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CITY OF PEORIA – TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
DRIES LANE, CONFERENCE ROOM
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ROLL CALL

ANNOUNCEMENTS, Etc.

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM No. 1: UPDATE on Manual of Practice (MOP)/Infrastructure Design Standards (IDS) Process by Stakeholders Group. (City of Peoria Civil Engineer II, Jane Gerdes) [Attachment of DRAFT Standards]

ITEM No. 2: CONSIDERATION of Proposed Request AMENDING the TRAFFIC CODE of the City of Peoria, As Needed:

A CONSIDERATION of a REQUEST to CONVERT FREDONIA AVENUE, Between COOPER STREET and WESTERN AVENUE, from TWO-WAY TRAFFIC to ONE-WAY TRAFFIC. (Letter of Request from Moss Bradley Residential Association and Location Maps Attached) [District 2]

ITEM No. 3: OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST to the Transportation Commissioners.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENT

NEXT MEETING
Tuesday, April 19, 2016

ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE CITY OF PEORIA  
: TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  :

FEBRUARY 16, 2016

A Regular Meeting of the City of Peoria’s Transportation Commission convened at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 2016, at the Lester D. Bergsten Operations & Maintenance Facility located at 3505 N. Dries Lane, Peoria, Illinois.

CALL TO ORDER

Call to Order showed the following Transportation Commission Members in attendance:

Commissioners Present: Commissioner Dan Adler, Commissioner Mary Jane Crowell, Commissioner George Ghareeb (arrived 3:10 p.m.), Commissioner Nathaniel Herz, Chairman Joe Hudson, Commissioner Brandon Lott, Commissioner Lon Lyons, Commissioner Patrick McNamara, and Commissioner Randall Ray (arrived 3:17 p.m.) - 9.

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Joe Messmore and Commissioner Michael Vespa - 2.

Others in attendance included I-Team Coordinator Anthony Corso, City Traffic Engineer Nick Stoffer, Civil Engineer II Stephen Letsky, Civil Engineer II Andrea Klopfenstein, and Public Works Administrative Specialist Ruth Blancaflor.

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.

SmartGrowth America Webinar

Commissioner McNamara announced the February 17th SmartGrowth America Webinar regarding Creative Placemaking in Transportation to begin at 3:30 p.m. eastern time, and he referred to the information he had forwarded by email to them.

MINUTES

Commissioner Crowell moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission held on January 19, 2016, as printed; seconded by Commissioner Lyons.

Approved by unanimous viva voce vote.

ITEM No. 1: PRESENTATION of I-TEAM PLANNING EFFORTS and PUBLIC WORKS by I-Team Coordinator Anthony Corso.

Traffic Engineer Nick Stoffer introduced i-Team Director Anthony Corso.

Mr. Corso distributed a handout regarding Community Benefits (co-benefits) of Green Infrastructure (GI) to all members of the Commission who were present. He updated the Commission regarding the i-Team’s efforts with Public Works and its relevance to transportation issues. He explained the i-Team’s efforts were funded by a Bloomberg Grant for three years, and that the Team acted as in-house consultants to creatively problem solve. He outlined the four steps followed in their work: investigate the problem/data collection; generate new ideas/engage many--reach out to other communities; formulate ideas for initiatives/generate solutions; and deliver and adapt the initiatives.

Mr. Corso discussed the i-Team’s current work on the city’s combined sewer overflows (CSO) issue, and leveraging a green infrastructure solution with the USEPA. He explained the technical premise was to use the public right-of-way within the 8-mile CSO area, to retrofit a third of the streets with green
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infrastructure. He discussed the items on the Co-Benefits sheet and the planning efforts, and he said a 20 year implementation plan would provide Peoria with a robust network of walkable streets.

Commissioner Ghareeb arrived at 3:10 p.m.

In discussion with Commissioner McNamara, Mr. Corso stated a good portion of Peoria’s east bluff was in the CSO area. He displayed the CSO Green Infrastructure Concept Map and gave an overview of the areas depicted. He explained that the arterials would be used in the first tier of the green infrastructure because, as the connections between the neighborhoods, they allowed for maximized co-benefits. He said it was logistically and technically more difficult to implement the GI on the arterials, though. He discussed the benefits of adding back parkways and pervious areas on the wider streets. He explained how those measures aided in diverting water from the combined sewers.

Commissioner Ray arrived at 3:17 p.m.

Commissioner Herz questioned the i-Team’s status beyond the life of the grant, and Mr. Corso explained that, according to the model, their efforts should shift to other initiatives after the deliverables at the end of year one.

In discussion with Mr. Stoffer regarding the Commission’s role, Mr. Corso suggested that they help identify streets from the CIP for phasing in green infrastructure projects that would ensure the distribution of the co-benefits. He stated that the areas of the city with some of the lowest property values also had the highest CSO frequency. He said the goal was to set a framework that would be successful in the neighborhoods for generations to come.

Mr. Corso stated the i-Team planned to update the City Council and commissioners quarterly.

Mr. Stoffer questioned if any early action projects had been targeted, and Mr. Corso stated it was necessary to provide a “proof of concept” pilot project. Because there were limited funds, he said they were hoping to find an area that would outperform the goals, and there was an ongoing evaluation of a few sites below the bluff for the pilot project. He said they hoped to have it decided within the next few weeks.

Mr. Corso discussed the co-benefit opportunity of Local Jobs and Workforce Training. He pointed out information regarding Philadelphia’s powercorps youth job training program, at www.powercorpsphl.org and YouTube video. He said the i-Team was also assisting with the development of a Peoria youth corps for the CSO endeavor. Besides the GI maintenance work the youth corps did, he explained that they were involved in educating their friends and neighbors on the program. With the $1.5 million Bloomberg 3-year grant program, he explained there were $500,000 matching funds for implementation. Since there was not yet an EPA consent decree, he said the City had to fund it. He said the i-Team was working on private sources or grant dollars to fund it.

Commissioner Lott questioned whether the CSO green infrastructure measures would take funding away from roadways, and Mr. Corso stated it did not compete for General Funds. He said sewer funds or a specific enterprise fund would most likely be impacted, since it dealt with retrofitting the streets and sewers.

Also regarding the green infrastructure challenge, Mr. Corso requested that the Commissioners keep an eye on cities that owned their own utilities. He said some of Peoria’s peer cities were using technology to monitor their infrastructure, prior to leaks, in “dig once” programs. He discussed the importance of including utilities in the GI discussion.

Mr. Corso distributed some copies of a page from Florida’s Complete Streets Plan and he said its goals and metrics aligned with the GI co-benefits he discussed.

The Commission thanked Mr. Corso for the information and his presentation.
ITEM No. 2: CONSIDERATION of Proposed TRAFFIC REGULATIONS AMENDING the TRAFFIC CODE of the City of Peoria, As Needed:

A REVIEW of Traffic Speed Studies and CONSIDERATION of a REQUEST to PROCEED with a TRAFFIC REGULATION Lowering the Speed Limit on UNIVERSITY STREET, Between NEBRASKA AVENUE and WAR MEMORIAL DRIVE From 40 MPH to 35 MPH. (City of Peoria Civil Engineer II, Stephen Letsky) [District 2]

Mr. Stoffer introduced the request to proceed with a traffic regulation to lower the speed limit on North University Street between Nebraska and War Memorial Drive from 40 miles per hour to 35 miles per hour. He pointed out the speed studies provided to the Commission in the Agenda packet, and he noted the traffic regulation had not yet been drafted. He explained improvements to University between Nebraska and Forrest Hill had been made during 2015, and more improvements were planned during 2016, between Forrest Hill and War Memorial Drive. Those section improvements would then tie in and complete the corridor improvement with the area north of War Memorial Drive from a few years ago, he said.

Mr. Stoffer outlined the preliminary traffic study on University. He said the southern portion that was just constructed had traffic volumes of 23,000 and nearer War Memorial Drive volumes were 26,000. He noted the area near Hudson was a commercial area where the traffic was a little slower.

Commissioner McNamara questioned the reason for the different time frames covered in the speed studies, and Mr. Stoffer said they were taken when staff was available and were according to off peak times. He explained the purpose was to get cars during typical times when the traffic was at its natural, quicker speed.

Commissioner Herz asked for clarification on the importance of the speed study. He said he questioned whether the goal was to have the speed limit within a certain percentile or whether it was to meet certain targets based on other factors.

Mr. Stoffer explained the traffic calculations for the 85th percentile and he said the speed limits were typically set by that or by the pace of the traffic and other factors such as conditions of the roadway, the number of driveways, the number of signalized intersections along the section, and the accident history. He explained the Federal Highway Association (FHA) provided a spreadsheet for the data that calculated for guidelines of a standard speed limit. He said he used that system for both of these zones and, for the southern zone, it produced a 40 mph guideline, and 35 mph for the northern section.

In discussion with Commissioner Ghareeb regarding his question on the origin of the request, Project Engineer Stephen Letsky stated he had received several requests from businesses in the northern section during meetings concerning the pending project. He said they expressed concern about pedestrian safety in the area and customers complaining about nearly being hit while turning into their businesses. In the southern section, he said people suggested it a year and a half ago after a pedestrian was struck when crossing mid-block.

Mr. Letsky also stated the request was in line with ITE Recommended Practices, since slower speeds helped pedestrians crossing the road, enhanced stopping sight distances, actual time and braking time. Further, he noted that Knoxville Avenue, a parallel section to University, was posted at 35 mph and had similar driveway numbers and configurations.

Commissioner Ghareeb noted that State Statute required a traffic study or engineering study prior to speed limits being lowered. He cautioned that any request should be supported by documentation in order for the Commission to ensure it was in compliance.

Mr. Stoffer said the speed study was considered as justification for the traffic regulation to lower the speed limit.
Commissioner Ray stated, as a Home Rule municipality, the City would be allowed to do this, but he requested Staff check with the Legal Department for a confirmation of that.

Commissioner McNamara spoke in favor of the Commission establishing an ongoing criteria for handling these requests and other various requests. He said the decision should be data-driven. In looking at University, particularly from Forrest Hill to Nebraska, he said he felt the request was responsibly supported by the criteria of the curbline sidewalks, a school, a number of businesses, and lots of driveways. He said, even though the 85th percentile suggested 40 mph, he encouraged the Commissioners to consider the 35 mph speed limit request as it would be parallel to the Knoxville section.

In further discussion with Commissioner Ray, Mr. Stoffer agreed that even though these two sections were different they both should be the same speed limit for continuity of the corridor. He explained that different speed limits were confusing for drivers.

Commissioner McNamara moved to proceed with the preparation of a Traffic Regulation lowering the Speed Limit on University Street, between Nebraska Avenue and War Memorial Drive from 40 miles per hour to 35 miles per hour, without bringing it back to the Commission for approval; seconded by Commissioner Herz.

Approved by viva voce vote.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Letsky for the discussion and he left the meeting.

ITEM No. 3: UPDATE on ONEWATER COMMITTEE Storm Water Education and Wet Weather Solutions for the City of Peoria. (City of Peoria Civil Engineer II, Andrea Klopfenstein) [With Handout]

Mr. Stoffer introduced Civil Engineer II Andrea Klopfenstein, who was continuing the OneWater Committee’s storm water education for wet weather solutions in the City of Peoria.

Ms. Klopfenstein distributed a handout entitled Our Water, Our Way to all Commissioners who were present. She gave a presentation about Wet Weather Solutions for the City of Peoria. She discussed city’s ongoing problem of Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) into the Illinois River and said the CSO area was within Council Districts 1 and 2 and parts of 3. She explained that Council Districts 4 and 5 also had wet weather issues during storms, so that every District in Peoria was affected. Currently, she said there was a $6.6 million budget backlog and 84 storm water and drainage projects to be done by a contractor that were pending. She said the city was only able to be reactive in addressing the problem, due to lack of resources.

Ms. Klopfenstein discussed the city’s decade-long history of negotiating with the USEPA for a solution to CSOs. She said the city proposed to address CSOs by 100% Green Infrastructure (GI) for practices to slow storm water in order to get capacity back in the sewer pipes. She said the current estimate for GI measures proposed by the city was approximately $200 to $250 million and, besides the co-benefits previously discussed by Mr. Corso, she said that money could be spent here, using local labor and local engineers. She explained the GI construction could cover 18 to 20 years, and included ongoing maintenance for 1 to 3 % of the project cost. She said the EPA was more comfortable with a “gray” solution which included construction of a 4-mile long pipe 40 feet underground to take the water to the waste water treatment facility, with a cost of $500 million. However, she said, no local contractors had the ability to construct the gray solution, so those funds would be spent on overseas contractors.

In discussion with Commissioner Herz regarding what number of events would be considered as acceptable by the EPA, Ms. Klopfenstein explained their goal of “acceptable level of control” was almost zero events for a particularly designed storm.
Ms. Klopfenstein discussed the problem of storm water wet weather issues. She explained the infrastructure that manages storm water is both open and closed, and consists of the pipes and drains in the streets, and ditches, creeks, channels and rivers. She said the problem had an $8.24 million price tag. She described the OneWater Committee and their assistance to the city in formulating the storm water program its funding mechanism through a storm water utility fee. She said the fee would go into an enterprise fund which could only be used for wet weather issues. She discussed how the fee would be calculated for impervious areas of residential properties and that no property would be exempt. She said the average residential fee would be $13 monthly. She said there was not an average rate for commercial properties, because commercial properties vary so much that “average” is not a meaningful number.

In discussion with Commissioner Lott regarding his question of whether credits would be given in some instances, Ms. Klopfenstein said those reductions were still being considered, but could include rain gardens or discharges that didn’t go into city infrastructure or went directly into the river. She said there was continuing discussion about credits for permeable parking lots and she said they welcomed ideas from everyone.

Commissioner Adler stated the fee could have an estimated $300,000 annual cost to the school district. Ms. Klopfenstein said the city had been in conversations with the District and she said the city’s permit required a component for educational credits, so that was a possibility for them to partner with the City to reduce their fees by providing public education, which the City is required to do as part of its permit with the EPA.

In discussion with Commissioner Herz, Ms. Klopfenstein stated the i-Team was looking for grants to fund the issue and that there were some 319 grants available from EPA which the city had submitted for, but those were highly competitive.

Ms. Klopfenstein stated all of the presentations were available on the OneWater Committee web site at www.onewaterpeoria.com and she invited the Commissioners to contact her or Mr. Stoffer with any questions or ideas they may have concerning wet weather issues.

The Commissioners thanked Ms. Klopfenstein for her presentation, and she left the meeting.

**ITEM No. 4: OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST to the Transportation Commissioners:**

A. Discussion Notes of a Special Meeting of December 10, 2015 of the Downtown Advisory Commission and the Transportation Commission for Public Workshop #3 on the DOWNTOWN MASTER STREETSCAPE PLAN; (Receive and File).

Commissioner Lott moved to receive and file the Discussion Notes of the Special Meeting of December 10, 2015 of the Downtown Advisory Commission and the Transportation Commission for Public Workshop #3 on the Downtown Master Streetscape Plan; seconded by Commissioner McNamara.

Approved by viva voce vote.

B. News Release with Map Regarding Pay by Cell Parking Payment System by Passport Parking (For Information Only).

Mr. Stoffer discussed the brochure and map handed out as part of the Agenda packet. He said the pay by cell parking system was instituted on a trial basis in downtown Peoria and he explained it use through a downloadable app. He said people were using the system and there had been about 80 parking sessions used to-date.
C Adoption of the PEORIA BICYCLE MASTER PLAN by the Peoria City Council.

Mr. Stoffer announced that the Peoria Bicycle Master Plan had been unanimously adopted by the Peoria City Council at its meeting on February 9th, after a brief presentation by Josh Sikich of Alta Planning + Design. He said utilization of the Plan would begin immediately.

D TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION WORK ITEMS (Handout)

Staff distributed a Work Items Gantt chart from Commissioner McNamara to all Commissioners who were present.

Commissioner McNamara stated the tasks had been reordered by ranking, excepting for budget items which start in June. He said it was very flexible and he welcomed the addition of other items for discussion. He said some items made be covered in one meeting and others may take several meetings to decide.

Mr. Stoffer agreed, and he noted items such as the Thoroughfare Plan would involve discussion and input from other groups, as well.

Chairman Hudson thanked Commissioner McNamara for his work on the list.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one came forward to address the Commissioners.

Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 15, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.

Adjournment

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Adler moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Commissioner Lott.

Approved by viva voce vote.

The Transportation Commission meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

Chairman Joe Hudson            Nick Stoffer, Traffic Engineer
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Development Standards – Staff Recommendations

Introduction and Purpose

Once infrastructure is in place, it rarely goes away. Infrastructure built now will likely be in place for our children and grandchildren. The City’s current Infrastructure Design Standards or Subdivision Standards were adopted in 1972, and have not been significantly revised since that time. In 2013, Staff proposed a revised set of Infrastructure Design Standards (IDS), or Manual of Practice, to incorporate Action Items and Critical Success Factors from the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The goal of the revised standards is to improve the design of our infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, storm water management, etc.) with regard to sustainability and livability, while positioning Peoria as a desirable place and a competitive city for development. The comprehensive 2013 effort was realigned per City Council direction to pursue consensus on individual standards.

The purpose of this Memorandum is to inform the City Council about Staff’s recent efforts to improve upon the 2013 Development Standards, in order to gain public consensus while remaining true to City’s Comprehensive Plan; and to present current Development Standards recommendations.

Relation to the Strategic Plan

The proposed Infrastructure Design Standards is listed as a High Priority Policy Agenda Item in the City’s 2013-2028 Strategic Plan.

It’s our safety and attractiveness, lively downtown/warehouse district, great place for diverse business, desirable neighborhoods, growing city, culture of educational achievement, and collaboration for community excellence that makes us unique.

—City of Peoria Vision Statement

Improvements to our Development Design Standards align with the Strategic Plan Principles below:

- Safety and Attractiveness
  - Reputation and reality that the city is safe in which to live, or visit
  - People feeling safe and secure in their homes, in their neighborhoods and anywhere in the city
  - Well maintained neighborhood streets, sidewalks, and public areas
  - City designed for connectivity for all
  - Beautiful, well maintained major corridors with attractive streetscapes and businesses
• **Desirable Neighborhoods**
  o Well maintained, connected neighborhood infrastructure: streets, sidewalks and bike lanes
  o Pedestrian friendly and walkable neighborhoods with gathering places
  o Residents feeling safe in their homes and in their neighborhood

• **Growing City**
  o Families want to live in the city
  o Businesses prefer to locate and grow in the city
  o City population is increasing
  o Growing middle class population
  o Our children stay or return to the city to raise their families
  o Positive image of city government with responsible governance and responsive, cost effective service delivery

• **Collaboration for Community Excellence**
  o Shared visions and goals
  o Coordinated plans and actions

Additionally, many of the proposed Development Design Standards elements, such as street trees, are already in harmony with the intent and requirements of the City’s Land Development Code for the Heart of Peoria. The proposed standards will provide more consistency in requirements between the older and newer areas of the City.

**History**

A drive around the City will reveal neighborhood streets from 22’ to 44’ wide, with and without curb and gutter, with and without sidewalks, with and without street lights, and with and without right of way trees. Newer infrastructure generally follows the 1972 requirements including 34’ wide neighborhood streets with curb and gutter and sidewalks, but does not include street trees or street lights. Storm water regulations were significantly revised in 1997 to require erosion control during construction and storm water management (detention areas).

A primary driver for the revision of our infrastructure standards is failing street pavement in relatively new (less than 10 years old) neighborhoods.

Public Works staff began updating the 1972 standards in 2009 by researching other communities that had comprehensive infrastructure standards, including Bloomington, Normal, and Champaign. A draft proposed Infrastructure Design Standards for Peoria was based on the City of Champaign’s requirements. As the City’s Comprehensive Plan process unfolded in 2010, Critical Success Factors and Actions Items from the Comprehensive Plan (adopted in April, 2011) were incorporated into the draft standards. An example of one such Action Item was a requirement for street trees. Street trees have not been previously required for newly developed neighborhoods.
Steering Committee Undertakings – 2011 - 2013

A ten member Steering Committee was formed in 2011 including representatives from City Council, the Planning Commission, Community Development, and Public Works. A draft Infrastructure Design Standards Manual was posted to the City website in September 2012, for public review and comment. A significant outreach effort to seek public comment regarding the proposed Standards was held in 2012 and included notices of public meetings to over nineteen groups and organizations including builders, realtors, neighborhood associations, local and state units of government including Commissions and School District 150, local design professionals, and utility companies; and ten public meetings and focus group discussions.

Comments received at the meetings and presentations ranged from enthusiasm for the benefits to concerns with the associated costs. One local developer and the Peoria Area Association of Realtors submitted written comments regarding their concerns with associated costs, which were estimated to add $5,000 to the cost of developing a new single family lot.

A Policy Session was held with the City Council on March 19, 2013, at which the time the topics which received mixed public comment were discussed. These seven topics included Narrower Streets, Pavement Design, Sidewalk Installation, Storm Water, Street Lights, Testing and Inspection and Street Trees.

At the conclusion of the Policy Session, the City Council directed staff to continue to work on individual topics, incorporating public involvement to reach consensus.

For a full detailed report of the policy session, see the March 5, 2013 Memorandum “Infrastructure Design Standards/Manual of Practice - Peoria City Council Policy Session” and the Policy Session Minutes.

Follow Up – 2013

In May 2013, staff held a Street Paving Seminar for interested parties. Professionals for the concrete and asphalt industries discussed pavement construction methods, durability, and cost. The professionals recommended less thickness of pavement than was proposed in the 2012 draft standards. The seminar seemed to be well-received and was well attended.

In September 2013, through the arrangement of Councilwoman Akeson, a Complete Streets seminar and Council presentation was held. The Complete Streets topic interfaces with the many key design issues, such as pavement width, street trees, and pedestrian connectivity.

Currently, Community Development Staff is leading an effort to adopt a Unified Code which will combine and replace current City code including Appendix A – Subdivisions, Appendix B – zoning Ordinance, and Appendix C – Heart of Peoria Land Development Code. This is relevant because currently, there are two different right-of-way and street width requirements in the City’s Municipal Code. The Subdivision Ordinance is used for new construction, generally in the Growth Cells or north of War memorial Drive; and the Land Development Code is intended to be
applied to redeveloped streets south of War Memorial Drive. Recommendations to revise Infrastructure Design Standards must be coordinated with the City’s efforts to adopt a Unified Code.

Update - 2014 and 2015

Public Works Staff formed a new Steering Committee in late 2014, with representatives from a cross-section of participants with interest in and knowledge of development issues. The Development Standards Stakeholders Group included the following members:

1. Councilwoman Beth Akeson
2. Former Councilman Chuck Weaver
3. Councilwoman Beth Jensen
4. Jeff Kolbus, REMAX Traders Unlimited
5. Allen Cullinan, RA Cullinan
6. Tom Wall, RA Cullinan
7. Steve Worsfold, IDOT
8. Eric Therkildsen, TERRA Engineering
9. Tim Shea, Peoria Builders
10. Cheryl Bluth, Dunlap resident
11. Devin Birch, Austin Engineering Co
12. Jason Haupt, University of Illinois Extension
13. Anthony Corso, i-team Director
14. Ross Black, Community Development Director
15. Josh Naven, Community Development
16. Mike Rogers, Public Works Director
17. Scott Reise, City Engineer
18. Jane Gerdes, Public Works
19. Karen Dvorsky, Public Works Representative

The Stakeholders Group met eleven times over the period of a year, from November 2014 to November 2015. Additional Staff and the City’s Urban Forestry Commission members were invited to attend meetings relevant to their area of interest and expertise. Discussion at the meetings focused on the same seven topics discussed at the March 2013 Policy Session:

- Street Width
- Pavement Design
- Testing and Inspection Requirements
- Sidewalks
- Storm Water Management
- Street Lights
- Street Trees

Based on the discussion and feedback from the Development Standards Stakeholder’s Group meetings, Staff will request City Council concurrence to move forward on revisions to the City’s code to reflect the following recommendations for each topic, as detailed on the following pages.

Note that the discussions and recommendations of the Stakeholders Group were focused on local residential and residential collector streets typical of new subdivisions; and proposed changes to City requirements will not directly impact the design of higher volume arterial streets serving the wider community. In addition, any changes to proposed standards cannot be
enforced on properties with an annexation or other agreement stating otherwise. Anticipated cost to implement the proposed changes is shown in the table below.

**Incremental Initial Cost of Proposed Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to Developer</th>
<th>Estimated Cost to Consumer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Width &amp; Pavement Thickness</td>
<td>$132 (HMA) or $518 (PCC with HMA surface)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights</td>
<td>Optional; if installed, $2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150 or $300 for corner lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Installation**</td>
<td>$0 or $2060 **</td>
<td>-$2060 or $0 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water</td>
<td>Varies – see explanation in Storm water section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing &amp; Improvement Inspection</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>$692 to $5838</td>
<td>-$1910 to $300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures represent additional initial costs of the proposed standards – shown as cost per 75’ frontage, R3 zoning lot

**In theory, there is no additional cost to developing a single family lot since sidewalks are already required in residential subdivisions. However, depending on the timing of when individual lots are sold relative to when sidewalk installation is required, the new standard may result in a shift of cost from the home builder to the developer.

For each of the seven topics, a summary follows describing the existing standards, proposed standards, benefits, cost considerations and peer comparisons. This data is also presented in tabular format in Attachment A.

**TOPIC: Street Width (NARROWER STREETS)**

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group reviewed the research and recommendations from the previous 2012/13 Steering Committee and concurs with the recommendation for narrower streets.
Existing Standards

The current standard for residential street width is 34 feet from face of curb to face of curb.

Proposed Standards

The proposed standard for residential street width is 28 feet from back of curb to back of curb. Narrower or wider sections, including boulevard sections, will be considered and will provide flexibility to the Developer. Approval will be through a waiver process overseen by the Transportation Commission.
Benefits

The benefits of narrower streets are as follows:

- Reduction in impervious cover which reduces the impact on existing and future storm water assets and helps with erosion control.
- Reduction in speed of traffic. Wide neighborhood streets are a strong contributing factor to higher vehicle speeds which increase the frequency and severity of accidents. Air pollution from vehicle emissions is also reduced.
- Savings in cost of paving, clearing and grading, infrastructure, long-term maintenance and storm-water management.
- Narrower streets also contribute to neighborhood livability and provide a pedestrian and bicycle friendly environment which, in turn, supports sustainability.
- “Increased” space within the right-of-way to provide a buffer between pedestrian and cars, room for street amenities such as street trees and/or street lights, and room to manage utilities.

Cost Considerations

Refer to the cost information included in the Pavement Design section.

Peer Comparisons (also see Attachment A)

During the 2013 efforts, a comparison of infrastructure standards for Peoria was made to other neighboring municipalities as well as other cities in the Midwest with similar size or character. This information, as updated in 2015, is presented in Attachment A. Regarding pavement width standards, some of our neighboring Tri-County communities have similar requirements to current City standards. Metamora and Pekin require narrower streets at 29 feet and 24 feet, respectively. ‘Scorecard Cities’ Madison, Dayton, Des Moines and Omaha have narrower street width regulations than the current City requirements.

Comments

The primary driver for recommending narrower streets came from comments received through the Comprehensive Plan development process.

There are no notable concerns from the current Stakeholder’s Group in regard to recommending narrower streets. In fact, it was suggested that streets could be even narrower if parking was prohibited. Staff would not object to narrower streets/no parking if the no parking requirements were recorded on the plat; however, this request would need to be evaluated on a case by case basis.
TOPIC – PAVEMENT DESIGN

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group reviewed the research and recommendations from the previous 2012/13 Steering Committee. A sub-committee of technical experts including contractors, materials experts, and engineers was formed to evaluate additional options to improve long term pavement performance. Seven pavement design options were developed, with an emphasis on better sub-base requirements. These options were evaluated and compared to existing standards in terms of initial cost to construct. The sub-committee chose two cost effective options for further evaluation including long term maintenance costs over the life of the pavement. All options were presented to the Stakeholders Group for consideration and the group concurred with the sub-committee’s recommendation to propose two alternate pavement design options as the new minimum City standard.

Back Ground - Performance of Existing Streets

A survey was done on about 8 miles of streets that were built in Growth Cell One over the past 10+ years. The pavement condition was rated as Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor. In the area surveyed, 8% of the streets were rated excellent, 11.8% good, 74.3% fair, and 5.9% of the streets were rated poor. Subsequently, in 2015, an extensive city-wide street condition rating survey was completed based on a Pavement Condition Index (PCI). Results of the study were consistent with previous studies, in particular, it showed that many streets in Growth Cell One have fallen too short of a “good” rating, too early. The pictures below are reflective of pavement conditions noted within Growth Cell One in the past couple of years. Most of the unsatisfactory pavement and pavement failures have been a result of inadequate sub-grade (the dirt beneath the pavement structure).

Current Standards

Typically, developers opt to utilize the minimums the City will allow in lieu of incurring the cost of a site specific pavement design. Thus, these minimums become the standard in practice. The two most common “designs” utilized in Peoria’s subdivisions are shown below, based on design standards as adopted by the City in 1972:

- 3-inch Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA), 8” of gravel base overtop an un-treated sub-grade.
- 6-inch concrete overtop an un-treated sub-grade (less common)
Proposed Standards

The proposed minimum pavement design standards for new subdivisions include one asphalt section and one concrete section as follows:

- 4.5-inch HMA overtop a 10-inch gravel base with a B6.18 C&G
  (4.5” HMA includes 2.0” HMA surface and 2.5” HMA binder; 10” gravel base includes 3” of CA-6 over 7” of CS-01)
- 5-inch Portland Cement Concrete (PCC) with monolithic curb overtop 4-inch CA-6; plus a 1.5-inch HMA surface

The City will entertain other alternative pavement structure with appropriate engineering studies and analysis, as approved by the Director of Public Works. Permeable pavement designs will be welcomed and encouraged, but will require site specific engineering studies to determine appropriate base and drainage layers.

General consensus was to move forward with the two options the sub-committee presented as minimum standards, and a standard width of 28-feet width, back of curb to back of curb (BOC – BOC). Preference is that options for alternative pavement structure and width is built into the revised code.
Benefits

The market expects quality infrastructure as a baseline requirement. It is rarely praised, but it is often cited as a complaint of residents and users of public roadways. Quality streets help maintain a safe environment for vehicles and pedestrians alike. Additionally, studies have shown that better streets result in higher market prices.

In order to adequately maintain its street pavements in “good” condition, both improved construction standards and ongoing maintenance strategies need to be employed:

Cost Considerations

A cost comparison was done for existing standards with a 34’ f-f pavement and for the proposed standards with a 28’ b-b pavement. Maintenance costs, over a 60-year life were then projected for each pavement type. These costs are based on the premise that you get the highest condition level at the lowest cost through preventive maintenance. By using surface treatments and crack sealing on a regular basis the need for more costly rehabilitation strategies such as mill and overlays or total reconstruction will be delayed, while giving the motoring public much better roads on which to drive.

While the initial cost (to developers) is slightly higher, the overall cost (to citizens) including long term maintenance is lower. These cost comparisons are shown in the following table, presented for one mile of roadway and on a per lot basis, assuming a lot width of 75 feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMA</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3” asphalt w/ 8” gravel base</td>
<td>6” PCC on subgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cost</td>
<td>$172,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Cost (60 yr life cycle)</td>
<td>$550,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$723,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per 1000-LF of Road

Per 75’ Lot

(1) Initial cost based on pavement constructed with a monolithic curb

Comments

A concern was brought up that not all contractors are set up to construct monolithic curbs. This would not be a requirement. Curb could be constructed separately from the pavement.

Representatives from the development community indicate that they cannot compete in the market if there are additional requirements placed on them. While this proposed standard would
not necessarily be a deterrent to area developers in terms of cost, it will need to be evaluated in combination with added costs in conjunction with all new standards being proposed.

Others felt that initial costs cannot control (City) decisions to implement new standards. Long term consequences need to be considered.

Another comment was that the City should include a minimum standard for a concrete pavement section (without the HMA overlay). Initial costs of the concrete section would be higher, but the additional cost would be borne by the Developer. However, since maintenance costs over the life of the concrete pavement would be approximately 30% higher than the composite section, staff was not supportive of adding a third standard pavement section.

**TOPIC: TESTING AND INSPECTION OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS**

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group reviewed the research and recommendations from previous 2012/13 Steering Committee and generally concur with the need for increased testing of city infrastructure.

**Comprehensive Plan**

The Comprehensive Plan repeatedly cites the importance of investing in infrastructure and transportation. Similarly, it emphasizes competitive taxes and fees and supporting sustainability. In response to the Comprehensive Plan, the City of Peoria is proposing modifications to testing and improvement inspection requirements to improve quality control and ensure the longevity of the City’s infrastructure.

**Benefits**

Increased testing and inspection requirements will help reduce premature pavement degradation and/or pavement failure by assuring standards are being met during construction and by assuring that the new pavement is placed upon a suitable sub-base.

**Current Standards**

Currently, the City requires minimal inspection and material testing of new roads, and storm sewers. Peoria also requires an informal 1-year warranty, with no bond.

It is worth noting that both IAWC and GPSD require full time inspection of their respective utilities, and pass this cost along to the Developer. In contrast, City utilities (storm sewers) and streets are self-inspected by Developers, who hire the design engineer to inspect on a part-time basis and certify to the City that the streets are constructed to standards. The City is currently contracting with Dewberry Architects Inc. to provide limited oversight services.

Compare the inspection of infrastructure to the inspection of buildings: The City inspects buildings that it will not own, yet permits developers to self-certify infrastructure that the City will
own. It seems logical that the City should adopt the process that is used for the sanitary sewers and take over the inspection of infrastructure.

**Proposed Standards**

Staff proposes to require additional inspection and testing of public infrastructure construction by the City during the installation of improvements.

Proposed inspection requirements include full time inspection for specific tasks including city-owned utilities, trench backfill, roadway sub-base and all pavement structure.

For testing, staff proposes to add a Quality Control / Quality Assurance (QA/QC) requirement per IDOT specifications. This places the burden for 100% of material testing on the Contractor, plus spot checking (about 20% of the tests) by a City representative. This process puts the responsibility on the appropriate parties (contractor and supplier). Compaction testing will also be required for earthwork.

Lastly, it is recommended that the City require materials come from an IDOT certified plant.

Staff recommends assessing a developer fee of $15/LF for City inspection and testing costs. Staff recommends eliminating the warranty requirements.

**Cost Considerations**

City inspection costs are estimated at $15 per centerline foot (or $560 per 75-foot lot). As a comparison, the cost for sanitary sewer inspections per GPSD requirements ranges from $130 to $1090 per lot. Inspection of streets is expected to be 5% of construction cost, whereas developers have indicated they are currently paying only 2%. The cost for adding a QA/QC should be minimal as most contractors are already doing this as part of all work, so there should not be a cost increase to the Developer for testing the HMA or concrete infrastructure components.

Peoria currently charges forty cents per centerline-foot (or $15 per lot); Morton charges $3 per centerline-foot; while Washington has a per lot fee which includes water and sewer tap fees.

Note that eliminating the warranty requirements will offset some of the additional cost to the developer for increased inspection and testing requirements.

**Peer Comparisons** (also see Attachment A)

Comparative cities analyzed require varying degrees of frequency and acceptable testing authority, but almost all of them require testing. A third-party observer is typically required to be present during critical periods of the installation process, and to make periodic inspections. The frequency of the inspections can vary with the experience and workmanship of the contractor involved. Generally speaking, it appears that Morton has more inspection and testing requirements than Peoria, while East Peoria and Washington has equal or less stringent requirements.
Comments

Developers expressed concerns over the proposed increased testing and inspection requirements as a part of the total package. They have generally agreed with the importance of street quality, but urged the City to look at the total cost impact of all proposed development standards.

Others felt that initial costs cannot control (City) decisions to implement new standards. Long term consequences need to be considered.

Several options were discussed as to how to assess fees for inspection and testing. Developers indicated a preference for a fixed fee / LF as opposed to being invoiced for the actual cost of inspections and testing, since the former is easier to budget. This is consistent with the staff recommendation of $15/LF.

It was suggested that Peoria should look into partnering with IAWC and GPSD for combined inspection services. Based on initial discussions with these agencies, this would be a challenge to implement. There could potentially be some cost savings if inspection for city utilities is performed by the engineer as opposed to by the City staff or City representative, since the same engineer is likely to be on site for the IAWC required full-time water main inspection.

TOPIC: SIDEWALK INSTALLATION

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group reviewed the research and recommendations from previous 2012/13 Steering Committee. Group consensus is that the current standard, which delays sidewalk installation for undeveloped lots and consequently requires homeowners who move in early to wait for completed sidewalks for many years, falls short. However, the Stakeholder’s Group did not concur with the recommendation for installing sidewalk in new subdivisions at that time that initial infrastructure is installed. The main concern with upfront installation is that too much damage can occur to sidewalks during construction. Options such as thicker initial sidewalk, or sidewalk protection during construction were discussed and dismissed. The 2014/2015 Stakeholder’s Group was in favor of reducing the timeframe and/or percent of occupancy requirements for sidewalk installation.

Comprehensive Plan

“Critical success factors” related to sidewalk installation include “Invest in Our Infrastructure & Transportation,” “Reinvest in Neighborhoods,” and “Reduce Crime.” Specific action items in the Plan include, “require sidewalks,” “require connectivity,” “adopt complete streets,” “enforce accessibility standards,” “safe and attractive infrastructure,” “plan for more attractive neighborhoods,” and “safe streets.” These action items are closely correlated to the provision of sidewalks.
Benefits

Sidewalks allow for pedestrian safety, and they promote social interaction and healthier residents, among other positives. In addition, “walkable neighborhoods” have been shown to have higher property values.

Current Standards

In residential subdivisions, each homebuilder installs the sidewalk along the new home’s frontage. The installation of sidewalks in front of undeveloped lots, by the Developer, is not required until two years after the development is 80% occupied. Sidewalk requirements in commercial and redeveloped areas are a “gray area” of the current Code, occasionally requiring Commissions/Council to consider staff recommendation for conditions on a site per site basis. There are no current requirements for sidewalks in industrial zones.

Proposed Standards

The proposed standard is to require the installation of sidewalks in all residential, commercial, and industrial areas. Sidewalk construction within commercial and industrial areas will be required with the initial installation of infrastructure and prior to the occupancy of buildings in redeveloped areas. The proposed standard in new subdivisions is that each homebuilder will be required to install the sidewalk along the new home’s frontage, and installation of sidewalks in front of undeveloped lots will be required within one year after an individual block is 70% occupied.

Cost Considerations

Since sidewalks are already required in residential subdivisions, theoretically, there would be no additional installation cost to developers.

Comments

Installing the sidewalks in advance of home construction could require the developer to “guess” where the driveway will be located along each lot, because sidewalks through driveways must be 6” thick, rather than 4” thick at all other locations.

TOPIC: STORMWATER

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group reviewed the research and recommendations from previous 2012/13 Steering Committee and did not concur with the proposal to adopt the Unified Stormwater Ordinance. There was however general consensus that additional requirements are needed in regard to management flood events.
Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan identifies three “critical success factors” which relate to stormwater management: “Invest in Our Infrastructure & Transportation”—with the “Action Item” Green Infrastructure; “Grow Employers & Jobs”—with the “Action Item” Increase Green Development; and “Support Sustainability”—with the “Action Items” Protect Streams and Floodways, Regional Stormwater Solutions, Use Permeable Pavement, and Preserve & Protect Resources.

Benefits

The Illinois River is perhaps our greatest natural resource. The river is currently polluted with bacteria, and sedimentation threatens wildlife, recreation, and commerce. The proposed stormwater management standards include both water quantity and water quality requirements, in order to enhance the protection of our environment. Also, from a flooding standpoint, homes would be protected to the same 100-year level of protection as currently adopted and administered under the Flood Insurance Program.

Current Standards

The current standard for storm water management was effective in 1997, requiring detention of the 2 year and 25 year, 24-hour rainfalls. Erosion control during construction is required. This City also requires storm water detention for redeveloped site, even if the amount of impervious (hard) surface is reduced.

Proposed Standards

In addition to our current ordinance requirements, Staff proposes to add requirements for the following:

- Safe conveyance (flood routing) for 100-year storm event
- Storage for the first 1-inch of rainfall from all hard surfaces
- Encourage infiltration techniques to improve water quality and reduce stormwater runoff
- Encourage the use of native vegetation

In recent years, the need for flood conveyance has been evident. With an apparent increase in high-intensity rainfall and long wet seasons, the City has received numerous calls reporting flooded streets, flooded yards, and flooded basements in newly constructed subdivisions.

New storage requirements will have a dual benefit of addressing both water quantity and water quality. The first inch of rainfall will be required to be stored and then soaked into the ground. This is consistent with the City’s CSO solution of green infrastructure. Design elements like permeable pavers for driveways and patios, rain gardens, rain barrels and bioswales are measures that would be allowed and encouraged. The City will also encourage multi-functional storm water management systems, for example designs can add aesthetic value while providing the required storm water management.
Erosion control during construction and management of the 2-year and 25-year storm events will still be required, per current requirements.

**Cost Considerations**

It is difficult to assess a general cost increment per acre of development since stormwater management is dependent on the site characteristics and topography of the land. Meeting stormwater management requirements on very flat sites generally costs more than meeting the same requirements on steeper sites with a defined ‘low spot’. There are also a wide variety of design solutions available to meet the proposed storm water standards, which further exaggerates the challenge of assessing an incremental cost.

Current permit review fees are $50/acre with a $250 minimum and $2000 maximum. No additional permit fees are proposed at this time.

No additional inspection fees are proposed at this time (for storm water detention systems).

**Comments**

The primary concerns staff received were cost increase and disparity with other neighboring communities’ requirements.

Others felt that initial costs cannot control (City) decisions to implement new standards. Long term consequences need to be considered.

Some stakeholders recommend that the City should consider taking over long term maintenance of detention systems, in particular the maintenance of vegetation including native plants, which should be cared for by qualified professionals.

**TOPIC: STREET LIGHTS**

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group reviewed the research and recommendations from previous 2012/13 Steering Committee and **did not** concur with the proposed requirement for street lights in all new subdivisions. Discussion included concerns with added cost burden to Peoria Developers, and possible alternatives including yard lights instead of street lights. It was also discussed that street lighting may not be appropriate for all subdivisions, for example lower density, rural or estate type areas. Generally, it was determined that when desired, a combination of street and pedestrian scale lighting will have the most benefit.

**Comprehensive Plan**

The Comprehensive Plan identifies three “critical success factors” which relate to the provision of street lights. “Invest in Our Infrastructure & Transportation”, “Reinvest in Neighborhoods”, and “Reduce Crime” are all objectives outlined in the Plan. Specific action items in the Plan include “street and alley lighting”, “safe and attractive infrastructure”, and “safe streets.”
Benefits

Studies have shown a connection between street lighting and reduction in crime. It is difficult to quantify the exact effect of additional lighting; however, it is clear that additional lighting increases neighbors’ perception of safety. Studies show that neighbors who feel safer are more likely to spend time outside, and that added presence monitoring the streets adds additional safety. According to the Pacific Institute, improved lighting also allows safer operation of vehicles at night, reduces accidents, and assists in traffic flow.

Current Standards

Currently, the City of Peoria does not require street lights for new residential subdivisions. Exterior yard lighting can be required by homeowners’ associations; however, it is not mandated by the City. Maintenance of the yard lights is the responsibility of the individual homeowners.

Proposed Standards

The proposed standard is approximately one, pedestrian scale street light every three (3) lots on both sides of a residential street. Street lights will not be required for all new residential subdivisions, but when installed, installation meeting new standards will be by the Developer and maintenance will be by the City. Subdivisions constructed after the new standard is in place will not be eligible for any type of cost-share assistance for retrofitting street and/or pedestrian scale lights.

The proposed street lights for residential streets would be similar to the street lights installed in the Lynnhurst Subdivision in Peoria, which recently voted as a neighborhood to install street lights as part of the City’s Special Assessment process. Another recent example of neighborhood lighting is Forrest Hill, from Sheridan Road to Knoxville Avenue.

Cost Considerations

The installation of one pole every three lots would come at an estimated initial cost of $2,700/lot. Although the City does not track costs for streetlight maintenance separately, the post-installation maintenance/bulb changing/energy costs are expected to be minimal, in that the City currently maintains thousands of streetlights.

Peer Comparisons

See attachment A

Comments

We have received concerns from developers about the initial cost of streetlight installation and the future maintenance costs to the City. The concerns were related to increased cost to developers and the ability of the City of Peoria to compete with surrounding communities for
homeowners. Since streetlights installation has a relatively high cost to developers, staff recommends making street lights optional.

Home buyers need to be aware that if the Developer opts out of installing street lights initially, then the City will not participate in cost to install street lights at a later date. It was suggested to partner with the Peoria Area Association of Realtors and the Home Builders Association of Greater Peoria to disseminate this information.

Concerns were expressed by utility representatives that street lights within the right of way are not desirable because it adds additional burden for long-term maintenance of underground utilities.

**TOPIC: STREET TREES**

The 2014/15 Stakeholder’s Group, the City’s Urban Forestry Commission and a represented from IAWC reviewed the research and recommendations from previous 2012/13 Steering Committee. Developers raised concerns regarding the cost of trees and the long term maintenance costs to the City. Another concern is with the timing of tree planting with consideration of home construction and initial watering requirements. Yard trees versus street (parkway) trees was discussed, but general consensus was that with yard trees, the benefits of street trees are lost considering in that there would be no street canopy, no ‘wall’ to slow traffic and no separation for pedestrians and vehicles. In addition, the City would lose control over the maintenance and long term sustainability of the trees. The proposed recommendation is to require street trees, but implementation will be by the City as opposed to by the Developer or Home Owner.

**Comprehensive Plan**

The Comprehensive Plan adopted goals to provide attractive public spaces, design for pedestrians, and promote safety. Street trees were one of the features that the public strongly encouraged, and requiring street trees was an action item in the plan.

**Benefits**

The benefits of trees are numerous and include:

- Barrier between pedestrians and vehicles
- Traffic Calming
- Combat greenhouse effect
- Clean the air
- Provide oxygen
- Conserve energy
- Save water
- Reduce runoff (absorption and evaporation)
- Improve water quality
- Provide visual screening
- Increase property value
Current Standards

The City of Peoria does not require street trees in new developments, and the narrow 4’ parkways prevent trees from being planted later.

Proposed Standards

The proposed standard is a 10’ wide parkway (area between the curb and sidewalk) with trees at a maximum 60’ spacing with at least one tree per lot and at least two trees per corner lot. The Developer or the Homeowner will be charged a fee, and the City will responsible for planting trees as homes are built and as sidewalks are installed on vacant lots (see proposed Sidewalk Standards). City staff will coordinate tree placement with other infrastructure elements such as driveways, utilities, light poles (if applicable), etc.

Cost Considerations

The cost for the City to install a new tree is estimated at $150 each. Staff was assisted by Davey Resource Group, a tree industry leader, to help estimate long term maintenance costs. They prepared a scenario which included 50 large, 35 medium, and 25 small trees. Based on a 40 year scenario they estimated the annual maintenance cost for trees to be $21 per tree per year. This included costs for replanting, pruning, removals, pest and disease control, infrastructure repair, cleanup, irrigation, liability, legal and administrative costs.

Peer Comparisons

See Attachment A.

Comments

Concerns were expressed by utility representatives that trees within the right of way are not desirable because it adds additional burden for long-term maintenance of underground utilities.

Advantages to the City managing the street tree installation include ability to layout and select specimens/species on a larger scale (by block versus by lot), flexibility to plant trees at the appropriate time of year, and control to ensure quality installation by trained staff and/or a qualified professional.

An internal standard needs to be developed to address planting installation requirements and species/specimen options.

The City could consider offering the home building a more expensive tree or additional specimen/species options for an “upcharge.”
### ATTACHMENT A

**Peer Community Comparison**

Based on readily available information – refer to narratives for design standard details. Created in 2013; updated in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Standard</th>
<th>Peoria (existing)</th>
<th>Peoria (proposed)</th>
<th>Morton</th>
<th>Washington</th>
<th>Metamora</th>
<th>Pekin</th>
<th>Des Moines</th>
<th>Madison</th>
<th>Omaha</th>
<th>Scottsdale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Width</strong></td>
<td>34’ FOC - FOC</td>
<td>28’ BOC - BOC</td>
<td>34’</td>
<td>34’</td>
<td>29’</td>
<td>24’</td>
<td>32’</td>
<td>32’</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Thickness (surface, base)</strong></td>
<td>6”,0” PCC* 3”,8” HMA*</td>
<td>5”,4” + 1.5” HMA 4.5”,10”</td>
<td>7”,0” 3”,9”</td>
<td>6”,4” 3”,8”</td>
<td>6”,0” 2.5”,10”</td>
<td>6”,0” 3”,8”</td>
<td>3.5”,10”</td>
<td>7”,0”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Lights</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sometime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Trees</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, installed by City Staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater</strong></td>
<td>See narrative</td>
<td>See narrative</td>
<td>Similar to Peoria existing</td>
<td>Similar to Peoria existing</td>
<td>Less stringent than Peoria</td>
<td>Similar to Peoria proposed</td>
<td>Similar to Peoria proposed</td>
<td>Similar to Peoria proposed</td>
<td>Similar to Peoria proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Installation</strong></td>
<td>2 years after 80% occupancy</td>
<td>1 year after 70% occupancy per block</td>
<td>75% occupancy or 3 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>First bldg. permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Testing</strong></td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement Inspection</strong></td>
<td>Certify by Developer’s Engineer; limited City oversight</td>
<td>See narrative</td>
<td>Dev.’s Engr plus more City oversight</td>
<td>Dev.’s Engr with limited City oversight</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warranty / Guarantee</strong></td>
<td>Informal 1-year; no bond</td>
<td>No, with improved testing</td>
<td>2-year w/ 20% bond</td>
<td>Informal, uses surety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Fees</strong></td>
<td>$0.40 per centerline foot</td>
<td>$15 per centerline foot</td>
<td>$3.00 per centerline foot</td>
<td>Per lot fee, includes utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PCC = thickness of concrete pavement, thickness of gravel base;  
* HMA = thickness of hot-mix asphalt pavement, thickness of gravel base
Transportation Commission  
City of Peoria  
Peoria, IL  

February 19, 2016  

To Whom It May Concern:  

It has come to the attention of the Moss Bradley Residential Association (MBRA) that there exists concerns about traffic related issues from residents adjacent to Whittier school. The issues have been identified as congestion and cut-through traffic during school hours and events at Whittier.  

These issues were discussed with and addressed by city staff present at the February 3, 2016 MBRA membership meeting. During this discussion, a number of solutions were presented including converting Fredonia Avenue to a one-way street from Cooper to Western Avenue. City staff suggested this could have the benefit of preventing some of the cut-through traffic.  

Also discussed at the meeting, and in subsequent correspondences, there is a concern about unintended consequences of converting Fredonia into a one-way street. MBRA is aware of this.  

The Moss Bradley Residential Association supports the need for converting Fredonia into a one-way street from Cooper to Western Ave. With this support comes the caveat of the city and Transportation Commission to address any and all traffic issues that arise from this change including increased traffic along adjacent streets, specifically Barker Ave.  

I thank you in advance for your consideration of this request and am available to discuss it with anyone from the city or the Transportation Commission. To do so, please contact me at 309.369.2037.  

Regards,  

Brian Buralli, President  
Moss Bradley Residential Association