requires local and state environmental permits. • Roadway would need to be upgraded to current design standards prior to any other improvements.

Summary

Alternative 1A is a direct, highly visible roadside facility along the Route 28 corridor that directly connects to a number of residential neighborhoods. Development of a shared use trail or sidewalk along either side of the corridor would impact abutting properties. As the proposed facility is located within a State Highway layout, any proposed construction would be subject to MassHighway review and approval. Based on discussions with MassHighway District 5, Route 28 would need to be upgraded to current design standards prior to any other roadside improvements.

Conclusion

Alternative 1A will require a lengthy approval process, substantial roadway upgrades, and significant roadside impacts. However, this alternative scores high on its desirability and effectiveness to improve bike and/or pedestrian access and safety along the heavily used Route 28 corridor. Although there is an unknown timeframe for any Route 28 corridor improvements, it is conceivable that when the long-awaited sewer main improvements occur along the Route 28 corridor, a shared-use trail could be constructed concurrently. It is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project.

Alternative 1B: Eastern Watershed Trail

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenic, natural trail along watershed perimeter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires blazing new trail through wooded area. Minimal Route 28 access opportunities. Remote location could lead to personal security concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possibility to create a trail that is less physically challenging by following the existing topography. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant vegetative disturbance. Requires local and state environmental permits. ROW impacts and safety issues associated with providing access to Route 28 near Monument Road.

Summary

Alternative 1B calls for blazing a new trail along the watershed perimeter that generally parallels Route 28. The land and vegetative disturbance required to construct a trail within an environmentally sensitive, natural area needs to be weighed against the benefits of providing a pleasant experience for trail users. Further, the Committee expressed a desire to provide a connection to Route 28 near Monument Road. However, there are right of way (ROW) impacts and user safety issues associated with constructing this connection.

Conclusion

Alternative 1B allows users to traverse a scenic, natural area while still traveling in a direct north-south direction. This alternative will require location-specific design solutions aimed at avoiding/minimizing project impacts. It is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project as a greenway trail suitable for pedestrian use. Limiting the use to passive recreation is consistent with the current activities permitted within the watershed. Pending approval from the Board of Water Commissioners, improvements to the existing trail could consist of signage installation, limited grading, and selective vegetative thinning & clearing.

Alternative 1C: Route 6 Trail

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trail mainline located parallel to but outside watershed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires blazing new trail through wooded area. Does not connect to residential areas along Route 28. Remote location could lead to personal security concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watershed connection follows existing hiking trail or access road. Wide Route 6 layout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant grading and vegetative disturbance. Requires approval from Board and MassHighway. Unlikely to secure State or private funding.

Summary

Alternative 1C calls for the creation of a trail within the Route 6 right of way (layout) along the far western edge of the study area. Such an alignment would be subject to approval by MassHighway. Although this alignment connects South Orleans to points north, it does not meet the Committee’s objective to connect to the residential and open space areas in between.

Conclusion

Given the remote location of this trail, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration.

Alternative 1D: Power Line Trail

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in an already disturbed area within the watershed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not connect to residential areas along Route 28. Remote location could lead to personal security concerns. Prone to illegal ATV access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in an already disturbed area within the watershed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to accommodate power company access. Requires design controls to separate trail and ATV access. Unlikely to secure State or private funding.

Summary

Alternative 1D is a trail alignment following the existing overhead power lines on the western edge of the watershed property. One of the benefits of this alignment is that the proposed trail follows an existing disturbed corridor within the watershed. However, with that cleared corridor comes the need to accommodate power company access and deter illegal ATV use.

Conclusion

Given the ease of implementation, it is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project as a greenway trail suitable for pedestrian use. Limiting the use to passive recreation is consistent with the current activities permitted within the watershed. Pending approval from the Board of Water Commissioners and NStar, improvements could consist of signage installation, limited grading, and selective vegetative thinning & clearing.

Alternative 1E: Windmill Trail

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows existing fire and service roads along majority of alignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal Route 28 access opportunities. Remote location could lead to personal security concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilizes portion of existing fire and service roads. Effort could be combined with future access improvements for the proposed wind turbine project. No local or state environmental permits anticipated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROW impacts and safety concern associated with providing access to Route 28 near Monument Road. Vegetative impacts to blaze new trail through wooded area around Well 8 buffer. Substantial grading to make the trail ADA compliant. Extensive grading and control measures to address existing erosion issues. ROW impacts and safety concern associated with providing access to Route 28 near Monument Road.

Summary

Alternative 1E traverses the section of the watershed where the Town is considering wind power in support of watershed activities. The alignment enters the watershed property through the southern service road and then heads north following:

- Existing unimproved fire road past the proposed wind turbine site
- Paved service road past Wells 1, 2 and 3
- Recently constructed Well 8 service road
- Proposed trail north of Well 8 in order to divert the trail outside of the Zone II wellhead buffer.

The Committee expressed a desire to provide a connection to Route 28 near Monument Road. However, there are ROW impacts and safety issues associated with having users cross Route 28 at this location.

Conclusion

Based on the uncertainty surrounding the wind turbine project at this time, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration. This alternative could be reconsidered in the future.

Alternative 1F: Pond Trail

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows existing hiking trail through scenic, natural areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to minimize impacts to natural resources. Minimal Route 28 access opportunities. Remote location could lead to personal security concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenway trail would only require signage installation, limited grading, and selective vegetative clearing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROW impacts and safety concern associated with providing access to Route 28 near Monument Road. Traverses most environmentally sensitive portion of watershed property. Requires local and state environmental permits.

Summary

Alternative 1F enters the watershed property via the northern access road accessible from Route 28 across from Carmen Lane. As discussed in Alternatives 1B and 1E, there are ROW impacts and safety issues associated with having users cross Route 28 at this location. After entering the watershed property, the trail follows an existing hiking trail through an environmentally sensitive section of the watershed. Any improvements involving earth or vegetative disturbance along this alignment would require a NOI filing with the Orleans Conservation Commission, MESA review by NHESP, and an ENF filing with the MEPA office.

Conclusion

Based on the sensitivity of this area, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration.

Alternative 1G: Northern Fire Road Trail

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows existing fire road in an already disturbed section of watershed. Accessible from all alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prone to illegal ATV access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follows existing fire road in an already disturbed area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to accommodate watershed maintenance & emergency access. Requires design controls to separate trail and ATV access.

Summary

Alternative 1G is an east-west connector alignment along the northern perimeter of the watershed. One of the benefits of this alignment is that the proposed trail follows an existing disturbed corridor within the watershed. However, with that cleared corridor comes the design challenges and safety issues posed by the need to accommodate watershed vehicle access and deter illegal ATV use.

Conclusion

As this is a critical connection to all watershed alternatives, it is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project as a greenway trail suitable for pedestrian use. Limiting the use to passive recreation is consistent with the current activities permitted within the watershed. Pending approval from the Board of Water Commissioners, improvements to the existing trail could consist of signage installation, limited grading, and selective vegetative thinning & clearing. It is recommended that such improvements be performed outside of the endangered species habitat to eliminate the need to file and undergo MESA review by NHESP.

6.3.2 Section 2: Watershed Limits to Eldredge Park Way

Alternative 2A: Route 28 Corridor

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would improve bike and/or pedestrian access and safety along the heavily used Route 28 corridor. • Highly visible location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flexibility within State Highway layout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located along a developed roadway corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flexibility within State Highway layout. • Impacts to abutting properties with frontage along Route 28. • Requires local and state environmental permits. • Roadway would need to be upgraded to current design standards prior to any other improvements. • Unlikely to secure State or private funding.

Summary

Alternative 2A is a direct, highly visible roadside facility along the Route 28 corridor that connects to a number of residential neighborhoods. Development of a shared use trail or sidewalk along either side of the corridor would impact abutting properties. As the proposed facility is located within a State Highway layout, any proposed construction would be subject to MassHighway review and approval. Based on discussions with MassHighway District 5, Route 28 would need to be upgraded to current design standards prior to any other roadside improvements.

Conclusion

Alternative 2A will require a lengthy approval process, substantial roadway upgrades, and significant roadside impacts. However, this alternative scores high on its desirability and effectiveness to improve bike and/or pedestrian access and safety along the heavily used Route 28 corridor. Although there is an unknown timeframe for any Route 28 corridor improvements, it is conceivable that when the long-awaited sewer main improvements occur along the Route 28 corridor, a shared-use trail could be constructed concurrently. It is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project.

Alternative 2B: Giddiah Hill Road to Marston’s Way

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings users to existing crosswalk at school campus and Eldredge Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike route not suitable for all ages/levels. • Brings users through difficult intersection. • Increases bike/ped use through residential neighborhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public way connections defined. • Brings users to existing crosswalk at school campus and Eldredge Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings users through a congested industrial area. • Pedestrians must walk alongside roadways. • Increases bike/ped use through residential neighborhood.

Summary

Alternative 2B is a bike route along local roadways with no separate provisions for pedestrians. This alternative poses a safety issue by increasing bicycle and pedestrian traffic through the heavy industrial Giddiah Hill Road area. On the other hand, one of the benefits of this alternative is that it provides a relatively direct connection to the existing crosswalk at Eldredge Park.

Conclusion

Although this is a low cost alternative, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration

Alternative 2C: O’Connor Way to Lots Hollow Road

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct connection from skating rink to Eldredge Park Way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings users to difficult intersection at Eldredge Park Way. • Does not connect to residential neighborhoods. • Requires MassHighway approval at Skaket Corners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public way connections defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires MassHighway approval at Skaket Corners intersection. • ROW impacts along Lots Hollow Road for sidewalk construction. • Brings users through a congested industrial area.

Summary

Alternative 2C proposes designation of a bike route along O’Connor Way and Lots Hollow Road and construction of a sidewalk along one side of each roadway. Although this alternative connects to the skating rink, it does not connect to any residential neighborhoods. This alternative also poses a safety issue by increasing bicycle and pedestrian traffic through a congested industrial area.

Conclusion

Due to the safety issues and anticipated ROW impacts, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration.

Alternative 2D: O’Connor Way to Nickerson Road

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brings users to existing crosswalk at Eldredge Park Way at which point they can travel towards Cape Cod Rail Trail (West Road) or Orleans Center area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires conversion of Nickerson Road into a two-way roadway at Finlay Road. Increases bike/ped use through residential neighborhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public way connections defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brings users through a congested industrial area. Increases bike/ped use through residential neighborhood. Minimize sidewalk impacts to existing earth berm and stockade fence along Finlay Road.

Summary

Alternative 2D proposes a bike route along local roadways and a sidewalk along one side of each roadway through the industrial area. Sidewalk construction would need to minimize impacts to the existing earth berm and stockade fence along Finlay Road, which was installed to mitigate the impact of industrial noise upon the Nickerson Road neighborhood. This alternative requires the conversion of Nickerson Road into a two-way roadway at Finlay Road. One of the benefits of this alternative is that it brings users to the existing crosswalk at Eldredge Park Way at which point they can travel towards Cape Cod Rail Trail (West Road) or Orleans Center area.

Conclusion

Pending approval to convert Nickerson Road into a two-way road at Finlay Road, it is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project.

Alternative 2E: O'Connor Way to Marston's Way

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brings users to existing crosswalk at school campus and Eldredge Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brings users through difficult intersection at Finlay Road / Giddiah Hill Road / Kettle Pond Way. Increases bike/ped use through residential neighborhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public way connections defined. Brings users to existing crosswalk at school campus and Eldredge Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brings users through a congested industrial area. Increases bike/ped use through residential neighborhood. Minimize sidewalk impacts to existing earth berm and stockade fence along Finlay Road.

Summary

Alternative 2E proposes a bike route along local roadways and a sidewalk along one side of each roadway through the industrial area. Sidewalk construction would need to minimize impacts to the existing earth berm and stockade fence along Finlay Road, which was installed to mitigate the impact of industrial noise upon the Nickerson Road neighborhood. This alternative retains Nickerson Road as a one-way roadway at Finlay Road and instead brings users along Kettle Pond Way. This alternative poses a safety issue by bringing bicycles on road through the hard to maneuver Finlay Road / Giddiah Hill Road / Kettle Pond Way intersection. On the other hand, one of the benefits of this alternative is that it brings users along Kettle Pond Way, Daley's Terrance and Marston's Way to connects users to the existing crosswalk at Eldredge Park.

Conclusion

If Nickerson Road is not converted into a two-way road at Finlay Road, then it is recommended that Alternative 2E be incorporated into the larger trail project.

6.3.3 Section 3: Eldredge Park Way to Orleans Center

Alternative 3A: Route 28 Corridor

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would improve bike and/or pedestrian access and safety along the heavily used Route 28 corridor. • Highly visible location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flexibility within State Highway layout. • Roadside location is not as desirable as other alignments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located along a developed roadway corridor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited flexibility within State Highway layout. • Significant impacts to Eldredge Park field facilities. • Roadway would need to be upgraded to current design standards prior to any other improvements. • Unlikely to secure State or private funding.

Summary

Alternative 3A proposes trail construction, sidewalk improvements or roadway widening along the Route 28 corridor.

Conclusion

Due to the anticipated roadside impacts of any of these options, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration.

Alternative 3B: Middle School Campus

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a safe route through the school property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires input and approval from school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formalizes existing use. Connects to key Town facilities. Provides an accessible connection to the Main Street area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of a few parking spaces in the lower and upper school parking lots. Connection to Main Street requires a context sensitive design. Requires a local environmental permit.

Summary

Alternative 3B proposes the construction of a sidewalk from Eldredge Park Way to Main Street. The sidewalk connection from Eldredge Park Way could either travel in front of or behind of the Nauset Public Schools Administration Office.

A sidewalk along this alignment would formalize an existing use and result in an ADA accessible connection through the school property. It is not anticipated that the peak use of this walk would coincide with school hours and therefore should not pose a safety concern or distraction to students. With proper design, this connection would minimize impacts to the recreational fields/track and only result in the loss of a few parking spaces in the lower and upper school parking lots.

Conclusion

Pending approval from the school administration, it is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project.

Alternative 3C: Elementary to Middle School Campus

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides improved elementary school access to the Snow Library. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires input and approval from school. Need to deter students from gathering in the wooded area between the two campuses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formalizes existing use. Connects to key Town facilities. Provides an accessible connection to the Main Street area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circuititous route around field perimeter. Potential for conflicts between field activities and trail use. Connection between the schools is located in a wooded area on the outskirts of the property. Loss of a few parking spaces in the upper school parking lot. Connection to Main Street requires a context sensitive design. Requires a local environmental permit.

Summary

Alternative 3C proposes the construction of a shared use trail from Eldredge Park Way to Main Street via the middle and elementary school campuses. In order to connect to the elementary school, the trail would follow a circuititous alignment around field perimeter. Formalizing this connection may encourage students from both schools to gather in the wooded area between the two campuses. In addition, such an alignment has the potential to create conflicts between field activities and trail use formalizing this connection.

Conclusion

Due to the concerns associated with this alignment, it is not recommended that this alternative be given further consideration.

Alternative 3D: Eldredge Park Way to West Road

General Performance Measures		Key Design Considerations	
Opportunities	Constraints	Opportunities	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bypasses the busy section of Orleans Center. • Improvements easy to implement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not connect to the Main Street area near the Snow Library and Village Green. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public way connections defined. • Provides a direct connection to the Cape Cod Rail Trail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brings users through the busy Skaket Corners signalized intersection.

Summary

Alternative 3D is a low cost alternative that allows users to bypass Orleans Center should they so desire. This alternative utilizes the existing sidewalk along Eldredge Park Way and West Road and calls for the installation of bike route guide signage along these local roadways.

Conclusion

Due to the ease of implementation, it is recommended that this alternative be incorporated into the larger trail project.