CITY OF PEORIA – TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
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TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2016

3:00 P.M.

COMMISSION MEETING – TO BE HELD AT CITY OF PEORIA DRIES LANE FACILITY CONFERENCE ROOM #113, 3505 N. DRIES LANE, PEORIA, ILLINOIS 61604. (309) 494-8800.
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AGENDAS AND MINUTES
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3505 N. DRIES LANE, PEORIA IL 61604
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INTERNET ADDRESS: www.peoriagov.org

To access electronic Agenda & Minutes (only):
1. www.peoriagov.org
2. Click "Boards/Commissions" tab in the Green Ribbon @ the top of Page
3. Choose Transportation Commission
4. Scroll to the bottom of the screen. Under "Agenda & Minutes" will be a list of the .pdf postings.
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*CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA SHOULD CONTACT A COMMISSION MEMBER PRIOR TO THE MEETING.
ALL OTHER PUBLIC INPUT WILL BE HEARD UNDER PUBLIC COMMENT NEAR THE END OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING.

NOTE: THE ORDER IN WHICH AGENDA ITEMS ARE CONSIDERED MAY BE MOVED FORWARD OR DELAYED BY AT LEAST 2/3 VOTE OF THE COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT.

THE CITY OF PEORIA – TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETS IN REGULAR BUSINESS SESSIONS THE THIRD TUESDAY OF THE MONTH AT 3:00 PM AT 3505 N DRIES LANE CONFERENCE ROOM #113, PEORIA, ILLINOIS. (309) 494-8800.
NOTICES OF ANY SPECIAL MEETING ARE POSTED AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR.

CITY OF PEORIA – TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
DRIES LANE, CONFERENCE ROOM
3:00 PM

ROLL CALL

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.
- Peoria County Highway Sales Tax Referendum on November Ballot
- Save the Date: Thurs. October 20, 2016, 6:00 p.m., Public Meeting re: Western Avenue from Adams Street to Lincoln Avenue; at the Lincoln Branch Public Library
- Save the Date: Sat. October 22 from 4 til 8 p.m. CityFest – Warehouse; Adams Street CSO Pilot Project area

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM No. 1: CONSIDERATION of the Following Request(s) AMENDING the TRAFFIC CODE of the City of Peoria, As Needed:

A. EVALUATION and DISCUSSION of Staff Requests re: Two-Way Stop Intersections for the Proposed INSTALLATION of Four-Way Stop Controls:
   1. Illinois Avenue at Indiana Avenue [District 3]
   2. Rock Island Avenue at Park Avenue [District 1]

ITEM No. 2: OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST to the Transportation Commissioners:

A. UPDATE and DISCUSSION of Staff Recommendations to Peoria City Council for Changes to the City Code Relating to INFRASTRUCTURE DESIGN STANDARDS:
   a. Erosion, Sediment & Stormwater Control (Jane Gerdes) and Unified Development Code (Leah Allison)
B. DISCUSSION and REVIEW of the 2017-2021 COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PLAN (CIP) PROJECT BUDGET SHEETS – Public Works Director Scott Reese

ITEM No. 3: DISCUSSION of Transportation Commission WORK ITEMS:

A. REVIEW and DISCUSSION of UPDATED DRAFT MATRIX for Complete Streets PROJECT CHECKLIST;
B. REVIEW and DISCUSSION of UPDATED DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES for Complete Streets.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENT

NEXT MEETING
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2016

ADJOURNMENT
Peoria County - The Peoria County Board has placed a sales ballot County-owned of Peoria Motor Fuel budget. Should additional owned by the Peoria County which must go

tax referendum on the November 8, 2016 specifically for the improvement of roads. The maintenance and project needs County roads exceed its current share of Tax and County Highway Department the referendum pass, this tax would provide funding to repair certain roads currently County.

The referendum asks voters to authorize to increase its share of sales tax by 1/4%, specifically to improve County-owned roads. This sales tax increase would end after 15 years. The tax is on retail goods, excluding food, pharmaceuticals, and titled goods.

Find the full details of the plan, including the planned road improvement projects and short video, at www.fixthecountyroads.com.

Peoria County has two meetings scheduled to discuss the sales tax referendum and planned road projects. The public is encouraged to attend to learn more and ask questions of staff. Both meetings are from 6:00-8:00 pm.

Thursday, September 29 Redeemer Lutheran Church, 6801 N Allen Rd, Peoria
Tuesday, October 18 Mossville Jr. High School, 12207 North Old Galena Road, Chillicothe

Peoria County officials are happy to speak to groups and organizations regarding the referendum details. If your organization would like to have a speaker at your next engagement, please contact Gretchen Pearsall, Director of Strategic Communications, at (309) 672-6918.

###

Peoria County Courthouse, 324 Main Street, Room 502, Peoria, Illinois 61602
A Regular Meeting of the City of Peoria’s Transportation Commission convened at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 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 George Ghareeb, Commissioner Bernie Goitein, Chairman Joe Hudson, Commissioner Brandon Lott, Commissioner Lon Lyons, Commissioner Patrick McNamara, Commissioner Joe Messmore, and Commissioner David Smesrud - 8.

**Commissioners Absent:** Commissioner Dan Adler, Commissioner Nathaniel Herz, and Commissioner Michael Vespa - 3.

Others in attendance Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Scott Reese (arrived at 3:15 p.m.), City Traffic Engineer Nick Stoffer, and Public Works Administrative Specialist Ruth Blancaflor.

ANNOUNCEMENTS, ETC.
- Welcome to New Commissioner, Dr. Bernie Goitein (replaces Mrs. Crowell)

MINUTES

Commissioner Ghareeb moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Transportation Commission held on June 21, 2016, as printed; seconded by Commissioner Lott.

Approved by unanimous viva voce vote.

**ITEM No. 1:** CONSIDERATION of the Following Request(s) AMENDING the TRAFFIC CODE of the City of Peoria, As Needed:

A. CONSIDERATION of a REQUEST for a TRAFFIC REGULATION AMENDING SCHEDULE “S” OF THE TRAFFIC CODE for the REDUCTION of SPEED LIMIT on FORREST HILL AVENUE Between Knoxville Avenue and Prospect Road. (30 to 25 MPH). [District 3]

Mr. Stoffer explained this request came forward through a request to Mayor Ardis from the area, because the speed limit on Forrest Hill in the Knoxville to Sheridan section was lowered after the roadway improvements. In response to the request, he said staff performed a speed study on Forrest Hill both at California and Atlantic, in the morning and afternoon, and they averaged to 35 mph for the 85th percentile. He said those findings didn’t warrant lowering the speed limit to 25, but that he wanted to bring the request to the commission for discussion. He said he recommended going ahead with a planned road diet and performing another speed study later in the year, after the road diet had been in place for a time.

In discussion with Commissioner Lyons, Mr. Stoffer explained how the 85th percentile was used to determine speed limits by gauging the speeds traveled by 85% of the traffic under a roadway’s existing conditions. He noted the newer guidelines were for more pedestrian and bike friendly roadways, but this section was wider, which seemed to encourage speeding. He said it was unlikely that the traffic speed would decrease without the road diet.
Commissioner McNamara discussed the importance of developing other criteria besides the 85th percentile rating to answer these requests. He suggested that the Commission review the practices used by other communities to establish speed limits, since this question continued to surface. He spoke about studying the characteristics of a roadway and what things to use to visually prepare the motorist for a speed that is appropriate. He said he agreed with the road diet concept and giving people a chance to respond to it, and then addressing the request again.

Commissioner Goitein said he also agreed with the recommendation. He said the Commission needed to make sure these roads continued to fulfill a service to the citizens, which was to handle the traffic.

In discussion with Mr. Stoffer, Commissioner Lott said there needed to be a connection through this area, but there were not a lot of options if it was a secondary arterial. He said it didn’t seem to fit a 25 mph residential speed limit. He questioned if there were other examples of neighborhood arterials being provided with neighborhood speed limits, and Mr. Stoffer answered the other areas, like the Main Street business corridor, had different characteristics.

Chairman Hudson discussed the relationship between reduction of speed limits and the need for the police enforcement. Mr. Stoffer agreed there was no incentive to follow the speed limit if the police weren’t there to enforce it. He said he frequently worked with the Police to target certain areas, but that was only a temporary fix to the problem.

In response to Commissioner McNamara’s question regarding the volume of traffic in this section of Forrest Hill, Mr. Stoffer stated it was in the range of 6,000 to 8,000 daily and since this corridor was developed, he did not expect that number to increase.

Commissioner McNamara moved to defer the recommendation of a Traffic Regulation Amending Schedule “S” of the Traffic Code for the Reduction of Speed Limit on Forrest Hill Avenue between Knoxville Avenue and Prospect Road from 30 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour until such time as a Road Diet was in place and a subsequent Traffic Study had been done; seconded by Commissioner Messmore.

Approved by unanimous viva voce vote.

Mr. Stoffer stated he believed the request could be brought back to the Commission before the end of the year.

City Engineer Scott Reeise arrived at 3:15 p.m.

ITEM No. 2: DISCUSSION of Transportation Commission WORK ITEMS:
1. REVIEW and DISCUSSION of DRAFT MATRIX for Complete Streets PROJECT CHECKLIST:

Mr. Stoffer explained this item had been discussed at the June meeting. He said he drafted this Complete Streets checklist to be followed on city and privately-developed construction projects. Even though all street projects may not be equal, he said, they should be tested in this system. He explained the engineer would check the items listed at the top of the form against his proposed project and that would correspond to the items at the bottom of the checklist which should be reviewed for Complete Streets.

Commissioner McNamara said it was a good tool to have in place for staff to use to evaluate their projects so that no step was missed. In further discussion with Mr. Stoffer and Mr. Reeise, he determined the Form Based Code was a part of the Land Development Code adopted by the Council.

In discussion, the Commissioners suggested the following additions and notations:
- Add to the documents list at the bottom the Downtown Streetscape Master Plan and the Manual of Practice (MOP);
- Add to the bottom list: collaborate and coordinate with utilities, for major repairs;
• For projects near schools, incorporate the use of SINR, Safe Routes to Schools and Neighborhood Schools Impact Zones funding into those projects;
• Traffic Counts by Roadway Type;
• For large corridor projects, plan to capture “before” and “after” data, including bicycle use counts;
• Accident data counts — capture “before” and “after” to measure success of safety improvements;
• Add items in the top list to correspond with H and M in the bottom list; those items are missing.

Mr. Stoffer stated this checklist, ideally, would be utilized by the project engineers when a project was in its infancy. He said he would discuss it with the Project Engineers on staff.

Mr. Reese stated the Western Avenue and Glen Avenue projects were two projects where the use of the checklist would be pertinent.

2. REVIEW and DISCUSSION of DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES for Complete Streets.

Mr. Stoffer began the discussion on the draft Performance Measures chart. Since the Complete Streets Policy required the tracking and annual reporting of performance measures, he said there was a need to decide on the units to be tracked and the overall goals to be met. He said some things would be easier to track than others.

Commissioner Lott suggested tracking the information on the average annual miles or linear feet of road projects completed in the city, but he questioned what would be an appropriate type of project to expect the addition of sidewalk and bike lanes in order to set the appropriate targets for them.

Mr. Reese stated it may be better to track a percentage goal of road projects, due to the variety in roadway lane class and project types. In general, he said, not much more than one or two miles of road reconstruction with new sidewalks and new pavement was done annually, but that other projects like sealcoating often lead to an opportunity to stripe in bike lanes.

Commissioner McNamara suggested utilizing data from some past years may help to formulate a matrix with realistic assessments and appropriate goals. He said he understood the budgets in the recent past were smaller than current, but the item was a work in progress. Further, he said it was his opinion they should set 10-year goals.

Mr. Stoffer said he should be able to formulate a conceptual plan for the next commission meeting.

In discussion, it was noted that the annual Complete Streets compliance report would be prepared on a calendar year basis.

Commissioner Goittein said it would be helpful to know the current numbers before moving on toward a goal. He requested a report showing the current number of bike lane miles, including the distinction between arterial and non-arterial versus residential streets. For outcomes, he said it would be important to know usage and whether there had been a change in bike usage.

Mr. Stoffer pointed out there were different grades of bike lanes. He said he would pull together some previous data for sidewalk and bike miles and develop a report.

Regarding the benchmark for crash report data, Mr. Stoffer recommended using a sampling from annual projects and not trying to tackle the whole system, because of the time lag in getting the “after” data.

In discussion regarding the right-of-way tree plantings, Mr. Stoffer stated this data would come from the Street and Engineering Division projects, at the end of each year. It was noted that inter-departmental cooperation was key to tracking that data coming from private developments, because the plans containing that information and the inspections came through Community Development.
Regarding the last item, annual surveys of citizen responses to Complete Streets, there were suggestions regarding the use of Survey Monkey, soliciting ideas from the Communications Specialist, the use of Bradley University business or engineering student groups to formulate the surveys, or tracking participation in public meetings to identify public concern or public acceptance of projects.

ITEM No. 3: OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST to the Transportation Commissioners:
   a. DISCUSSION and REVIEW of the 2017-2021 COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PLAN (CIP) BUDGET PROCESS – Assistant Public Works Director Scott Reese;

Mr. Reese gave an overview of the budget process. He explained they adopted a one-year Community Investment Plan budget, but a five-year plan. This year, he explained, staff would submit the 2017-2021 CIP plan and budget requests. After those are compiled, he said, they are reviewed with the City Manager and adjusted as necessary to get to a balanced budget. At that point, he said they are forwarded to the City Council. If Council added a new request, he said, something else had to come out. He said they tried to get the proposed budget to the City Council by the first meeting in September.

Commissioner McNamara said he would like for the commission to suggest specific projects or adjustments. He pointed out that the commission had the Bicycle Master Plan to follow, but no funding was budgeted for that. He questioned how the commission could be advocates for that Plan.

Mr. Reese also discussed the impact of the larger construction projects, which many times added bike routes in addition to the normal sidewalk and paving items they included. He said the Commission could adopt a resolution advocating for the bike plan or any other item they felt missed the mark on funding requests. He said they should have an opportunity to do that between the time staff sent the proposed balanced budget to City Council and when they adopted it, in November.

In further discussion, Mr. Reese explained the process for submitting budget exceptions for items that differed from the previous year. He discussed how staff had to make their case for a budget exception, especially explaining why the project’s number changed and how it still benefited the community.

Mr. Reese said Council’s goal was typically to fund all of the Level 1 priority requests. He said staff may be able to bring the proposed, individual CIP budget sheets for transportation items to the commission’s September 20th meeting for review and discussion. At that point, he said, if they felt something needed to change, they could make that recommendation to the City Manager. If he couldn’t meet that deadline, he said the commission may have to schedule a special meeting in October in order to be able to give their input on anything they felt was lacking for the goals they were expected to meet.

Commissioners Messmore left the meeting at 4:17 p.m.

The Commissioners thanked Mr. Reese for the information he provided and said they looked forward to a review of the budget materials.

b. Update on August 11th Public Meeting Regarding MACARTHUR BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. Stoffer reported on the public meeting held on August 11th regarding the plans for the MacArthur Highway Bridge Reconstruction. He said the attendance and discussions were good. He explained the bridge had significant deterioration and concrete contamination to the point that it had a structural rating of 3 out of 100. He said it wasn’t in danger of falling, the rating meant it was not repairable. He said the purpose of the meeting was to get public input on the type of bridge and other things people wanted to see in its reconstruction. He said it’s planned as a 3-lane section bridge with a bike lane on one side and a sidewalk. Currently, he said there was no pedestrian access on the bridge and it was non-ADA compliant.

Mr. Reese agreed there was good feedback received, especially as related to the separated bike lane on the travel lanes. He said the federal dollars funding 80 percent of its reconstruction would be lost if the
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bridge was not rebuilt. He explained it was eligible for 2018 Major Bridge funds which were available in IDOT's 2018 fiscal year which ran from July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018. He encouraged the commissioners to review and complete the public survey regarding the bridge on the city's web site and he stated it would remain open 30 days from the date of the meeting.

Commissioner Lott complimented the survey and he asked to know the budget and whether or not there was a maximum cost to the funding.

Mr. Reese stated the estimate was for a $6 million project and 80%, or $4.8 million, would be federal dollars. He said the bridge was built in 1942 and it had some historical significance which would be lost once it was torn down. He said a goal was to focus on the architectural elements and the value they brought to our area, and to replicate those that would be lost in its reconstruction. There had been some interest shown by the public art community.

Mr. Stoffer pointed out the MacArthur Bridge was the last of the low-rated bridges in the City of Peoria to be reconstructed. The other two were on Sheridan and Nebraska, he noted.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Regarding the performance measures discussed earlier, Commissioner Goitein said in light of the lanes that had been restriped city-wide, it would also be good to know to what extent lanes had been reduced and increased.

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one came forward to address the Commissioners.

Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled Transportation Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 20, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.

Adjournment

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

Approved by viva voce vote.

The Transportation Commission meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Chairman Joe Hudson

Nick Stoffer, Traffic Engineer

rmb
ITEM NO. 2.B.
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Bridge — MacArthur Highway Replacement

Total Project Cost: $7,280,219
Lead Department: Public Works
Project Type: Public benefit - PB

Project Purpose:
This project will replace the structurally deficient MacArthur Highway Bridge.

Project Narrative:
The MacArthur Highway Bridge, which spans R.B. Garrett Avenue, is an aging structure along an arterial roadway. This structure was constructed in 1942 and received a maintenance renovation in 2001. The bridge is currently load rated 14 tons. The bridge has a sufficiency rating of 3.0 which makes it eligible for replacement through the State's Major Bridge Program. A request was made through IDOT for FY2018 funding. The City received notice from IDOT on April 17, 2013 that $4,840,000 in Illinois Major Bridge Program funds were approved for the replacement of the bridge, which represents 80% of the eligible construction and construction engineering cost estimated. In June of 2013, the deteriorated micro silica surface of the bridge was removed and replaced with an asphalt overlay to give a smooth driving surface and to attempt to extend the life of the bridge to FY2018 when it will be replaced.

Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$ 480,219</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,480,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 4,800,000</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 5,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$ 480,219</td>
<td>$ 5,200,000</td>
<td>$ 1,200,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,280,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southtown TIF</td>
<td>$ 480,219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 480,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements Other Agencies</td>
<td>$ 4,800,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 480,219</td>
<td>$ 5,200,000</td>
<td>$ 1,200,000</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 7,280,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+/- Total Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Glen Avenue (War Memorial Dr to University St)

Priority Matrix Level

Level 2

Project Purpose:
This project will allow for the design and reconstruction of Glen Avenue from War Memorial Drive to University Street.

Project Narrative:
Glen Avenue from War Memorial Drive to University Street has deteriorated due to the high volume of traffic with trucks going between the two commercial sites. The Glen Avenue project will improve the existing roadway to provide multi-modal transportation alternatives and applicable green infrastructure on a section between two high density commercial zones. Approximately 5,100 linear feet of roadway will be removed and reconstructed.

Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$2,350,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>$6,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
<td>$6,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+/- Total Impact on Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Name: Northmoor Rd Improvement (Allen to University)**

**Total Project Cost:** $12,025,000  
**Lead Department:** Public Works  
**Project Type:** Road (state mkt) - M  
**Council District:** Combination (explained in narrative)

**Project Purpose:**  
Design engineering, right-of-way acquisition, construction engineering, and construction of Northmoor Road Improvements from Allen Road to west of University Street.

**Project Narrative:**  
This is the fourth construction phase of a City/County effort to improve Northmoor Road. This project will reconstruct Northmoor Road to a nominal three lane cross section between Allen Road and just west of Richwoods High School, transitioning to a nominal five lane cross section from just west of Richwoods High School to just west of University Street. This current project was formerly split into two projects. Design is planned in 2015 and 2016, with easement and ROW acquisition planned for 2016. Federal grant funds through the Peoria Pekin Urbanized Area Transportation Study are available to fund 70% of construction in 2017 and 2018. This project is located in Council Districts 4 & 5.

### Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>4,005,000</td>
<td>$5,220,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>$4,255,000</td>
<td>$5,720,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$12,025,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grant</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3,255,000</td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>$4,255,000</td>
<td>$5,720,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,025,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact on Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+/- Total impact on</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Radnor Rd./Alta Lane Intersection Improvement

Total Project Cost: $3,645,000
Lead Department: Public Works
Project Type: Road (state mfi) - M

Priority Matrix Level

CIP Status: Existing
Criteria: Maintenance-Replacement
Priority: High

Project Purpose:
To improve the safety and operation of the intersection of Radnor Road and Alta Lane by installing a Roundabout intersection.

Project Narrative:
The intersection of Alta Lane and Radnor Road lies in the Growth Cell 1A area of City Council District 5. This rural intersection of two, two-lane roads has experienced significant growth in traffic in the past 5 years. The improvement of this intersection was funded in the amount of $700,000 in the State of Illinois Capital Bill. Adjacent developers have previously committed $50,000 towards the intersection improvement. In late 2013 we received a federal grant in the amount of $1,400,000. An additional $135,000 will be contributed by Peoria County per the Growth Cell 1A agreement.

Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,465,000</td>
<td>$1,065,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,230,000</td>
<td>$1,415,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,645,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$915,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,230,000</td>
<td>$1,415,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,645,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+/- Total Impact on Operating Budget</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Sheridan Road Reconstruction (McClure to Richmond)

Total Project Cost: $9,410,000
Lead Department: Public Works
Project Type: Road (state mft) - M

Project Purpose:
This project will address arterial streets within the City that need significant repair that is beyond an overlay.

Project Narrative:
Infrastructure such as pavement reconstruction, new curbs and gutters, storm sewer systems, and sidewalks are needed on the arterial streets. The plan for this project would be to start addressing the streets one at a time. In 2015, continued plan preparation for Sheridan between McClure and I-74 Bridge approached and began construction. In 2016, continue construction of the improvement on Sheridan from McClure and I-74 Bridge approach; other projects will include Nebraska from Knoxville to Prospect, McClure from University to Prospect, and Wisconsin from Nebraska to Forrest Hill. New regulations will require work on these projects to include upgrades to ramps and sidewalks to meet ADA requirements.

Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,825,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$2,825,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$7,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$2,585,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$3,325,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$9,410,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Motor Fuel Tax</td>
<td>$2,585,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$5,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,585,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$3,325,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$9,410,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+/- Total Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Sidewalk In Need of Repair Program - SINR

Total Project Cost: $2,110,000
Lead Department: Public Works
Project Type: Public benefit - PB

Project Purpose:
To maintain a safe walking surface for the citizens of Peoria.

Project Narrative:
This annual program, overseen by Public Works is intended to repair hazardous sidewalks: 1) within a target area as identified by the Public Works Department; 2) at hazardous locations received via complaints; and 3) at hazardous locations involved in litigation. These are defective sidewalks, which property owners have not addressed and which are or potentially could be liability and safety hazards. According to SINR Program policy, the City contracts for the work, pays the contractor in full, and is reimbursed by the property owner for the private share (20% or 10% if income eligible; sometimes paid over a period of time with a promissory note).

Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$83,498</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$283,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$605,502</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,826,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$2,110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Source Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements Other Agencies</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact on Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+/- Total Impact on Operating Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Sidewalk Participation

Total Project Cost: $3,880,000
Lead Department: Public Works
Project Type: Public benefit - PB

Project Purpose:
Upgrade sidewalks within the City of Peoria to be safe and attractive.

Project Narrative:
This project, overseen by Public Works, is a city wide Sidewalk Participation program. The program provides funds to replace defective sidewalks and provide infill in those areas that meet sidewalk policy guidelines. Sidewalks replaced are those which present potential safety hazards to pedestrians and liability to the City. This program includes both residential and commercial properties and can enhance economic development of an area. This program provides a well-maintained infrastructure and safe walking routes. Annually, there is a great demand for these funds. The City’s share of costs is 80% of the sidewalk replacement.

Council District: Citywide
CIP Status: Existing
Criteria: Maintenance-Replacement
Priority: Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$ 280,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 90,000</td>
<td>$ 730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,175,000</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 395,000</td>
<td>$ 3,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$ 1,455,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 3,880,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Prior Year(s)</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$ 1,230,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td>$ 410,000</td>
<td>$ 3,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements Other Agencies</td>
<td>$ 225,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 1,455,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 485,000</td>
<td>$ 3,880,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+/- Total Impact on Operating Budget</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Beyond 2021</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Investment Plan (FY17-21)

Project Name: Western Ave from Adams St to Lincoln Ave

Total Project Cost: $10,500,000
Lead Department: Public Works
Project Type: Road (state mft) - M

Project Purpose:
Reconstruct Western Avenue from Adams Street to Lincoln Avenue.

Project Narrative:
Western Avenue is a major north south connector that connects the residential bluff to the commercial and industrial (employment) areas. The existing hot mix asphalt over concrete pavement has been steadily deteriorating and is in need of reconstruction. Completion of this roadway reconstruction will improve a major link between to the employment and residential areas. Pedestrian and bicycle accommodations will also be improved during the construction of this road. The Western Avenue project will include street concepts and construction of green infrastructure.

Expense Category | Prior Year(s) | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 | FY2020 | FY2021 | Beyond 2021 | Total |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Engineering | $ | 350,000 | $800,000 | $850,000 | $ | $ | $ | $ | $2,000,000 |
Land Acquisition | $ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
Construction | $ | 950,000 | $6,050,000 | $1,500,000 | $ | $ | $ | $ | $8,500,000 |
Equipment | $ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
Other | $ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
Total Cost | $ | - | $1,300,000 | $6,850,000 | $2,350,000 | $ | $ | $ | $10,500,000 |

Funding Source | Prior Year(s) | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 | FY2020 | FY2021 | Beyond 2021 | Total |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
State Motor Fuel Tax | $ | - | $1,300,000 | $350,000 | $1,750,000 | $ | $ | $ | $3,400,000 |
Local Motor Fuel Tax | $ | - | $2,000,000 | $600,000 | - | - | - | $ | $2,600,000 |
Sewer Fees | $ | - | $4,500,000 | - | - | - | - | $ | $4,500,000 |
Total | $ | - | $1,300,000 | $6,850,000 | $2,350,000 | $ | $ | $ | $10,500,000 |

Impact on Operating Budget

| FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 | FY2020 | FY2021 | Beyond 2021 | Total |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
+-/ Total Impact on Operating Budget | $ | - | - | - | - | - | - |