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Executive Summary

Walking and biking to school, once a dominant method of transportation, has seen a sharp decline in the past several decades. A new movement called Safe Routes to School (SRTS) aims at increasing safe walking and biking to school, for reasons related to community health, environmental health, and transportation.

Glen Oak, a slightly underprivileged neighborhood in Peoria, IL, contains a school (Glen Oak Community Learning Center) and a park (Glen Oak Park) that exemplify the need for improved active transportation to and from the two, and in the neighborhood in general.

After collecting data from various sources, the common barriers to safe active transportation were identified: crumbling infrastructure, lack of sidewalk buffers, unsafe crossings, unsightly appearance, obstacles, and driver behavior.

Data were collected by different modes. First, the City of Peoria provided a base map, data on sidewalk location and condition, ADA ramps, row trees, and Pavement Condition Index rating.

The second set of data came from two community events: a Community Walkabout on Friday, November 6th, 2015, and a Parent Teacher Organization event on Thursday, March 3rd, 2016. These events provided important feedback from community members. The Community Walkabout used the AARP Sidewalks and Streets Survey on four routes in the neighborhood, and a post-walk discussion revealed more barriers to walkability.

The second community event, hosted by the PTO, took the discussion further. Attendees first further identified barriers to walkability, and then came up with potential solutions. As a group, we created a vision and goals for the school and neighborhood. Finally, the group brainstormed potential partners for funding opportunities.

The third set of data came from the National Safe Routes to School data collection process for three consecutive days in March: Parent Surveys and Teacher Tallies. The surveys and tallies provided important data about current travel patterns, and identified the top barriers to safe walking. For issues that parents would like to see improved, ‘crossing guards’ were the highest, with ‘violence or crime’ as second, ‘sidewalks or pathways’ as fourth, and ‘safety of intersections and crossings’ as fifth.

Taking into consideration the community events and the parent surveys and teacher tallies, recommendations were formed that are in line with the goals and vision created at the PTO meeting. The 5 E’s contributed to the recommendations: enforcement, education, engineering, encouragement, and evaluation. The focus is on the engineering and encouragement aspects of the 5 E’s, based on the identified community needs.

For enforcement, parents identified concerns about speeding (supported by the Community Walkabout results), the lack of stop signs, trash in the area, and a lack of police presence during school hours. More stop signs and police presence would help mitigate some of these problems. Additionally, more crossing
guards and a crossing guard appreciation program would help with the problem of speeding and safety of intersections.

For education, the aim is to grant students the knowledge, skills, and confidence to walk and bike safely. This can be done with a curriculum update to incorporate these skills into the classroom.

For engineering, the goal is to create a safe, connected and comfortable place for all road users. The top barrier between the park and school is Prospect Rd, a high volume road with difficult crossings. This is listed as a potential site for a road diet in the Peoria Bicycle Master Plan, and this plan recommends a road diet. Additionally, the sidewalks are in great need of improvement. Several routes are identified as priority for rebuilding, to maximize the benefits of new sidewalks to as many areas.

For encouragement, there are several options outlined in the report, for example a walking school bus. The options are left as suggestions for the school district and the SRTS committee to decide which programs would work best with the appropriate funding.

Lastly, for evaluation, the school should repeat the same SRTS parent surveys at least once a year, with the teacher tallies ideally twice a year. These are sent to the National SRTS program, and provide important information for the National Center and Glen Oak School.
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Introduction
Introduction

Walking or biking to school was once part of the everyday lives of American Children. In 1969, around 50% of school children aged 5 to 14 walked or biked\(^1\). By 2009, that number had dropped to 13%. With less walking and biking, the community spends more on transportation related costs, such as air pollution, infrastructure, or school buses, as well as the health related costs of a more sedentary lifestyle, like obesity and behavioral problems. The easiest way to increase childhood public health is through incorporating it into daily life. Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Parks are a viable way forward in the fight against childhood obesity and automobile pollution and congestion.

This study and plan was completed by Graduate Research Assistant Emily Weimer between August 2015 to May 2016, under the supervision of Dr. Mary Edwards, Associate Professor of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Illinois. Kathleen Brown, University of Illinois Extension Educator in Community and Economic Development for the Fulton-Mason-Peoria-Tazewell Unit served as another advisor to the project. This study is part of the Designing Healthy Communities Initiatives and is funded through the Office of the Provost and College of ACES Illinois Extension and Outreach Initiatives. The project is supported by the City of Peoria Innovation Team and Peoria Public Schools District 150. Rachael Wilson, a Master’s of Urban and Regional Planning student at the University of Illinois provided support. The project examines the relationship between health, design, and the built environment in the Peoria Region. This study is a micro-level portion of the project, examining one neighborhood (East Bluff) in Peoria.

Peoria Context

Peoria is a small city in central Illinois, with a population of 115,828 and a metro area population of 380,447. It has a median household income of $45,270, below the state level of

$56,797. The poverty level is 22.5%, also above Illinois’ 14.1%. Peoria boasts an attractive downtown on the Illinois River. It is the global headquarters of Caterpillar, and has a rich, agricultural history. A quintessential American town, Peoria has won the “All-America City” distinction four times.

The current conditions have cultivated a low rate of bike and pedestrian travel, establishing it as a city that could clearly show a positive impact from active transportation plans and policies. Peoria respondents to the National Citizens Survey rated the overall quality of the built environment at 41% satisfaction. Sidewalk maintenance is rated at 27%.

Current rates of commuting by bicycling and walking in Peoria are low (Figure 2). Around 3% of Peoria residents walk to work.

According to the National Citizen Survey, only 40% of Peoria residents rated the “ease of walking” positively, by contrast travel by car was rated positively by 68%. Overall, by all modes, there is an ease of travel to the places that respondents normally have to visit of 75%, ranging from 60% to 89% between the five districts.

The lowest rated mode is biking, with an average rating of 31%, with one district reporting 19%. The second lowest mode rated by ease is walking.

Despite these low ratings and low levels of active commuting, there is a small improvement in the levels of activity for recreation. According to the National Citizen Survey form 2015, 51% of respondents rated positively that they walked or biked instead of driving.

**Study Area and Scope of the Project**

The scope of this project is on the Glen Oak Neighborhood, focusing on two main attractions: Glen Oak Community Learning Center, and

---


Glen Oak Park. Figure 6 shows the boundaries for the Glen Oak Neighborhood, and Figure 7 shows the neighborhood location within the City of Peoria. This project examined the Glen Oak neighborhood’s overall built environment, with a focus on safe walking and biking for school children. Specifically, the aim was to improve the safety of students getting to school, getting to the park, and going between the school and the park.

Glen Oak Community Learning Center
Glen Oak Community Learning Center, of Peoria Public Schools District 150, is located in the East Bluff neighborhood, on 2100 N Wisconsin Ave. The school serves grades K-6, with a total enrollment of 884 in 2015, with an average class size of 21. It is a racially diverse school, and 10% of the students are English Learners. 93% of its students are categorized as low-income according to the Illinois Report Card.

The property encompasses four city blocks and the building occupies 126,000 square feet. It opened its new building in 2010.

Glen Oak Park
About three blocks from the school is Glen Oak Park, operated by the Peoria Park District. This 117 acre park contains many amenities, such as the Peoria Play House Children’s Museum, Peoria Zoo, Luthy Botanical Garden, an amphitheater, playgrounds, biking and hiking trails, and more. Glen Oak Park is the only park located in Glen Oak Neighborhood.
Figure 6: The East Bluff Neighborhood boundaries, according to the East Bluff Housing Services.
East Bluff Neighborhood in Peoria

Figure 7: East Bluff Neighborhood in Peoria Context

Author: Emily Weimer
Data Source: City of Peoria, ESRI
Date: 2/15/16
Important Concepts

**Safe Routes** are designated routes that have been evaluated as the safest option, based on the location of sidewalks, crosswalks, crossing guards, and other factors.

**Bikeability** is a concept of how conducive an area’s built environment is to biking. Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) is a measurement of comfort for on-road bicyclists. The assessment grades sections of roads based on several inputs: roadway width, traffic volume, speed limit, pavement condition, on-street parking, percent of heavy vehicles, and paved shoulder width.

**Walkability** is a concept of how conducive an area’s built environment is to walking. Walkable neighborhoods can increase public health, and economic and community development. Factors such as presence and quality of sidewalks, shade trees, pedestrian crossings, access to goods and services, and many others impact how walkable a neighborhood is.

**Active Transportation** is a form of transportation that relies solely or in part on biking, walking, or transit.
Safe Routes to School

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a federal program to improve safe walking and biking to and from school. SRTS is also a national movement lead by schools, parents, and officials. SRTS programs enable and encourage walking and biking to school, while increasing the safety of those modes.

The benefits that SRTS brings to children and the community are manifold. Students who walk or bike to school are better prepared for the school day. They are more alert for their start, and have more energy throughout the day\(^1\).

Adding pedestrian infrastructure can reduce car congestion and pollution, all while improving the safety of all road users.

There are many barriers to safe walking and biking to school, whether perceived or warranted. These factors can be classified in two categories: infrastructure and non-infrastructure.

Infrastructure

Infrastructure can actively encourage or discourage safe active transportation, including sidewalks, bike paths, crosswalks, school zone signage, and traffic calming measures. Impediments in the sidewalk network include:

- missing or crumbling sidewalks (Figure 8), blocked sidewalks, conflicts with sidewalks meeting driveways, a lack of a buffer between the sidewalk and the street, or missing curb cuts/ramps.

The crumbling infrastructure can be quite dangerous for walkers, especially those with visual or walking impairments. Bike lanes face similar problems to sidewalks, and others like incomplete networks, potholes, and conflicts with automobile traffic. Crosswalks are needed to help move students across the street safely, but they are not always placed in the locations students actually use, and not always apparent and/or followed to automobile users. School zone signage include school speed limit 20, flashing lights, and school crosswalks. Traffic calming measures are a response to overbuilt and unsafe roads. Actions like narrowing roads, adding speed bumps, or creating bump outs (Figure 9). Bump outs decrease the length that a pedestrian has to cross, lessening the chance of an incident.

In addition to the gray infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, and bike paths), green infrastructure also affects transportation behavior. Shade...
trees can be important in hotter climates, and increase the comfort and appeal of the walk or bike ride. Other green infrastructure factors are landscaping, and native flowers and other plants. Finally, comfort and appeal can also be increased by miscellaneous factors of the built environment, like lighting, litter, presence of graffiti, and vacant/rundown buildings.

To ameliorate these infrastructure concerns, they first have to be identified. Public input is key to identifying the local conditions. After they are identified, they can be rated and then prioritized for improvement.

**Non-infrastructure**

Non-infrastructure concerns deal with safety and perceived safety. The presence of speeding cars, and traffic congestion can discourage walking. The pressing concern about safety is the lack of education, which can be addressed in a SRTS program. Events and ongoing education campaigns can help alleviate some parental and student concerns about safety. A Bike Rodeo is an age specific class teaching rules of the road, safe bicycling skills, and basic bicycle tune-ups. At a Bike Rodeo, the children get hands on practice through an obstacle course representing a road, and can include hand signals, stopping, turning, and merging.

A Bike Rodeo is just one example of an educational campaign to foster safe walking and biking. Other programs are encouragement campaigns, using prizes and recognition. A third type of program is, for example, the Walking School Bus. The Walking School Bus uses adult volunteers to pick up students on the walk to school. Walkers have safety in numbers, and walking school buses can offer alternatives for parents who cannot walk with their child.

The school or school district can work with their local SRTS organization if one exists, or can work independently to assess the needs of the community, and implement non-infrastructure improvements.

**Green Space**

Access to green space is another component of public health, affecting the wellbeing and health in people of all ages. Similar to SRTS, Safe Routes to Parks refers to the infrastructure that promotes access to parks by bicycling, walking, and transit. Both movements focus on safe access by active transportation modes.

There are social and physical barriers to safe park access, including distance, infrastructure, crime and traffic concerns.

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), a non-profit organization dedicated to advancing parks and recreation, outlines five essential elements of a safe route: comfort, convenience, safety, access and design, and the park. The NRPA recommends an ideal safe route distance is no more than half a mile to the park, about a 10 minute walk. The walk should be aesthetically pleasing and safe, with comfortable pedestrian facilities like sidewalks, accessible to all.

83% of Peoria respondents\(^2\) have visited a neighborhood or City park. Peoria has a 2,000 acre state park, and a Park District with 16 neighborhood parks and 20 regional parks and facilities.

---

Existing Conditions
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Existing Conditions

Literature Review
There are three main plans that influence or are important to this plan: The Peoria Bicycle Master Plan, the Wisconsin Avenue Business Corridor Plan, and the Glen Oak Work Plan.

Peoria Bike Master Plan (2015)
The Peoria Bicycle Master Plan is the city’s first bicycle connectivity master plan. It aims to make bicycling in the city safe, convenient, and comfortable. The plan recommends various engineering and evaluation/planning practices, and programs that focus on education, encouragement, and enforcement. Since the Bicycle Master Plan is at the city level, it is pretty broad with its recommendations, so it would benefit from a neighborhood approach.

Key Points:
- The Peoria Bicycle Master Plan is a macro level plan with a vision for the whole city. This plan is a neighborhood level plan, with consistent goals, but at a more detailed scale.
- Lists Prospect Ave as a potential for a road diet, and ranks it as the least comfortable for biking.
- Peoria Bicycle Master Plan conducted a community survey; respondents rated bicycle improvements as important – while at the same time respondents indicated that overall bicycling conditions at present are poor.
Wisconsin Avenue Business Corridor Plan (2014)
In the middle of the Glen Oak Neighborhood runs Wisconsin Ave, a historic commercial corridor. This North South road contains the main entrance to Glen Oak School. The plan aims to revitalize the corridor.

Key Points:
• Recommends a bicycle lane
• Improves overall walking environment, with facade improvements, murals, and light fixtures.

Glen Oak Work Plan (2011)
The City’s vision for the area is to “create a safe, vibrant, attractive, and affordable neighborhood within an existing urban setting.” There are five goals for 2011: Increase Homeownership, Revitalize the Wisconsin Avenue Business District, Increase Neighborhood Involvement, Curtail Crime, and Improve Infrastructure.

Key Points:
• Calls for continued sidewalk improvements in the Glen Oak Zone
Data Collection

Data collection involved a variety of sources and methods:

- The US Census, Community Survey
- 2010 Glen Oak Neighborhood survey
- Geographic Information System (GIS) files from the City of Peoria
- A Community Walkabout
- PTO Meeting
- Two Safe Routes to School tools: a Teacher Tally and a Parent Survey

The results of all data collection methods are compiled in the “Identified Barriers” section of the plan, and the individual data collection results are included in the Appendix.

Community Walk

On Friday, November 6th, 2015, the team conducted a Community Walk (process in Figure 11). This walk was open to the community to identify walkability issues in the neighborhood. Participants were assigned pre-determined routes, and give instructions on the two audits used. The two audits used were the AARP’s Sidewalks and Streets Survey, and the NHTSA’s Walk-Friendly Community Assessment for Teens.

Six original routes were planned, and four were chosen on the event day (Figure 10). The routes were chosen based on their traffic volume and certain destinations. All four routes started at Glen Oak Primary School. Two routes took different approaches to entering Glen Oak Park. Another route went to the East Bluff Community Center. Figure 12 is a composite map of common complaints and comments. For a more detailed look at the routes and results, see Appendix 1.
The Process

1 Advertisement
The event was advertised through the partners in the project. The information was sent out to the School District, local officials, and community organizations.

2 Preparation
Six walking routes were carefully predetermined with several alternatives for flexibility. Several routes between Glen Oak Primary School and Glen Oak Park were the primary focus. Additionally, other routes were chosen based on their destinations (including the East Bluff community center) and to include major streets.

3 The Introduction
The event met at the Glen Oak Primary School, where facilitators assigned groups, introduced the project, and explained the walkability assessments.

4 The Walk
Four groups with their own routes used one primary and one secondary assessment to examine the walking environment: the AARP Sidewalks and Streets Survey (primary), and the NHTSA Walk Friendly Community Assessment (secondary). While on the walk, participants wrote down their observations on the AARP assessment and took pictures.

5 Post-Walk Reaction
Once the groups completed their routes, the participants and facilitators met back at the Glen Oak Primary School to finalize their assessments and discuss the results. Each group was asked to list the five most important walkability issues of their route.

6 Discussion
The participants were asked what they learned about the area’s walkability, and what they would like to see changed in the long and short term. All responses were recorded on a poster board. Then, participants were invited to annotate a large map of the area where they encountered specific problems.

Figure 11: The Community Walk Process
Community Walkabout Results: Identified Walkability Issues

- Needs shade trees
- No ramps or curb cuts
- No marked crosswalk, and missing or ill placed pedestrian buttons
- The playground parking lot is not pedestrian friendly
- Need for pedestrian crosswalk for access to playground, and traffic calming

Walking Routes | Identified Problems
---|---
Sidewalks | Safety
Crossings | Comfort and Appeal

Figure 12: Community Walkabout Results
PTO Meeting
On Tuesday, March 3rd, we collaborated with the participants at the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) to discuss the project and create a vision for the school. We discussed possible funding sources (primarily the National Safe Routes to School grant) and community organizations who could be active partners supporting the neighborhood vision.

A description of the identified problems with walkability was read to the group, and the PTO further identified problems close to the school. Notes were taken during the meeting, and included in Appendix 2.

SRTS Teacher Tallies
The National SRTS Teacher Tallies were administered by Glen Oak School during the week of March 8th-10th (Appendix 3 and Appendix 4). For three consecutive days, teachers counted, by a show of hands, how their students traveled to school that day, both in the a.m. and the p.m.

Teachers also included information about the weather conditions, how many students are in the class, the class grade, and if there were any circumstances that would affect normal travel behavior.

32 classrooms participated in the teacher tally.
There were discrepancies of the weather reporting, for example with some teachers recording sunny on Thursday, while others recorded rain, and others recorded snow. The data based on travel and weather patterns are not as reliable as the basic counts.

“Many of the students who are driven to school are tardy on a daily basis” says one teacher, indicating a potential problem with the drop off situation. This was the only teacher to write comments.

The Teacher Tallies were entered into the National SRTS website data collection system, which analyzed the data and created a report (Appendix 5). The report compares morning and afternoon travel by mode, and by weather.

Over the three day period, the most trips were made by walking, followed by family car. In the afternoon, around 45% of students walked home, with 37% in the morning. In the morning, more students were driven, with 36%, compared to the afternoon, with only 30%. Walking is the only mode that significantly increased from the morning to the afternoon.

SRTS Survey Results
The National SRTS parent surveys were administered by Glen Oak School during the week of March 7th-11th. 186 surveys were returned. The approximate enrollment of the school is 884, so the parent survey return rate was around 21%.

The surveys were coded and analyzed using Excel. After the analysis, they were sent into the National SRTS Data Collection Center. Some late surveys were accepted, and sent along, but were not included in the initial data analysis for the purpose of this plan. The National SRTS organization will have reports available with all of the surveys (including the late surveys) after the completion of this plan. However, since the number of late surveys was small, the following analysis is still valid. The following is the analysis of the parent surveys.

149 parents recorded their nearest intersection, and those results were mapped to display where students were traveling from (Figure 15) and which mode (Figure 16 and Figure 17).

Note in some charts and figures, the numbers don’t add up to the total number of surveys returned, because not all questions were answered.
Figure 15: SRTS Survey Respondents: closest intersection and transportation mode in the morning
SRTS Survey Respondents - AM Mode, All Respondents

Figure 16: SRTS Survey Respondents: closest intersection and transportation mode in the morning
Figure 17: SRTS Survey Respondents: closest intersection and transportation mode in the afternoon

Author: Emily Weimer
Data: City of Peoria; SRTS Survey
Date: 3/30/2016
Figure 18: SRTS Survey Respondents: closest intersection and transportation mode in the morning
Figure 19: SRTS Survey Respondents: closest intersection and transportation mode in the afternoon.
Student grades were not equally represented in the parent surveys: only four percent of the results came from parents or guardians of 6th graders (Figure 20). Kindergarten through 5th graders had a range of 12% to 20%, more equally distributed. It is unknown why parents or guardians of 6th graders did not fill out the survey.

In the last year, 76 parents (44%) reported that their child has asked permission to walk or bike to school, while 98 have not. 72 respondents (41%) reported that they would not feel comfortable for their child to walk alone to school at any age. Those who felt comfortable, 97 respondents, gave an average grade of 4, with ranges from 1st to 9th grade. The statistical mode is grade 5 (most frequently occurring grade).

Based on the parent responses to the questions about their student’s most common mode of transportation to and from school, these show that the highest modes are: walk, family vehicle, and school bus, consistent with the Teacher Tallies. There were no bicyclists or transit users (Figure 21).

The most informative question on the survey listed 12 potential issues and asked the parents/guardians to identify issues with walking and biking: “1- What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk to bike to/from school? 2- Would you probably let your child walk or bike to/from school if this problem were changed or improved?”

For the first question, for issues that affect their decisions, parents/guardians listed ‘weather or climate’ as the number one factor, and the second as ‘convenience of driving.’ ‘Crossing guards’ are listed as third (Figure 22).
**Figure 22: SRTS Survey Response to issues that affected their decision to allow or not allow their student to walk or bike to school.**

**Figure 23: SRTS Survey Response to issues that if changed, they might allow their student to walk or bike to school.**

**Figure 24: SRTS Survey Response to issues that affected their decision to allow or not allow their student to walk or bike to school, and what issues that if changed, they might allow their student to walk or bike to school.**

For the second question, ‘crossing guards’ were the highest expressed condition parents would like to see improved, with ‘violence or crime’ as second, ‘sidewalks or pathways’ as fourth, and ‘safety of intersections and crossings’ as fifth (Figure 23).

In both questions, ‘time’ and ‘adults to bike with’ were listed rather low. Figure 24 combines the two questions. It shows that crossing guards are the number one issue that affected the commute and that they would like to see improved.

Parents/guardians were asked based on a scale, to rate: how much the school encourages walking and biking to school (Figure 25), how much fun is walking or biking to school (Figure 26), and how healthy walking and biking to school is (Figure 27). 22% of Parents/guardians rated the school as either ‘strongly encourages’ or ‘encourages’ walking and biking to school. Overall, parents/guardians felt the school neither encouraged or discouraged walking or biking, with a response rate of 68% for neutral. For the level of fun, 45% of parents/guardians rated walking and biking as either ‘very fun’ or ‘fun’, with 50% of parents as neutral. 75% of parents/guardians ranked walking and biking to school as ‘very healthy’ or ‘healthy.’

After running a regression analysis on the level of parental education with the perceptions on how healthy walking or biking to school is, there is no relationship between the factors based on the survey results. Therefore, the level of education a parent has achieved does not seem to impact whether they think walking or biking to school is healthy. This indicates that all parents should be targeted for education on the health benefits of walking and biking to school.
Map Analysis
Many maps were created for this project and can be divided into two categories: neighborhood scale and city scale. The maps were used for a variety of purposes, including the presence and condition of infrastructure, the identification of barriers to active transportation, and more. Data came from the City of Peoria, Illinois Department of Transportation, and the American Community Survey (ACS).

Neighborhood Level Maps:

Active Transportation
Figure 28 shows active transportation commuters in the area. One dot, color coded to represent either bike or walk, represents one worker (16 and older) reporting their main mode of transportation. The north third of the map doesn't have quite as many active transportation commuters. In fact, that top third area doesn't have any bicycle commuters at all. The area around East Bluff shows a demand for active transportation.

ADA Ramps
Figure 29 shows the sidewalk ramps rated on their ADA compliance. The ramps with a close proximity to the school are rated as new. However, most of the ramps in East Bluff are rated medium priority by the City of Peoria, as well as a streak of high priority along Prospect Rd. While the area (about one block) around the school is accessible, the rest of the area needs to be addressed. Barriers in the neighborhoods exist, and without a consistent infrastructure, mobility is seriously inhibited.

School Enrollment
The purpose of Figure 30 is to show where school children live. The darker colors show a higher number of students enrolled in K-6. Glen Oak is located among many schoolchildren enrolled in K-6. This map is helpful in potentially showing where schoolchildren might be walking to school from.

PCI Rating
Figure 31 shows the PCI Rating. Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a way to measure the condition of a road, using a numerical rating for the condition of a road segment. Zero is the worst possible, and 100 is the best. The PCI considers two inputs: the type and severity of pavement distress, such as cracks, and the smoothness and comfort of the road. The PCI rating is relevant for pedestrians and bicyclists. Rough looking roads do not encourage pedestrians or bicyclists to partake on a journey. The majority of East Bluff is in the top half of the PCI. One major problem apparent from this map is Wisconsin Avenue, which is rated in the 50-70% category. The second major problem is Frye Ave, a connecting route between the school and the playground at Glen Oak Park.

Roadway Classification
Figure 32 shows the roadway functional class, a grouping of road types based on their function. This is a street hierarchy system. A principal arterial serves major activity levels with the highest traffic volumes, generally higher speeds, and longer trip lengths. A minor arterial serve trips of moderate length and have a lower level of mobility. These do not go through neighborhoods, but do connect neighborhoods. Wisconsin Ave, McClure Ave, and Prospect Rd are listed as minor arterials. These are the roads that will be harder for students to cross.

Row Trees
The purpose of Figure 33 was to locate areas where trees add to the pleasant walking environment. There are consistent trees immediately around Glen Oak School, but there are gaps in the
neighborhood areas. Feedback from the Community Walkabout suggested more trees along the sidewalks.

**Sidewalk**

Figure 34 shows the locations of sidewalks according to the City of Peoria. The map shows missing sidewalks in numerous areas. First, Archer Ave is missing sidewalks on both sides of the streets for multiple blocks in a row. There are gaps sporadically throughout the neighborhood, creating an incomplete and unreliable sidewalk network. However, since this map data were collected, a couple of new sidewalks have been built, such as on Nebraska Ave between California Ave and New York Ave. Although the data is not the most up to date, there are still missing and deteriorating sidewalks in the neighborhood.

**Sidewalk Condition**

Figure 35 shows that the sidewalk conditions in East Bluff are rated very poorly. However, the data on this map is also a little outdated, since the areas immediately around Glen Oak School were repaved recently. Although the map is slightly outdated, the message that the sidewalks are in very poor condition remains true.

**Traffic Counts**

Figure 36 shows the average daily traffic (ADT) count for road segments. It shows the traffic volumes. From the map, Prospect is a high traffic road compared to the other minor arterials. These are streets that are harder for children to cross and create a barrier to safe walking and biking.

**City Level Maps:**

**Active Transportation**

Similar to the neighborhood active transportation map, Figure 37 shows workers reporting their commute by bike or walk. East Bluff does contain more bicycle commuters than the middle of the city, but walking levels are comparable to other neighborhoods in close proximity. The block of walkers in the southeastern edge of the city is the location of Bradley University.

**Commuting Patterns: Drive Alone**

Figure 38 uses Census data to show the level of automobile commutes in the city. The two census tracts that primarily make up East Bluff are in the mid range of percentages of commutes by driving alone. The lowest is Bradley University, an exception. Glen Oak has slightly higher rates of car commuting than the southern neighborhoods. The northern neighborhoods of Peoria have significantly high rates of commuting by driving alone. Glen Oak already has a mid range of car commuting, which can mean several things: car ownership, poverty, access to businesses and services, as well as other factors all go into car commuting. This might indicate a need for more infrastructure, support, and education for active transportation.

**Percent of Families below the Poverty Line**

Expanding on the commuting patterns of East Bluff, Figure 39 shows a relatively high percent of families living below the poverty line. When comparing the two maps, there is a stark correlation between the poorer southern neighborhoods with less automobile commuting and the northern affluent automobile commuters. Although this area does not contain as many families living below the poverty line as the southern areas, Glen Oak is still an impoverished area.
Figure 28: Active transportation commuters
School Enrollment

Figure 30: School Enrollment
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Figure 31: Pavement condition
Roadway Classification

Figure 32: Roadway Classification
Figure 33: Row Trees

Author: Emily Weimer
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Traffic Counts

Figure 36: Traffic Counts

Author: Emily Weimer
Data Source: Illinois Department of Transportation; City of Peoria
Date: 2/15/2016
Legend

- East Bluff Tracts
- 1 Dot = 1
  - Bicycle
  - Walk

Author: Emily Weimer
Data Source: ACS 5 year Estimates 2014
Date: 2/15/2016
Figure 38: Commuting Patterns

Legend
- East Bluff

Transportation
Commute by Drive Alone
- 47.02% - 55%
- 55.01% - 65%
- 65.01% - 75%
- 75.01% - 85%
- 85.01% - 100%

Author: Emily Weimer
Data Source: ACS 5 year Estimates 2014
Date: 2/15/2016
Census Tract Percent of Families Below the Poverty Line

East Bluff

Percent of Families Below the Poverty Line

0% - 10%
10.01% - 20%
20.01% - 30%
30.01% - 40%
40.01% - 56.02%

Author: Emily Weimer
Data Source: ACS 5 year Estimates 2014
Date: 2/15/2016

Figure 39: Percent of Families Below the Poverty Line
IDENTIFIED BARRIERS
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After analyzing all the information presented in this report and more in the Appendix, many barriers to safe active transportation were identified: crumbling infrastructure, lack of sidewalk buffers, unsafe crossings, unsightly appearance, obstacles, and driver behavior. For a more detailed look at the issues and locations, see Appendix 1 for the full Community Walkabout Results, Appendix 6 for Complete Street Audits, Appendix 3 for the Teacher Tally Information, and Appendix 4 for the Parent Surveys.

1. Sidewalk conditions heavily influence active transportation. From the Community Walkabouts to walking the routes, many examples of poor infrastructure presented themselves. From vanishing sidewalks to cars parked on sidewalks, there are many issues with sidewalk conditions. A lot of sidewalk segments had missing curb cuts, were sloped sideways, and had conflicts at points of intersections of alleyways and driveways. Some of the older sidewalks are also very narrow, not allowing a lot of room for pedestrians to walk together, especially when there are other barriers present.

2. Sidewalk buffers were missing along most parts of Prospect Ave. The sidewalk ran right up to the road, and at some points, the curb was deteriorated so there was virtually no barrier between the street and the sidewalk. No buffer combined with utility poles in the middle of the sidewalk created real and dangerous barriers to safe travel, especially for those using wheelchairs or the visually impaired. Along some of the neighborhood streets, there was also no buffer. Buffers are needed to create a barrier between cars and pedestrians, and can create a pleasant aesthetic.

3. Unsafe crossings were identified along many routes, but primarily along Prospect Ave. Prospect Ave presents as the main barrier between the school and the park. This wide road has limited crossing points. For example, there is no crossing across Republic Ave, which leads to the park. For crossings that were there, some had faded paint, and some crossings were hard to see by approaching cars. Additionally, pedestrian cross buttons are inconveniently placed in several crossings. People might have a hard time reaching for the ill placed buttons, or even finding them. A prime example of a poorly planned pedestrian crossing is at McClure Ave and Prospect Rd: If you were on the southwest side of the intersection, you would have to cross north across McClure Ave, then East across Prospect, then South to get to the sidewalk.

4. Unsightly appearance was listed in several routes on the Community Walkabout. There was an abundance of trash in the streets, in the sidewalks, and in the adjoining land. Broken glass also appeared frequently on the sidewalks. Several Community Walkabout respondents remarked that there is not adequate lighting along some streets, or garbage cans. Some of the buildings, especially along Prospect Ave, are in disrepair. Some are vacant, while others need maintenance.
Obstacles, such as utility poles and fire hydrants located in the middle of the sidewalk, and overgrown landscaping, made it difficult to pass some locations. Prospect Ave would be near impossible for someone using a wheelchair. Other obstacles such as parked cars blocking the sidewalk, and even one car parked on the sidewalk, also create problems that are not quite as permanent. Overgrown bushes and landscaping also impede safe walking.

Driver behavior was a problem in several areas. First, the Community Walkabout participants said there was a lot of speeding on Prospect Ave. and Nebraska Ave. Drivers did not appear to yield to pedestrians and did not stop behind the crosswalks. The roads are wide, Prospect is approximately 16 feet, which encourages drivers to speed, and makes it difficult for pedestrians to safely traverse such a large area with speeding cars.
1 Sidewalk Conditions

Figure 40: This car parked on the deteriorating sidewalk on the east side of Wisconsin Ave, south of Virginia Ave.

Figure 41: This sidewalk segment almost disappears along Virginia Ave.

2 Lack of Sidewalk Buffers

Figure 42: This sidewalk on the east side of Prospect Rd slopes down into the street, with no curb or buffer.

Figure 43: This neighborhood street, Virginia Ave, has no sidewalk buffer either, with some curb deterioration as well.
Figure 44: This pedestrian button, at the intersection of Prospect Rd and Frye Ave, is facing the wrong way, in addition to its location by overgrown landscaping.

Figure 45: This is one example of a worn out crosswalk.

Figure 46: This driveway and sidewalk combination along Prospect Rd (at the corner of Frye Ave) represent both a danger to pedestrians as they present a larger area for conflicts with cars, and an unsightly appearance.

Figure 47: Unsightly appearance
Figure 47: This parked van is blocking the sidewalk on Prospect Rd, just north of Nebraska Ave.

Figure 48: Permanent objects like utility poles and fire hydrants are located in the middle of the sidewalks along Prospect Rd.

Figure 49: Prospect Road's wide width encourages speeding and presents a difficult passage for pedestrians.
Recommendations
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Moving Forward

For this plan to be successful in the future, partnerships need to be formed with committed members. This plan prepares for the formation of a Safe Routes committee, which was brought up as a possibility in the March 3rd PTO Meeting. At the PTO Meeting, an interest sheet was sent around for a SRTS committee members and numerous people signed their interest.

This plan prepares for the next funding cycle for the National Safe Routes to School grant. The grant offers infrastructure and non-infrastructure improvement opportunities. Several of the necessary materials for the grant application, such as the teacher tallies and the parent surveys, have been conducted. The recommendations in this plan can be used to apply for the grant. Additional funding opportunities are available, and can be found at: http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/program-tools/funding.

This plan uses the “Five E’s” approach to recommendations. The “Five E’s” include: engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation. While the emphasis is on engineering, all components are integral to the safety of walking and biking to school, that is not just safe, but is comfortable and convenient as well.

The following recommendations were created based on the data collected from the various public meetings, surveys, and from the City of Peoria. The emphasis is on a community planning approach: utilizing community member’s observations and concerns with planning education and experience.
**Enforcement**  
*Ensuring all road users act responsibly and respect all the other users*
- Crossing guards and crossing guard appreciation program
- More police presence during school hours

**Education**  
*Empowering students with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to walk and bike safely*
- Bicycle Safety Town
- Pedestrian education in curriculum

**Engineering**  
*Creating a safe, connected and comfortable place for all road users*
- Road diet on Prospect Rd
- Sidewalk rebuilding
- Improved crossings
- Redevelopment of the parking lot on Republic St into park
- Stop signs and speed limit signs

**Encouragement**  
*Creating a norm of support and encouragement for walking and biking*
- Walking School Bus
- National Walk to School Day
- Walking Clubs

**Evaluation**  
*Monitoring the effects of this and other plans on walking and biking behaviors*
- Repeat parent survey and teacher tally
Enforcement

1. Police Presence: Parents at the PTO meeting and through the parent survey listed a number of safety concerns. One parent suggested that there is not enough police presence during the beginning and ending of school. Parents were concerned about speeding and illegal parking around the school. One parent wrote on their Parent Survey: “The 20mph speed limits in the school zone is NEVER followed, and parking enforcement would be nice so cars are not parked in crosswalk. One too many times I have seen kids almost being hit by cars due to speeding or not being able to see around cars.”

- Other parents mentioned that cars don’t stop for the crosswalks. Additionally, teachers and parents, as well as the Community Walkabout participants, remarked on the amount and type (inappropriate for children, such as used contraceptives, drug paraphernalia, and broken bottles) of garbage that is found, especially Monday morning, in the school yard.

- There is a resident policeman living in Glen Oak. The School District or the PTO can talk with the officer about their concerns, and possibly some additional police presence can be requested. Residents can also form a local cleanup group or neighborhood watch, and be empowered to protect and clean up their community. The neighborhood group and PTO could meet and discuss options.

2. Crossing Guard Appreciation Program:

At the PTO meeting and through the Parent Survey, we found a need for more crossing guards. At the PTO meeting, we heard “Sometimes crossing guards are scared of traffic/ unable to stop traffic.”

- These are two responses from the Parent Survey: “Need a crossing guard at the corner of Kansas and Maryland” and “Crossing guards are needed on ALL sides of the school, but especially Frye and Maryland, teachers watch from the door, but there is no guard. VERY DANGEROUS!” Parents are requesting more crossing guards, but there also needs to be more respect for the crossing guards. This is another issue to bring up with the police.

- A Crossing Guard Appreciation program can be designed as a small or large event, based on resources available. This type of program simply aims at recognizing and thanking Crossing Guards for helping children walk safer to school. It can be as simple as asking parents and students to thank the Crossing Guard, in person or with a letter.

- The Active Transportation Alliance (http://activetrans.org/our-work/walking/crossing-guard-appreciation-day) has resources about appreciation programs, and offers an application for exploratory Crossing Guards. If funding allows, the Crossing Guards could be invited into the school for a some light refreshments and other appropriate appreciation ideas.
3. **Snow Removal Campaign:**

This campaign is directed at advertising to the larger community to shovel their sidewalks so that students can walk to school in the snow. This can be something as simple as sending out advertisements, via the school website or newsletter, to spread the idea of shoveling sidewalks for commuters. For further involvement, the SRTS campaign can design yard signs, billboards, or other advertisement to advocate for shoveled sidewalks. Beyond that, the SRTS campaign can recognize neighbors who do a good job shoveling.

**Education**

1. **Bicycle Safety Town:**

The Park District already has a fantastic facility for bicycle safety education, called Bicycle Safety Town. This would be a good partnership for the school. The school might sponsor a day at the Bicycle Safety Town for its students, or arrange a park district employee to come and talk to the school about safe biking.

- The course is limited to those who own bikes and have access to the Bicycle Safety Town. To ameliorate this disparity, the school might host a school wide assembly about bike safety training, one which doesn't require on bike training. This would compliment the on-bike training.

2. **Pedestrian Education in Curriculum:**

One way to encourage safe walking is to have it put into curriculum that every student should receive at least one pedestrian safety education event. There are many successful case studies of schools incorporating pedestrian and bicycle safety curriculum based on age. Many schools all across the nation are incorporating this important safety element into their curriculum. It can be incorporated into gym class, into their classrooms, or into an age based assembly.

- Just one example of curriculum comes from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: [http://www.nhtsa.gov/ChildPedestrianSafetyCurriculum](http://www.nhtsa.gov/ChildPedestrianSafetyCurriculum). This action plan breaks up the curriculum based on grades (K-1, 2-3, and 4-5). There are many
other options that the school can choose to model their own curriculum.

- Pedestrian education typically includes in classroom work, starting in Kindergarten with the basic vocabulary and rules of the road. The teacher can then lead students through a walk around the school, or create an imaginary road system with cones or chalk in the schoolyard.

- As the students get older, they learn more rules of the road and are allowed more freedom of movement. The curriculum covers crossing streets, how to get on and off buses safely, walking along busy streets, and walking in parking lots.

Engineering

1. Road Diet on Prospect Rd:
   This is an identified possible road diet site in the Peoria Bicycle Master Plan. This road is a huge safety concern not just for parents and students, but for the whole community. The crosswalks are faded and far between, the intersection to get into the park at McClure and Prospect is poorly planned for pedestrians and cyclists, and speeding is an issue identified along this corridor. One teacher took their classroom to the Zoo at the park, and did not feel safe walking and crossing at Frye Ave and Prospect Rd.

- A road diet could bring several needed changes: expand the sidewalks to make them ADA compliant, add bike lanes, add a buffer between the street and the sidewalks, discourage speeding, and give an opportunity to improve the pedestrian crossings. A crossing at Republic St is especially needed, as it leads into the park's playground.

2. Sidewalk Rebuilding
   The infrastructure near Glen Oak is old and in need of replacement. Since it is not a possibility to fix everything at once, here is a list of priority segments to maximize the benefits.

- Looking at the map of Parent Survey respondents, there are several possibilities for designated “safe routes.” Wisconsin Ave, Nebraska Ave, and McClure Ave, all within the Glen Oak boundary, would benefit from sidewalk improvements. These are major routes, and could be used as collectors for the smaller streets that won’t be able to have improved sidewalks all at once. Additionally, Republic St from Maryland to the east into the park is identified as a major connector between the school and park/ playground, and would also be a top priority for sidewalk improvements.
3. Redevelopment of the parking lot on Republic into park

A major and direct route between the school and the park’s playground is along Republic St. This route has great potential, but currently faces problems. First, the sidewalks and ramps (or lack of ramps) are an impediment to walking. Secondly and most importantly, there is no pedestrian crossing at Republic St and Prospect Rd.

- Finally, the students need to walk through a beaten up, non-pedestrian friendly parking lot which sits empty for most of the year (Figure 53). It is property of the Park District. This could be redesigned for safe passage by pedestrians, and since it is not widely used, maybe turned into overflow parking with grass or permeable pavers.

4. Stop signs and speed limit signs:

At the PTO meeting, there was much talk about speeding caused by not enough stop signs. According to one parent from the Parent Survey: “I would feel better if they put in more stop signs on Republic at each block by the school to help reduce speed of drivers.”

- Other parents expressed concerns that they haven’t seen the school speed limit signs, or that they weren’t being followed. A HAWK signal (Figure 55) would be useful at Frye Ave and Wisconsin Ave. Along Wisconsin Ave, speed flashback signs and school speed limit signs with lights could combat some of the speeding issues around the school.

- Additionally, more stop signs would slow down the traffic, specifically 4 way stop signs at Republic St and Wisconsin Ave, and at Kansas St and Wisconsin Ave.
• To combat the speeding issue, more signs stating the school speed limit are needed. In addition, a speed feedback sign would give instant feedback to speeding drivers might be utilized in the school zone (Figure 55).

Encouragement

The following are encouragement programs which the school may choose which to run, depending on the resources available.

1. Walking School Bus
   The Walking School Bus (WSB) is a group of adult volunteers (most likely parents) who walk with children to school along a designated route. The 'bus' picks up students as it walks to school. This program can be operated at little cost. There is typically a WSB coordinator, who could be an intern from a local college, a teacher or administrator, or a parent. The Safe Routes to School website offers a guide in implementing a successful program: http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/walking_school_bus/.

   • In Glen Oak, a WSB program might be successful, since parents have voiced their concerns about the violence and crime in the community. Having a parent to walk with might make some children and their parents/guardians feel more comfortable walking. The WSB has safety in numbers.

   • Funding: The cost of the program can be nothing, or it could require an independent grant for a part time coordinator (colleges are good sources), or the National SRTS funding could buy WSB vests for volunteers to identify themselves, or participation prizes.

   • Logistics: The WSB coordinator would need to reach out to parents and students to gain interest in the program. The WSB coordinator, in conjunction with the school, will need to create a parent consent form for liability issues. With a location of all the participating houses, they can then create safe walking routes to the school based on the interested houses.

   • Volunteer recruitment can include parents, high school or college students, and adult relatives. They will need to submit to a background check with the school district. The WSB coordinator and the school administration will have to create a list of rules for the program, such as what to do if a student will be absent, how the children should behave on the walk, etc. The volunteers will need to go through an orientation by the WSB coordinator.

   • Final thoughts: This program may or may not work in Glen Oak. The SRTS committee or PTO will need to conduct an interest survey. A WSB coordinator is essential to provide oversight and planning, which may be hard to with the limited funding at the moment, especially depending on the size of the potential program.

2. International Walk to School Day
   International Walk to School Day occurs once a year in October. Walk to School Day 2016 is scheduled for October 5th, and October 4th in 2017. Information on Walk to School Day can be found online: http://www.walkbiketoschool.org/ready/about-the-events/walk-to-school-day.

   • This once a year celebration of walking is also a low cost option for Glen Oak. This is a good introductory event to a SRTS program, launching the idea of safe walking in both
students and parents. The school can sign up on the Walk to School Day website. This is a day where students are encouraged to walk to school. Local ‘celebrities,’ city officials, the police, local media, and others can be invited to participate, and draw attention to walking and some walking impediments around the school. The police, transportation officials, or other city workers can participate and promote safety.

- Partnerships with local businesses or other sources can provide prizes for participants, such as a healthy morning snack, stickers, backpack reflectors (Figure 56) or other little prizes, and for temporary safety signs that can be placed around the neighborhood, alerting to the high volume of pedestrians.

- On International Walk to School day, walking and exercise can be incorporated into the curriculum. For example, in English class, students can write or journal about their experience walking or biking. In math, they can solve equations in terms of miles and walkers. All classes can incorporate some reference to walking. Some examples can be found at: http://www.walkbiketoschool.org/get-set/event-ideas/classroom-activities-and-handouts.

3. Mileage Clubs and Contests:
There are many options to encourage frequent walkers. The National SRTS website provides a succinct overview: http://guide.saferoutesinfo.org/encouragement/mileage_clubs_and_contests.cfm. This can be a school wide program, or a teacher initiated classroom program. The purpose is to record how much children are walking (either by number of trips, or by mileage). This will be up to the school how they might want to organize a program like this.

- Some options are to give prizes for all walkers who signed up for a Frequent Walkers Club (school wide), with a faculty member there to monitor and give out prizes to the participants. Prizes can come from businesses donations, or through the SRTS grant. If a teacher wants to form their own walkers club, it could be something similar. Logging the mileage or trips on a school board would help with participation levels.

- Another option at the school or classroom level is to have goals and pick at random who gets the bigger prize, while all participants gets a little prize. One example, if students participate, they are entered once into the draw, and if students walk on average both ways three times a week or more, they are entered twice into the draw. There are many options that should be tailored to Glen Oak school, with teachers and administration having the best knowledge of their school.
Evaluation

Monitoring the effects of this and other plans on walking and biking behaviors

Repeat parent survey and teacher tally:

- These surveys and tallies are essential for SRTS grants and for tracking transportation patterns. Since they were completed in March, they should be completed next March for similar weather and other conditions. Parent surveys only need to be done once a year, to evaluate the SRTS progress and see what still needs to occur. Both the Teacher Tallies and Parent Surveys will be sent to the National Safe Routes to School for evaluation.

- Ideally, the teacher tally should be administered twice a year, once in October and once in March. Since the International Walk to School Day occurs in October, it would be an ideal week to collect data, since students and teachers are already aware of the idea of walking, and since the collection is for three consecutive days, the Teacher Tally should show the participation in the Walk to School Day.
Conclusion
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Further Steps

After the completion and adoption of this plan, ideally a SRTS Committee will start up with parents, teachers, and local officials. The committee could start out meeting once a month, forming subcommittees as needed. This committee would plan all events, such as International Walk to School Day.

This committee will decide which, if any, SRTS programs listed above they could implement in the school with funding and other constraints. It is up to their discretion which programs will work at their school, and which funding sources they can apply for. The committee will complete the evaluation section of the “5 E’s” and then decide where to go from there.

A Sidewalk Gap analysis is recommended, as well as an updated sidewalk condition assessment if time and resources allow. A map of the crosswalks and school signs would be beneficial for future planning endeavors as well as this project.

Finally, a study on the creation of “Safe Routes” should be done once more information becomes available, or based on the current data if new data cannot be collected. The “Safe Routes” will also change if funding sources allow for sidewalk improvements or other aspects. These studies can be requested by the SRTS committee, to the City of Peoria or the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, Peoria’s Regional Planning Commission.

The state contact for SRTS is Priscilla Tobias, State Safety Engineer. Tobias can be contacted at (217) 782-3568, and at priscilla.tobias@illinois.gov. The Illinois SRTS website can be found at: http://www.idot.illinois.gov/transportation-system/local-transportation-partners/county-engineers-and-local-public-agencies/safe-routes-to-school/index.
Community Walkabout Routes

Only four out of the six planned routes were conducted due to the number of participants, so the following analysis includes the routes conducted: 1, 3, 5, and 6.

Route 1

Route Profile:
On this route, there were some missing and deteriorating sidewalk segments. Crossing into the park on this route is not easily accessible by pedestrians.

Top Walkability Issues Identified:
• Intersection of McClure and Prospect
• Deteriorated Sidewalk on McClure
• Sidewalk on Maryland between Archer and McClure
• No All-way stops on Maryland- might be an issue at Arcadia.

Sections:
• Sidewalks: Broken sidewalk on McClure between Atlantic and Central. No curb cuts on the corner of McClure and Maryland
• Crossings: The corner of McClure and Maryland needs a traffic signal/ crosswalk. The crosswalk on McClure and Prospect needs repainting. Crossing into the park at McClure is not intuitive.
• Safety: Drivers do not stop behind the crosswalk at McClure and Prospect
• Comfort and Appeal: The grass and landscaping need maintenance along McClure

Overall Ratings:
• Crossing the Street (Intersections) → Fair (2 points)
• Sidewalks → Good (3 points)
• Driver Behavior → Good (3 points)

Summary:
- Safety → Good (3 points)
- Comfort and Appeal → Good (3 points)

Totals: 14 points (out of 20)
Appendix 1

Route 3

Route profile: This route had a fairly well built sidewalk network, but trash and broken glass were seen everywhere. Additionally, there is no pedestrian crossing at Prospect Rd. into the playground. The parking lot from the street to the playground is unsightly and not pedestrian friendly.

Walkability Issues:
- Intersection crossings (Prospect and Republic)
- Paint on intersections
- Broken glass
- Park access
- Park parking lot
- Clean up in general
- Speeding on Prospect
- Possible poor lighting

Overall Ratings:
- Crossing the Street (Intersections) → Poor (1 point)
- Sidewalks → Fair (2 points)
- Driver Behavior → Fair (2 points)
- Safety → Fair (2 points)
- Comfort and Appeal → Fair (2 points)

Totals: 9 (out of 20)
Appendix 1

Route 5:

Route Profile:
On this route, the sidewalks were rated poor due to the narrow width and the utility poles located in the sidewalk. The driver behavior was rated fair due to the speeding traffic along Nebraska.

Top Walkability Issues Identified:
- No stop signs traveling along Nebraska
- Traffic moves too fast
- Nebraska is used as a cut through between thoroughfares of Knoxville and Prospect
- Utility Poles in middle of the sidewalk, which results in non-ADA compliance
- Cross ramps could be added at intersection (in NS direction) for further ADA compliance
- Sidewalks are generally narrow; they widen from Atlantic to Prospect, but more cracking is present

Sections:
- Sidewalks: Not ADA compliant, utility poles along entire route
- Crossings: Prospect and Nebraska doesn’t have pedestrian crossings
- Safety: Speeding, blind spots on alleyways and driveways
- Comfort and Appeal: Too much trash, no landscaping

Overall Ratings:
- Crossing the Street (Intersections) → Fair (2 points)
- Sidewalks → Poor (1 point)
- Driver Behavior → Fair (2 points)
- Safety → Poor (1 point)
- Comfort and Appeal → Fair (2 points)

Totals: 8 points (out of 20)
Appendix 1

Route 6

Route Profile:
This route is limited in its pedestrian facilities. The sidewalk network is incomplete and fragmented, with missing segments, and broken and narrow sidewalks. Drivers appeared to be speeding in the area, and the group did not observe any speed limit signs along the route. Additionally, drivers did not yield to pedestrians and did not stop behind the crosswalk. The participants observed too much trash and litter, and not enough trash receptacles. The street could benefit from shade trees, and the landscaping could use improvements. Overall, there was “beautiful street tree cover on Nebraska”.

Top Walkability Issues Identified:

- No speed limits
- No sidewalks or bad sidewalks
- Appearance- trash in the streets
- Bad lighting
- Not a lot of trees

Overall Ratings:
- Crossing the Street (Intersections) → Fair (2 points)
- Sidewalks → Fair (2 points)
- Driver Behavior → Poor (1 point)
- Safety → Fair (2 points)
- Comfort and Appeal → Fair (2 points)

Totals: 9 points
Appendix 2

The following are the notes taken at the PTO Meeting on March 3rd, 2015. The first section is feedback from our identified concerns where participants added to the list. The second section identifies needs, and the third section participants shared their vision for continuing SRTS.

Identified problems/ concerns:

- Trash (esp. in playground) including broken bottles, used contraceptives, and syringes
- Street harassment
- Kids fighting and no one intervening
- Not enough police presence
- Speeding on Wisconsin and Indiana (not enough stop signs around the school - Republic from Wisconsin to Central, Delaware and Republic)
- People in the community
  - Shootings/ robberies
  - Fights
- Biggest fear: crossing Prospect
- Cars park in the middle of the street
- Need more crossing guards
- Need slow down for school signage
- Need school speed limit signage
- People need to shovel sidewalks
- Blocked sidewalks

Needs:

- Durable trash cans
- Hawk Signal
- More stop signs
- Kids at play signs
- School speed limit signs
- More lighting
- Police presence esp during school start and end times

Vision:

- Parent involvement
- Adult involvement
- School responsible for transportation to/from
- Feel safer walking and biking to school
- Cleaner neighborhood/ less trash
- Community pride
- Neighborhood watch
- Better infrastructure

Additional Comments

- Use Frye Ave to get to Zoo, safer but still not safe
- Sometimes crossing guards are scared of traffic/ unable to stop traffic

Possible Funding/Partnerships for SRTS Chapter in East Bluff:

- City Link
- bike Peoria
- CDBG
- OSF
- Hult Center for Healthy Living
- Methodist Hospital
Appendix 3

The SRTS Teacher Tally sheet was handed out to all teachers on March 7th, to be conducted March 8th-10th. The results were collected and sent to the author.

---

**Safe Routes to School Students Arrival and Departure Tally Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL LETTERS ONLY – BLUE OR BLACK INK ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name:</th>
<th>Teacher’s First Name:</th>
<th>Teacher’s Last Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade: (PK,K,1,2,3...)</th>
<th>Monday’s Date (Week count was conducted)</th>
<th>Number of Students Enrolled in Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M M D D Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please conduct these counts on two of the following three days Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. (Three days would provide better data if counted)
- Please do not conduct these counts on Mondays or Fridays.
- Before asking your students to raise their hands, please read through all possible answer choices so they will know their choices. Each Student may only answer once.
- Ask your students as a group the question "How did you arrive at school today?"
- Then, re-read each answer choice and record the number of students that raised their hands for each. Place just one character or number in each box.
- Follow the same procedure for the question "How do you plan to leave for home after school?"
- You can conduct the counts once per day but during the count please ask students both the school arrival and departure questions.
- Please conduct this count regardless of weather conditions (i.e., ask these questions on rainy days, too).

**Step 1.** Fill in the weather conditions and number of students in each class

**Step 2.** AM – “How did you arrive at school today?” Record the number of hands for each answer.

PM – “How do you plan to leave for home after school?” Record the number of hands for each answer.

**Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Student Tally</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S = sunny</td>
<td>Number in class when count made</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Only with children from your family</td>
<td>Riding with children from other families</td>
<td>City bus, subway, etc.</td>
<td>Skate-board, scooter, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R = rainy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O = overcast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN = snow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sample AM
  - S N 2 0 2 3 8 3 3 3 1

- Sample PM
  - R 1 9 3 3 8 1 2 2

- Tues. AM
  -

- Tues. PM
  -

- Wed. AM
  -

- Wed. PM
  -

- Thurs. AM
  -

- Thurs. PM
  -

Please list any disruptions to these counts or any unusual travel conditions to/from the school on the days of the tally.
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This SRTS Parent Survey was handed out the week of the Teacher Tallies, and were collected and sent to the author.

Parent Survey About Walking and Biking to School

**Dear Parent or Caregiver,**

Your child’s school wants to learn your thoughts about children walking and biking to school. This survey will take about 5 - 10 minutes to complete. We ask that each family complete only one survey per school your children attend. If more than one child from a school brings a survey home, please fill out the survey for the child with the next birthday from today’s date.

After you have completed this survey, send it back to the school with your child or give it to the teacher. Your responses will be kept confidential and neither your name nor your child’s name will be associated with any results.

Thank you for participating in this survey!

**+ CAPITAL LETTERS ONLY – BLUE OR BLACK INK ONLY +**

School Name: 

1. What is the grade of the child who brought home this survey? [ ] Grade (PK,K,1,2,3...) 

2. Is the child who brought home this survey male or female? 
   [ ] Male  [ ] Female

3. How many children do you have in Kindergarten through 8th grade? [ ]

4. What is the street intersection nearest your home? (Provide the names of two intersecting streets) 

   [ ] and [ ]

   Place a clear ‘X’ inside box. If you make a mistake, fill the entire box, and then mark the correct box.

5. How far does your child live from school? 
   [ ] Less than ¼ mile  [ ] ½ mile up to 1 mile  [ ] More than 2 miles 
   [ ] ¼ mile up to ½ mile  [ ] 1 mile up to 2 miles  [ ] Don’t know

   Place a clear ‘X’ inside box. If you make a mistake, fill the entire box, and then mark the correct box.

6. On most days, how does your child arrive and leave for school? (Select one choice per column, mark box with X)

   **Arrive at school**
   [ ] Walk  [ ] Bike  [ ] School Bus
   [ ] Family vehicle (only children in your family)  [ ] Carpool (Children from other families)
   [ ] Transit (city bus, subway, etc.)  [ ] Other (skateboard, scooter, inline skates, etc.)

   **Leave from school**
   [ ] Walk  [ ] Bike  [ ] School Bus
   [ ] Family vehicle (only children in your family)  [ ] Carpool (Children from other families)
   [ ] Transit (city bus, subway, etc.)  [ ] Other (skateboard, scooter, inline skates, etc.)

   + Place a clear ‘X’ inside box. If you make a mistake, fill the entire box, and then mark the correct box.

7. How long does it normally take your child to get to/from school? (Select one choice per column, mark box with X)

   **Travel time to school**
   [ ] Less than 5 minutes  [ ] 5 – 10 minutes  [ ] 11 – 20 minutes
   [ ] More than 20 minutes  [ ] Don’t know / Not sure

   **Travel time from school**
   [ ] Less than 5 minutes  [ ] 5 – 10 minutes  [ ] 11 – 20 minutes
   [ ] More than 20 minutes  [ ] Don’t know / Not sure

   +
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8. Has your child asked you for permission to walk or bike to/from school in the last year?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

9. At what grade would you allow your child to walk or bike to/from school without an adult?  
(Select a grade between PK, K, 1, 2, 3, ...)  ☐ grade (or) ☐ I would not feel comfortable at any grade

10. What of the following issues affected your decision to allow, or not allow, your child to walk or bike to/from school? (Select ALL that apply)  
☐ Distance  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Not Sure  ☐ Not Sure

11. Would you probably let your child walk or bike to/from school if this problem were changed or improved? (Select one choice per line, mark box with X)  
☐ My child already walks or bikes to/from school

12. In your opinion, how much does your child’s school encourage or discourage walking and biking to/from school?  
☐ Strongly Encourages ☐ Encourages ☐ Neither ☐ Discourages ☐ Strongly Discourages

13. How much fun is walking or biking to/from school for your child?  
☐ Very Fun ☐ Fun ☐ Neutral ☐ Boring ☐ Very Boring

14. How healthy is walking or biking to/from school for your child?  
☐ Very Healthy ☐ Healthy ☐ Neutral ☐ Unhealthy ☐ Very Unhealthy

15. What is the highest grade or year of school you completed?  
☐ Grades 1 through 8 (Elementary) ☐ College 1 to 3 years (Some college or technical school)

☐ Grades 9 through 11 (Some high school) ☐ College 4 years or more (College graduate)

☐ Grade 12 or GED (High school graduate) ☐ Prefer not to answer

16. Please provide any additional comments below.

[Blank space for comments]
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The SRTS Teacher Tallies were sent into the National Safe Routes to School Data Center, and the results are compiled below.

Student Travel Tally Report: One School in One Data Collection Period

School Name: Glen Oak Community Learning School
School Group: City of Peoria
School Enrollment: 0
% of Students reached by SRTS activities: Don't Know
Number of Classrooms Included in Report: 32

Set ID: 19854
Month and Year Collected: March 2016
Date Report Generated: 04/01/2016
Tags:

This report contains information from your school's classrooms about students' trip to and from school. The data used in this report were collected using the in-class Student Travel Tally questionnaire from the National Center for Safe Routes to School.

Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Afternoon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Vehicle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
### Morning and Afternoon Travel Mode Comparison by Day

#### Tuesday AM
- Walk: 38%
- Bike: 0%
- School Bus: 21%
- Family Vehicle: 35%
- Carpool: 5%
- Transit: 2%
- Other: 0.3%

#### Tuesday PM
- Walk: 46%
- Bike: 0%
- School Bus: 20%
- Family Vehicle: 30%
- Carpool: 4%
- Transit: 0.3%
- Other: 0.3%

#### Wednesday AM
- Walk: 34%
- Bike: 0%
- School Bus: 21%
- Family Vehicle: 38%
- Carpool: 5%
- Transit: 0.7%
- Other: 0%

#### Wednesday PM
- Walk: 42%
- Bike: 0%
- School Bus: 21%
- Family Vehicle: 31%
- Carpool: 5%
- Transit: 0.3%
- Other: 0.2%

#### Thursday AM
- Walk: 38%
- Bike: 0%
- School Bus: 21%
- Family Vehicle: 35%
- Carpool: 5%
- Transit: 0.5%
- Other: 0%

#### Thursday PM
- Walk: 45%
- Bike: 0%
- School Bus: 21%
- Family Vehicle: 31%
- Carpool: 3%
- Transit: 0.7%
- Other: 0%

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
Travel Mode by Weather Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather Condition</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Family Vehicle</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunny</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
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Complete Streets Audits

The Complete Streets Audit tool, conducted on Friday November 6th, 2015 by Emily Weimer and Research Assistant Rachael Wilson, was designed by Wilson. The Audit tool was adapted from the Built Environment Assessment tool, the Complete Streets Road Design Audit tool, and the PEDS walkability tool. The audits were conducted by both parties, and the results were written up by Wilson. The Complete Streets Assessment Tool is outlined.

Built Environment/ Complete Streets Assessment Tool

This tool is informed by the Built Environment Assessment tool, the Complete Streets Road Design Audit tool, and the PEDS walkability tool. This tool should be used to assess the ability of streets/corridors to support safe use by cyclists and pedestrians.

Methodology:

This tool uses scoring methodology developed by the League of American Bicyclists for the Complete Streets Audit. It is based on a 100-point scale, with the following gradations: A = 80-100, B = 60-79, C = 40-59, D = 20-39, F = 0-19. Sum the results from the sections below, including pedestrian accommodations along the road, bicycle accommodations along the road, road crossings, and accessibility of nearby amenities to get the overall grade for the street section being audited.

Before you begin:

Before you start the actual audit, use Google maps to get a sense of the area, this will make the audit easier.

Make sure to take pictures of the area as you audit. Document anything that stands out to you as particularly positive or negative about the street section or corridor.

Date and time of audit: November 7th, 2015 2:00 pm

Define the corridor: McClure Avenue from Wisconsin Avenue to the path that connects to the zoo right after Prospect Road

Number of crossings on the street: 7

Posted speed limit along the road (if any): 30

Road Classification: (ex. Major Arterial, Collector, Local Street): Minor Arterial
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Section one: Pedestrian accommodations along the road: 24 out of 40

- 20 points if sidewalks are on both sides
- 10 points if sidewalk is on the majority of both sides, but there are sections without sidewalk
- 5 points of sidewalk is only on one side
- 0 points if no sidewalk and move to the next section
20 pts.

Remaining 20 points

- Buffer between sidewalk and road: 2 points if on both sides, 1 point if on one side.
  1 pts.
- Crosswalks at crossing along the road: 1 point, if high visibility, 2 points
  0 pts.
- Sidewalk wider than four feet: 1 point
  ½ pts.
- Curb cuts at crossings: 1 point
  ½ pts.
- Traffic lights OR stop signs, depending on the business of road: 4 points, deduct if there is no pedestrian signal accompanying the traffic lights or if pedestrian signals are not audible.
  3.5 pts.
- ADA compliant crossings along road (ADA compliant crossings are on a slope of 8.3% or less, and have no broken areas in the path or easily passable broken areas): 2 points
  ½ pts.
- Pedestrian crossing aids along the section (such as curb extensions, signage, median/traffic island): up to 3 points depending on what you see
  1 pts.
- Buildings along corridor are well-maintained: 1 point
  1 pts.
- Sufficient lighting along sidewalk: 1 point
  1 pts.
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- Pleasant landscape features such as trees: 1 point 1 pts.
- Transit stops or visible transit activity: 1 point 0 pts.

Deduct points if…

- Majority of sidewalk is in poor condition…….5
- You observe long medium/high volume driveways or driveways that are at street-level rather than pedestrian level…3
- You observe speeding……………2
- Push buttons for pedestrian signals are not conveniently located: 1 point
6 pts. deducted

Section two: Bicycle accommodations along the road: 0 out of 35
Conduct a Bicycle Level of Service audit and record the grade. For a grade of A, award 35 points. For a grade of B, award 30 points. For a grade of C, award 25 points. Do not award points of any grade D or lower.

Information needed for BLOS:
http://rideillinois.org/blos/blosform.htm

BLOS example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Through lanes per direction: (Default = 1):1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of outside lane, to outside stripe, in ft: (Default = 12):12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved shoulder, bike lane, OR marked parking area - outside lane stripe to pavement edge, in ft: (Def=0):0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-directional Traffic Volume in ADT: this can be found here(Default = 4000): 3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted speed limit in mph: (Default = 30): 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Percentage of heavy vehicles (this can be found here...): (Default = 2): 2 |
| FHWA's pavement condition rating: (5 = Best, 1 = Worst; Default = 4): 3 |
| Percentage of road segment with occupied on-street parking: (Default = 0): 5 |

### Section Three: Road crossing accommodations: 4 out of 15

- Crosswalks: 2 points, highly visible crosswalks: 3 points 0 pts.
- Pedestrian crossing aids along the section (such as curb extensions, signage, median/traffic island): up to 2 points depending on what you see. 0 pts.
- Curb cuts: 3 points 1 pts.
- Traffic lights OR stop signs, depending on the business of road: 4 points, deduct if there is no pedestrian signal accompanying the traffic lights or if pedestrian signals are not audible, or if push buttons are not conveniently located. 2 pts.
- ADA compliant crossings along road (ADA compliant crossings are on a slope of 8.3% or less, and have no broken areas or easily passable broken areas): 3 points 1 pts.

### Section four: Nearby amenities and accessibility __ out of 10

List any amenities such as grocery stores, libraries, health centers or schools near (around ¼ mile) the area you audited. Note if they are easily accessible from the street by walking or biking. For example, a grocery store that must be accessed by walking through a parking lot is not easily accessible. Sidewalk in poor condition also limits accessibility. The point system for this section is more arbitrary than in the last sections. Start off with ten points. If there is a lack in amenities along the street, do not award any
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points. If there are amenities, but the majority of them are not accessible by walking and biking, award five points. If the majority of the amenities are accessible by walking or biking, award the full ten points.

Amenities off the street or nearby

1. The Chef and the Baker - 1122 E McClure Ave
2. Glen Oak Park
3. Glen Oak Learning Center - 2100 N Wisconsin Ave
4. Wisconsin Avenue Commercial Corridor
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Three Complete Street Audits were conducted on Friday, November 6th, 2015, by Emily Weimer and Rachael Wilson. The results were written up by Wilson and included below.

Complete Streets Audit of McClure Avenue between Wisconsin Avenue and the Glen Oak Park path leading to the Peoria Zoo

Summary:
Pedestrian accommodations along the road........24 out of 40
Bicycle accommodations along the road............. 0 out of 35
Road crossing accommodations..........................4 out of 15
Nearby Amenities.............................................5 out of 10
TOTAL.......................................................... 33 out of 100 --- D

A=80-100, B=60-79, C=40-59, D=20-39, F=0-19

Context of Audited Section:
The section of McClure from Wisconsin Avenue to Prospect Road provides connectivity from the Wisconsin Avenue commercial corridor and the Glen Oak Learning Center to the Glen Oak Park; all are major assets for the East Bluff community. These facilities should be able to be accessed by people using all forms of transportation, not just by drivers. Because most roads are built primarily for cars, a detailed audit of this section is necessary to identify impediments to bicycle and pedestrian travel along this section. This section road has a low ADT, which makes travel safer for pedestrians and bikers. However, impediments to walkability and bikeability were identified in this audit and will be described in the sections below.

Section one: Pedestrian accommodations along the road: 24 out of 40

FHWA sidewalk and pedestrian guidelines state that a minor arterial roadway requires sidewalks on both sides. This section of McClure meets this requirement. However, the sidewalk is cracked or broken in many places along this section, which creates tripping hazards and impedes wheelchair travel. Some of the curbs also have broken areas that are difficult for wheelchair passage. Additionally, alleys that cut into McClure are not even with the sidewalk and create the same problem. Storm water grates at
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crossings along this section also present a major obstacle for wheelchair travel because the wheels can get caught in the large grate openings parallel to the street. There is an adequate grass buffer (approximately 5 feet) along the north side of this section. The south side buffer is about a foot long. Stop signs are in place for cars crossing or turning or crossing at McClure, but crosswalks need to be implemented at all intersections. Some sections of the road are in disrepair at crossings along this section, which creates an obstacle for pedestrians. Curb cuts and a wider sidewalk are needed at the northeast corner of intersection of Atlantic and McClure. Additionally, the pathway that leads to the park and zoo after crossing at McClure and Prospect needs to be fitted with sidewalks. An abandoned gas station at the crossing on Prospect and McClure detracted from the walk.

Pedestrian-friendly features along this section include pedestrian scale lighting and numerous trees. Homes along this section are also generally well maintained. The slow speed of traffic and the adequate separation of vehicles and pedestrians make walking along this section safer and generally more enjoyable than walking down Prospect Road.

Section two: Bicycle accommodations along the road: 0 out of 35

This section of McClure Avenue has a BLOS score of D. Because of this, no points are awarded. This section has one lane per direction, an outside lane width of approximately 12 feet, no bike infrastructure, an ADT of 3050 and a speed limit of 30 mph. The street pavement is generally in adequate condition, but there are spots along this section in disrepair. There were a few cars parked along McClure on the day of the audit.

The Peoria Bicycle Master Plan designates McClure avenue as fit for use by “enthused and confident” cyclists. The ADT of 3050 makes this road safer for bicycle travel, but the road is in disrepair in some sections, which creates a hazard for cyclists. The current Bicycle Master Plan does not recommend adding any bicycle centered features on this street, however, adding shared use markings would be an easy and beneficial addition to connect McClure to the larger bicycle network proposed in the plan. Removing on street parking and adding bike lanes would be the
ideal choice to encourage a wider range of bicyclists to use this section for travel.

**Section Three:** Road crossing accommodations: 4 out of 15

Curb cuts and crosswalks are needed at all crossings along this section of McClure except for the crossings at Wisconsin and Prospect. Trying to cross the road at any other intersection along this section with a wheelchair is not possible due to the lack of curb cuts. There are many challenges for pedestrians at the intersection of McClure and Prospect. This crossing is unnecessarily large and complicated. This crossing is important because it provides access to the Glen Oak Park. Pedestrians looking to cross Prospect at the south side of McClure at this intersection must cross to the north side and then cross Prospect. Pedestrians wishing to access the sidewalk on the southeast corner of Prospect from McClure avenue must walk south to Archer avenue and cross there.

**Section four:** Nearby amenities and accessibility: 5 out of 10

This section of McClure provides access to previously discussed amenities such as the Glen Oak Learning Center, the Wisconsin Avenue commercial corridor, and the Glen Oak Park. It also provides access to The Chef and the Baker, a popular restaurant in East Bluff. Because of the walkability and bikeability issues discussed in the previous sections, and especially because of the intimidating crossing at McClure and Prospect that leads right to the park, 5 points are awarded.
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McClure Avenue Photo Gallery

Cracked sidewalk along McClure Avenue

Intersection of McClure and Maryland

Road in disrepair at intersection of McClure and Central
Appendix 6

McClure Avenue Photo Gallery

Hazardous grate

Push button and bike route sign at McClure and Prospect

Hazardous grate at McClure and Prospect
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McClure Avenue Photo Gallery

Uneven sidewalk

Intersection of McClure and Prospect
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McClure Avenue Photo Gallery

Intersection of McClure and Prospect
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McClure Avenue Photo Gallery

Intersection of McClure and Prospect

Entering Glen Oak Park from McClure
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McClure Avenue Photo Gallery

No sidewalks at Glen Oak Park Entrance
### Complete Streets Audit of Prospect Road between Nebraska Ave and Arcadia Ave

**Summary:**
- Pedestrian accommodations along the road .............. 6.5 out of 40
- Bicycle accommodations along the road ................. 0 out of 35
- Road crossing accommodations ........................... 3.5 out of 15
- Nearby Amenities ........................................... 3 out of 10
- **TOTAL .......................................................... 13 out of 100 --- F**

A=80-100, B=60-79, C=40-59, D=20-39, F=0-19

### Context of Audited Section:

Prospect Road is an important minor arterial roadway in the East Bluff neighborhood of Peoria. This road separates East Bluff from Glen Oak Park, a major health asset for the community. A detailed audit of Prospect road is necessary because exposure to this road is essentially unavoidable for pedestrians and bikers who wish to access the park coming from the west. Access to this park has important implications for the health of the neighborhood. Parks and green space provide a multitude of health benefits including improved physical activity and mental health, improved air quality, and increased opportunities for social activity. The Peoria Bicycle Master Plan has prioritized the implementation of buffered bike lanes along Prospect Road and has identified the road as a candidate for a road diet. These are much needed improvements. While the Bicycle Master Plan lays out improvements for bicycling along Prospect, major issues with walkability need to be addressed in order to transform Prospect into a “complete street.” This report presents conditions related to walkability and bikeability along Prospect in order to complement the initiatives already laid out in the Bike Connectivity Master Plan.
Details:

**Section one:** Pedestrian accommodations along the road: 6.5 out of 40.

FHWA sidewalk and pedestrian guidelines state that a minor arterial roadway requires sidewalks on both sides. The audited section of Prospect between Nebraska and Arcadia does not meet this guideline because there is a gap in the sidewalk on the east side of the street from Nebraska to Hillcrest. The sidewalk also essentially disappears in the parking lot on the northeast corner of Prospect and Frye. In general, sidewalks along this stretch of road are in poor condition with many cracks, and in some areas, the curb completely disappears. This leaves no barrier between the sidewalk and the street, which creates a hazard for pedestrians. There is also a lack of grass buffers along this section. Buffers are needed to separate cars from pedestrians. Many of the curb cuts along this section have broken areas that would not be easily passable by someone in a wheelchair. Additionally, telephone poles and fire hydrants are placed along the sidewalk, creating narrow passages that wheelchairs are not able to fit through. Furthermore, the lighting along this section of street is not oriented toward pedestrians, and pedestrian signage at the intersection of Freye and Prospect is not placed at pedestrian level. Stop signs for cars crossing Prospect Road are located along Nebraska, Kansas/Hillcrest, and Republic; however, there are no crosswalks to accompany them. There is no stop sign for cars turning on Prospect at the intersection with Arcadia. Traffic lights with pedestrian signals and crosswalks are present at the intersection of Frye and Prospect, but the push buttons are inconveniently placed. Prospect Road is also very wide (approx. 16 feet) which encourages high amounts of speeding. Some buildings along this section are vacant and/or could use maintenance; there is a general feeling of disrepair. The fast-moving traffic, the lack of buffers, and the disappearing curb along this section of street create an unsafe and unwelcoming situation for pedestrians. There is good tree cover all along this section, as well as evidence of transit use. However, the lack of separation between the sidewalk
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and the street creates an uncomfortable and unsafe situation for people waiting for the bus.

**Section two:** Bicycle accommodations along the road: 0 out of 35

This section of street is desperately in need of bicycle accommodations, but none are currently in place. However, the Peoria Bicycle Master Plan recommends that buffered bike lanes be added along the street from Glen Avenue to Nebraska Street. This improvement is listed as “high priority” in the plan. There is one lane per direction with a center turn lane along this section, and the lanes are approximately 16 feet wide. The ADT is 7550, and there is a dearth of street parking. The unnecessary parking space and over-wide roads along this section could easily be adapted as a 5-6 foot bike lane. Installation of side paths is not an option in this situation, due to the close proximity of buildings to the street.

**Section Three:** Road crossing accommodations 3.5 out of 15

Crossing Prospect road at any intersection other than Frye or Arcadia is dangerous for pedestrians. There is a lack of stoplights or stop signs along Prospect at Nebraska, Kansas/Hillcrest, and Republic. Curb cuts at these intersections are not consistent, and many that do exist have broken areas that do not allow for easy passage by a wheelchair. There are no curb extensions to ease crossing anywhere along this section. Although there is a stoplight with a pedestrian signal at Prospect and Frye, the push button is not conveniently located and would be difficult for someone with a disability to access. This intersection is marked by a faded crosswalk on the south, east and west sides of this intersection. There is a pedestrian crosswalk at Arcadia and Prospect, but it presents a hazardous crossing situation for pedestrians because the yield signs are placed too far north and south of the actual crosswalk. It is very possible that this distance between the signs and the crosswalk could cause a driver to miss the connection between the crosswalk and the yield signs. This crosswalk is currently marked with standard striping, but it should be marked in a more visible way (e.x. with zebra or ladder striping) to ensure that fast moving cars will notice it. In general, crossings along Prospect
could be improved by adding crosswalks, curb cuts, and stop signs at one or more of the previously identified intersections that lack these features. Because the only intersection with a stoplight and pedestrian signal north of Nevada is located at Prospect and Frye, pedestrians walking along Prospect may risk crossing at the more dangerous intersections south of Frye identified in the audit rather than take the time to walk all the way up to Frye. The dangerous crossings along this section of Prospect present a major challenge for pedestrians or bikers attempting to access Glen Oak park from the west.

**Section four: Nearby amenities and accessibility 3 out of 10**

Prospect is located near Glen Oak Learning Center and the Glen Oak Park, both important neighborhood resources. Pedestrians and those confident enough to bike must face many challenges along this section of road, which limits accessibility to these amenities. As mentioned before, some commercial buildings at Prospect and Frye are vacant or in disrepair, which detracts from the pedestrian walking experience. The food market does not provide many healthy options and is not immediately accessible from the sidewalk.
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Prospect Road Photo Gallery

Van blocking the sidewalk just north of Nebraska

Curbless sidewalk

Sidewalk ends at Hillcrest and Prospect

No curb cuts and broken sidewalk at Prospect and Kansas
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Prospect Road Photo Gallery

A telephone pole blocks the sidewalk along Prospect

Curbless sidewalk

Pedestrian sign above pedestrian eye level at Prospect and Frye

A telephone pole blocks the sidewalk at Prospect and Frye
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Prospect Road Photo Gallery

Inconveniently placed push button at Prospect and Frye

Obstructed sidewalk

Broken, curbless sidewalk
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### Prospect Road Photo Gallery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Path leading to Glen Oak Park from Arcadia Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Crosswalk at Arcadia Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Slanted driveway just south of Arcadia Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Sidewalk in disrepair along Prospect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prospect Road Photo Gallery

Broken sidewalk blocked by telephone pole

Fire hydrant blocks the sidewalk at Prospect and Kansas
Prospect Road Photo Gallery

Vacant businesses at the northeast corner of Prospect and Frye
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Prospect Road Photo Gallery

Faded crosswalk at Prospect and Frye

Convenience store at the southeast corner of Prospect and Frye
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Complete Streets Audit of Virginia Avenue between Wisconsin Avenue and Prospect Road

Summary:
Pedestrian accommodations along the road............23.5 out of 40
Bicycle accommodations along the road..................25 out of 35
Road crossing accommodations................................4 out of 15
Nearby Amenities................................................3 out of 10
TOTAL..........................................................55.5 out of 100 --- C
A=80-100, B=60-79, C=40-59, D=20-39, F=0-19

Context of Audited Section:
Virginia Avenue is a local street in the East Bluff neighborhood of Peoria, Illinois. It provides a possible route to the Glen Oak Park. Identifying the completeness of this street is important because community members living in the adjacent homes may use it to access the park.

Section one: Pedestrian accommodations along the road 23.5 out of 40

This section of Virginia has sidewalks on both sides, so an initial 20 points is awarded. Curb cuts are lacking going along this street at Virginia and Maryland. There are also large storm drains at the crossings along Maryland. The sidewalk thins out significantly at this intersection, creating an uncomfortable situation for pedestrians. The lack of curb cuts, stop signs or crosswalks going along the intersection of Prospect and Virginia presents a challenge for people trying to cross to access the Glen Oak Park.

Additionally, the break between the street and the sidewalk is too steep between Maryland and Atlantic Avenues. Driveways create breaks in the sidewalk, and in some places the sidewalk is in disrepair. Crosswalks are needed at all intersections, and pedestrian oriented lighting is lacking and should be installed. Stop signs are located along each intersection, but they should be at all corners of the intersecting streets to improve safety for pedestrians walking along this section. There are many shade trees along the sidewalk and the housing was diverse and interesting to view as the audit took place.
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Section two: Bicycle accommodations along the road: 25 out of 35

Because this section has a lower traffic volume, a BLOS score of C is awarded. Although this street can potentially accommodate a wider range of cyclists, sharrows should be added along this section to make cyclists feel more welcome and to make drivers aware of the possibility of cyclists on the road.

Section Three: Road crossing accommodations 4 out of 15

Crossing along this road is eased by stop signs; however, crosswalks need to be installed to accompany them. Curb cuts crossing at Maryland (where the sidewalk things significantly) are broken, and would be difficult to pass by wheelchair. Curb cuts for crossing are also needed at the intersection of Virginia Atlantic. The crossing at Wisconsin and Virginia is grown over with grass at the center of the curb cut on the northeast side, creating a possible obstacle for wheelchairs.

Section four: Nearby amenities and accessibility 3 out of 10

Unfortunately, crossing Prospect to access the Glen Oak Park is not safe due to the lack of curb cuts, stop signs or crosswalks at the intersection of Prospect and Virginia. Pedestrians looking to access the park must walk south to McClure and Prospect, which is also a difficult crossing. Because other amenities such as the Chef and the Baker and the Wisconsin Avenue Business Corridor are accessible from this section, three points are awarded.
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Virginia Avenue Photo Gallery

Hole in the road at Virginia and Prospect

Cracked sidewalk

Uneven sidewalk

Recreational use of Virginia Avenue
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Virginia Avenue Photo Gallery

Overgrown grass on sidewalk

Sidewalk thins at Virginia and Maryland

Unsafe sidewalk elevation
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Virginia Avenue Photo Gallery

Path to a home does not match up with sidewalk

Uneven driveway and sidewalk

Uneven concrete

Car blocks the sidewalk south of Wisconsin and Virginia