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## About site design group

Founded in 1990, site is an award-winning landscape architecture and urban design firm based in Chicago, Illinois. The firm is led by four principals, Ernest Wong, Robert Sit, Bradley McCauley, and Hana Ishikawa. As landscape architects, urban designers, planners, horticulturalists, architects, arborists, construction administrators, and creative thinkers, we are a staff of neary 40 diverse and innovative professionals. We are enlivened by our surroundings and strive to produce creative spaces that inspire, restore, and bring communities together.
site is often engaged to collaborate and coordinate efforts with other architects, engineers, and design professionals. Effective communication with the design team and client ensures successful coordination of projects from concept through construction. We transform complex design challenges into places that clearly reflect identity and are strong statements of beautiful and functional spaces.

As designers, creative thinkers, and engaged citizens, we understand the value of exterior environments that create a sense of place. Successful placemaking leads to the longterm care and use of these spaces by the public. At site this is our goal in all we do: create spaces that are well-loved and well-utilized by the communities they reside within.



#### Abstract

Hana Ishikawa, AIA, ASLA Affiliate Hana Ishikawa is the Design Principal at site, often leading the design process with complex, yet thoughtful ideas. Hana's projects, more than 100 of them throughout her tenure, have ranged from master planning of modern entertainment complexes, traditional commercial interiors, and historic streetscapes to contemporary urban parks. Constantly looking for visually enticing environments from the rigid structure of classical aesthetics to cutting-edge modern design, whether it is conceptual design or construction details, she enjoys merging innovation and logic into all aspects of design.




## Cassandra Rice, PLA, AICP, ASLA

Cassandra Rice is a landscape architect and planner at site whose work focuses on synthesizing environmental, economic, and cultural influences to create evidencebased, sustainable strategies for clients. Her work spans a variety of scales and project types-from parks, playgrounds, and plazas to design guidelines and strategic planning. She effectively guides her clients through the design and planning process from site analysis to ribbon cuttings, and she has worked with a number of her clients to secure grants and additional funding for implementation. Cassandra is passionate about participatory planning and design, and brings exciting and innovative public outreach strategies to her projects.


Richard Meagher, Project Designer
Richard Meagher is a project designer at site with a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture at Ball State University. He has a passion for designing spaces that are naturally and socially empathetic, and hopes to help create placemaking projects. He also hopes to engage the community by designing in a context-sensitive manner, with a respect for the context of the Chicagoland area.


## Paul Hsu, Student Intern

Paul (Wen-Po) Hsu, recently graduated with a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture from the University of Oregon. He is currently an intern at site. Despite being Taiwanese, Paul grew up on an island in Malaysia. On the island Borneo, known for its biodiverse beaches and rainforest, life was hot, humid, and without seasons.. He is passionate about improving people's lives through the design of urban spaces, with special interest in the relationships between buildings and outdoor spaces. He is seeking to create spatial sequences that provide experiences and this has been driven by his interest in the art of storytelling and animation.

## Program Overview

Tama is one of 10 communities selected to participate in the 2021 lowa's Living Roadways Community Visioning Program. The program, which selects communities through a competitive application process, provides professional planning and design assistance along transportation corridors to small lowa communities (populations of fewer than 10,000 ).

Goals for the Visioning Program include:

- Developing a conceptual plan and implementation strategies with local communities
- Enhancing the natural, cultural, and visual resources of communities
- Assisting local communities in using external funds as leverage for transportation corridor enhancement

Each visioning community works through a planning process consisting of four phases of concept development:

1. Program initiation
2. Needs assessment and goal setting
3. Development of a concept plan
4. Implementation and sustained action

Each visioning community is represented by a steering committee of local residents and stakeholders who take part in a series of meetings that are facilitated by field coordinators from Trees Forever. Iowa State University organizes design teams of professional landscape architects, design interns, and ISU faculty and staff. The program is sponsored by the lowa Department of Transportation.

## Community Goals

The Tama visioning committee identified a number of goals and priority areas during the visioning process, which are included below:

- Improving downtown Tama using wayfinding, on-street parking, and community projects.
- Connecting the Tama Rec Trail and Cherry Lake for improved community walkability.
- Re-thinking Oak Park to better accommodate residents and children.


## Capturing the Tama Vision

Based on the needs and desires of the local residents, as well as a detailed inventory of community resources, the design team developed a conceptual transportation enhancement plan. This plan, as well as the inventory information, is illustrated in the following set of presentation boards. These boards include the Program Overview, Bioregional Assessment, Transportation Assets and Barriers Assessment, Transportation Behavior and Needs Assessment, Hispanic Interview, Transportation Inventory and Analysis, Concept Overview, and Community Design Boards.


## Community Visioning

Tama and Toledo are two of 10 communities selected to participate int he 2021 lowa's Living
Roadways Community Visioning Program. The Community Visioning Program integrates Roadways Community Visioning Program. The Community Visioning Program integrates
landscape planning and design with sustainable action to empower community leaders and volunteers in making sound, meaningful decisions about the local landscape. Throughout the process, the committee identifies and investigates the physical and cultural dimensions of
landscape issues, sets goals for change, and develops implementation strategies for meeting
 Successful completion of the visioning process results in a transportation enhancement plan
and implementation strategies that empower communities to build meaningful townscapes, and implementation strategies that empower communities to build meaningful townscapes,
step by step, as resources become available.
Goals for the Visioning Program include:

- Develop conceptual plan and implementation strategies with local communities; Assist local communities in using external funds as leverage for transportation corridor
enhancement.
site design group
LA: Cassandra Rice, PLA, ASLA, Hana Ishikawa, AIA
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The two communities have worked together closely to identify common goals and formulate ideas
and solutions. Each community's steering committee also worked to identify goals and priority areas for each of their respective communities as well. The common goals identified during the visioning Create safe pedestrian routes between the two communities.
Implement traffic calming measures and signage for increased pedestrian and vehicular Balance pedestrian safety and traffic calming needs with regional truck and freight routes. Connect existing sidewalks to provide better connections between existing amenities such as the Tama-Toledo Water Park, STC High School and Elementary School, and both Tama and Priority areas identified for improvements include: Key US 63 Intersection Safety and Placemaking Improvements: High Street, 2nd Street, 17th - Placemaking Improvements: Oak Park, Downtown Tama, Downtown Toledo $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. Program Overview } & \text { 9e. Oak Park } \\ \text { 6a. Transportation Inventory-Tama } & \text { 10a. Broadway St + Lincoln Hwy } \\ \text { 6b. Transportation Inventory-Toledo } & \text { 10b. Connection Plans } \\ \text { 7. Feedback Summary } & \text { 10c. 2nd St + US } 63 \\ \text { 8a. Concept Overview } & \text { 10d. High St + US63 } \\ \text { 8b. Concept Detail } & \text { 10e. Downtown Toledo } \\ \text { 8c. South Tama Rec Trail } & \text { 11a. Plant Palette } \\ \text { 9a. Downtown Tama } & \text { 11b. Wayfinding + Identity } \\ \text { 9b. State St + US 63 } & \text { 12. Implementation Plan } \\ \text { 9c. Harding St + US 63 } & \\ \text { 9d. 17th St + US } 63 & \end{array}$


##  <br> Tama + Toledo <br> Program Overview

## Bioregional Assessment Historical Settlement Patterns

This board uses a map from A.T. Andreas' Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of lowa, 1875 overlaid with present-day town boundaries and water bodies. Published in 1875, Andreas' Atlas is an extraordinary resource showing the post-Civil War landscape of lowa, including settlement features (towns and villages, churches, schools, roads, railroads, etc.) and landscape features (water bodies, vegetated patches such as timber and swamp, and major topographic features). A high-quality scan of the Atlas has been arranged to correspond closely with present-day map, revealing major landscape changes as well as features that have persisted, such as railroad rights-of-way and in some cases remnant vegetation patches.

## Tama in Context

Compare the 1875 boundaries of your town to the current boundaries. How much has your town grown?

Compare the course of the rivers in 1875 to their current course. Are there major changes in alignment or location? Are there vegetation patches shown in the 1875 map still in existence?


## Historical Vegetation

The vegetation information shown here is derived from township maps made by the General Land Office (GLO) surveys beginning in 1836 through 1859. This information was digitized in 1996 as a resource for natural resource management and is useful "...for the study of long term ecological processes and as baseline data for the study of present day communities." ${ }^{1}$

The plant community names mapped by the GLO surveyors varied. The original terminology they used has been preserved in the original data, but we have renamed them on this map to reflect names used to describe contemporary vegetation communities.

Not all communities will have all vegetation types, because various conditions that affect vegetation-such as geology, wind exposure, seasonally high water or groundwater, and frequency of fire-differ from place to place. Early land surveyors mapped the following vegetation types, some of which may not be present in the vicinity of your community:

The vegetation types are defined ${ }^{1}$ :

1. Forest: Tree dominated, with a mostly closed canopy. Ground vegetation shade tolerant. developed under infrequent fire.
2. Wetland: Perennial, non-woody plants; water and fire dominated.
3. Prairie: Perennial non-woody plants; fire dominated.

[^0]

## Regional Watershed

A watershed is a defined area or ridge of land with a boundary that separates waters flowing to different rivers, creeks, or basins. Watershed boundaries show the extent of a drainage area flowing to a single outlet point and determine whether precipitation is directed into one watershed or an adjacent watershed.

It is important to note that there are multiple levels of watersheds; for instance, the lowa River watershed is composed of a dozen smaller watersheds, and the lowa River watershed is a sub-basin of the Mississippi River watershed.

Where a community is located in relation to its surrounding watershed(s) determines its capacity to manage regional watershed issues such as flooding. For example, a community located near the end of a watershed (close to the outlet point) will have little capacity to reduce the amount of water draining toward it from upland areas.


## Depth to Water Table

The water table is defined as the distance below the surface at which the ground is saturated with water. Depth to water table is represented as a range because it varies due to seasonal changes and precipitation volumes. For example, following spring snowmelt, an area with a depth to water table ranging from one foot to three feet is likely to be at or near one-foot depth.

The map shows how close to the surface groundwater can be. Pavement and foundations are affected by groundwater near the surface. Freezing and thawing and upward pressure of rising groundwater can cause cracks or "frost boils" in pavement. Foundations can be wet and require "dewatering," which can be expensive.

Where the value is less than zero feet, water can well up out of the ground. This causes localized flooding, even if there is no surface water draining to the area.


## Elevation and Flow

This map displays topographic differences in elevation using a combination of contour lines and the color gradient depicted in the legend. The high and low points have also been located. Note the relationship of your community to the surrounding elevation. Is it located in a valley or on high ground, or is it split between the two?

If your community lies within or near a floodplain or floodway, the map reflects these features. Not all communities will have these elements; if they are absent on this map, none are present.

Flood risk is correlated to low-lying land. This map shows your community's flood risk as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center. The map shows the two most important flood zones if present: the Base Flood and the Regulatory Floodway (consult legend). Base Flood is the zone having a 1\% chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year, also referred to as the "100-year floodplain." The Regulatory Floodway is the channel of a stream plus any adjacent floodplain areas that must be kept free of encroachment so that the $1 \%$ flood discharge can be accommodated without increasing the base flood elevation.


## Present-day Land Cover

The land-cover map depicts both natural and man-made land cover types with aerial imagery. The lowa DNR created 15 unique classes for this dataset to differentiate land covers. Refer to the legend for a breakdown of land-cover types within your community boundaries.

What do you observe about the dominant landcover types in your community?

Where is the tree canopy most concentrated?

Look at how much of your community consists of impervious surfaces (e.g., parking lots, roads, buildings) compared to the other surfaces (e.g, water, grass, and agriculture). What does this mean for surface-water movement?

Tree cover affects microclimate. Are places surrounded by canopy more pleasant in the summer? How do these places feel in the winter?

## Percent Land Cover Type




## Landscape Change Over Time

The map on this page shows how the landscape has changed over time, with an emphasis on vegetation and drainageways. ${ }^{1}$ The map is helpful for understanding how landscapes change and considering how these changes might affect how well the landscape works to support human and ecological needs.

Trees are invaluable. They clean the air, create shade, and cool the atmosphere. They intercept rainfall and consume groundwater, which helps mitigate stormwater runoff. Carefully chosen and placed trees provide communities identity and residents with a sense of home. In lowa, a prairie state, we increased tree cover to create shade and a sense of enclosure within rural towns. Lack of natural fires and burning has also generally increased tree cover along rivers and floodplains. Other areas of trees have diminished due to clearing for roads, agriculture, or other purposes.

What changes do you see to the tree canopy surrounding your community? Where has the tree canopy decreased? Where might the tree canopy have increased? Consider what changes to the landscape might have led to the increase or decrease of trees in the region (e.g., farming practices, community development, establishing homesteads and windbreaks, preservation of natural resources).

This map also shows current and historical stream and river corridors. Alterations to waterways such as channelization have been made to increase drainage, but can lead to increased erosion, sediment movement, and flooding where the straightened portion ends. Storm sewers also affect streams and waterways where outfalls drop urban runoff into the corridor, which can dramatically decrease water quality. How have streams and rivers changed? Do these changes appear to be man-made or natural?

[^1]

## Transportation Assets and Barriers Overview

Transportation is integral to small-town life and a vibrant economy. In the context of the Community Visioning Program, we recognize walking, biking, and driving as quintessential modes of travel to various destinations important to residents and visitors. Access to these destinations is crucial for many everyday activities-getting to work and school, participating in community events, and providing for basic needs such as food, health care, and healthy activity.

In this participatory assessment, we want to find out which factors and conditions affect transportation use in Tama, where these factors and conditions are most prevalent, and how they influence route and transportation choices locally. Because residents have the best knowledge of how Tama's transportation system works, we use focused, small-group conversations, mapping, and photos of the best and worst places taken by residents to understand local transportation.

## Different Users = Different Needs

To capture insights about transportation from a variety of perspectives, we invited Tama residents with different transportation needs to participate in focus groups. A total of 17 residents attended Tama's workshop. Participants were separated into five user groups and the Tama steering committee.


Actives


Mobility Impaired


Older Adults


Youth


Parents


Steering Committee

This user group represents those in the community who engage in outdoor recreation, including cycling, walking, running, swimming, skiing, etc. The availability of multiple venues for outdoor recreation matters to this group.

This user group is directly affected by accessibility barriers such as high curbing and uneven sidewalks that make it difficult to operate mobility-aiding equipment effectively. Handicapped parking, curb ramps, and smooth surfaces are critical transportation features.

Accessibility-both in terms of physical access and proximity-is a major concern for this user group. Because some people in this user group do not or are unable to drive, having goods and services within walking distance is important.

This group uses primarily non-motorized modes of transportation, so pedestrian- and bike-friendly streets and sidewalks are important. These users value the ability to get to destinations on foot or via bicycle and having goods and services within walking distance.

Safety of their children is a primary concern of this user group. Access to safe and easy routes to school activities is another significant factor to this group. Parents of young children desire smooth, wide surfaces for strollers.

The common denominator for this user group is that their observations are influenced by special knowledge of the transportation system acquired during the Community Visioning assessment process. As a result, this group is more representative of decision makers.


Residents appreciate the trail around Cherry Lake for its connections to nature, scenic views, and safety.


The smooth surface and curb ramps on E 5th Street allows easy access for bikers and walkers.


Pedestrians and cyclists enjoy the South Tama Recreation Trail for its nicely graded surface, scenic views, tree canopy and benches.


Heavy traffic and the lack of sidewalks and crosswalks make it difficult to get to the highschool on foot.


There are no sidewalks along State Street from Tama to Toledo. The narrow street is heavily used and feels unsafe for pedestrians and drivers.


The road connections to the school are narrow. Bus traffic and the lack of sidewalks creates an unsafe path for people walking to and from school.

## What People Said




Youth


## Emerging Themes

Discovering themes and consistencies among user groups helps the steering committee to identify solutions to address the needs of all. The chart on the opposite page displays each user group's collective thoughts on particular issues in comparison with the other user groups in the community.

Actives walk, bike, and drive to local destinations. This group enjoys using the South Tama Recreation Trail and walking at Toledo Heights Park for recreation and exercise. Actives desire additional walking, biking, and hiking paths throughout the community.

Mobility-challenged individuals use golf carts and drive to get around town. They appreciate smooth, wide walking surfaces and want a sidewalk stretching from the new retirement center to the business district, creating easier access for this group to walk to Dollar General, Hy-Vee, and the bank.

Older adults walk, drive, or bike to get to most destinations. They enjoy fishing at Cherry Lake. This user group appreciates watching the vegetation change through each season. Older adults want additional public transportation options that are easily accessible and more affordable in Tama.

Youth enjoy activities in town such as swimming at the pool, going to the library, and biking at Cherry Lake. During the winter months this group likes to go sledding at the old football field in Toledo.

Parents primarily walk and drive in town. This group enjoys going to Oak Park with their kids to use the playground and baseball diamonds. Parents want more sidewalks throughout town and better connections to Tama Park to improve safety.

Steering committee members bike, walk, and drive for transportation. They would like additional pedestrian crossings along Highway 63. They also want Cherry Lake to be better recognized throughout the community for bird watching and natural scenery.
User Types



## Transportation Behaviors and Needs Overview

The survey gives the visioning steering committee objective, representative information for the goal-setting phase of community visioning. The quantitative data collected from survey responses complements the qualitative information gathered from the focus groups at the transportation assets and barriers workshop.

The modes of transportation that residents use and the routes they take suggest suitable types of transportation enhancements in these areas. Having a sense for people's willingness to help either financially or with their time is important because many transportation enhancements are funded from multiple sources, including grants, private donations, in-kind contributions, and volunteers. Understanding what types of improvements are important to residents gives the committee insight into how to prioritize projects.

With assistance from lowa State University's Survey Research Services staff in the Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM-SRS), ISU visioning program staff conducted a survey to better understand the transportation patterns, behaviors, needs, and desires of Tama residents. Surveys were mailed to 280 randomly selected residents living in Tama and the surrounding area. To increase the response rate, the study was publicized through the local media and follow-up packets were mailed to nonrespondents. With adjustments for ineligible respondents (e.g., incorrect addresses, no longer living in the community), the final sample size was 252. A total of 67 people returned surveys, for a response rate of $26.6 \%$. (A response rate of $20 \%$ is considered valid.)

We asked survey recipients what routes they use most often for going to work, walking, and biking. In addition, we asked what qualities and features are important during these activities. We also discovered what residents think is most important in terms of transportation enhancements that address issues such as accessibility, mobility, and safety. Finally, we learned whether or not residents are willing to contribute their time or their financial resources to making enhancements to Tama. This series of boards summarizes the results of the survey as follows:

```
- Willingness to Help
- Enhancement Priorities
- Commuting Routes
- Walking Routes
- Biking Routes
- Regional Biking Routes
```


## How We Did

The demographics of the respondents are quite different from those obtained from the 2019 American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate and the World Population Review. For example, the survey respondents median age of 63 is nearly twice that of the 2019 estimated average age for Tama residents of 36 . In terms of gender, the percentage of female survey respondents is significantly higher than that of the census. Average household size of survey respondents is much lower than the 2019 estimate, as is the percentage of households with children among survey respondents compared to census data.


## How Tama Residents Travel

Most survey respondents drive to important destinations such as the convenience store, the post office, school, and church (89.6\%). More than $22 \%$ car pool or ride with someone else. Nine percent of participants indicated that they walk, $4.5 \%$ bike, and $1.5 \%$ use another form of transportation.

*Please note that some respondents indicated that they use more than one mode of transportation to get to work; therefore, percentages add up to more than 100\%.

## Willingness to Help



Of the survey participants who answered yes to this question, $50 \%$ are willing to contribute their time to community improvements, while $45 \%$ would contribute their time and money. Five percent of respondents indicated that they would be willing to contribute financially. Tama residents are comparable to other small towns in lowa in terms of willingness to become involved in improving their community. In 2014, on average, 43\% of residents in small, rural towns volunteered to help with a community project. ${ }^{1}$ Tama is only $1 \%$ below this average.

In 2014, the most common reason residents in small-town lowa said they didn't become involved in community projects is that no one asked them (34\%). Twenty-eight percent on average said that they don't have time, which is significantly lower than the 2004 average of $59 \%$. Sixteen percent indicated that they didn't know how to become involved, and $7 \%$ said that no community project needed volunteers. ${ }^{1}$ These results indicate that the best ways to get people involved in community projects is to simply ask, along with advertising opportunities through traditional and social media outlets.

[^2]
## Survey Participants Said...


> "[l] love the walk trail in Tama, [but] snow cover minimizes use during winter months."
> "[I] would like to see more assistance for the elderly, [and] better ways to get to the bike trails."

H.1.
> "[The] sidewalk system can be greatly improved, especially around and to schools, businesses."

## How Do You Get People to Help?

## Ask, Show, and Advertise Opportunities

In 2014, the most common reason residents in small-town lowa said they didn't become involved in community projects is that no one asked them (34\%). Twenty-eight percent on average said that they don't have time, which is significantly lower than the 2004 average of 59\%. Sixteen percent indicated that they didn't know how to become involved, and 7\% said that no community project needed volunteers. ${ }^{1}$ These results indicate that the best ways to get people involved in community projects is to simply ask, along with advertising opportunities through traditional and social media outlets.

[^3]
## Priorities

On a scale of 1 to 5 , with 5 being the most important, participants in Tama ranked better neighborhood streetscapes as most important, with a mean value of 3.96. Transportation enhancements that address pedestrian mobility, health, and safety are also considered important, such as creating safer routes to school (3.84), improving night use (3.79), and providing better pedestrian connections and creating more opportunities for physical activity (3.70 each). Other transportation enhancements that impact the quality of the built environment, such as enhanced seasonal beauty (3.69) and habitat for birds and pollinators (3.56) are also somewhat significant.

## Transportation Enhancement Issues

Pedestrian Mobility, Safety, and Health
Quality of the Built Environment


## Survey Participants Said...


> "I only bike on low-traveled streets and routes... Biking old 30 (Lincoln Hwy) to [the] Settlement and back is lovely, but extremely hazardous as there is no bike lane and it's a narrow blacktop. It would be wonderful if a bike lane could be made on that stretch of old 30..."
> "There [are] hardly any walkways in Tama and the sidewalks are in bad shape and a safety hazard for a disabled person. [l am] afraid of falling on bad sidewalks, and you have to walk on the highway."
> "...[the] temporary stop signs on 63 through Tama are short and not 'showy' enough to see until you come up on them."
> "Just because I no longer can walk any distance, I believe very strongly that walking is important. Our rec trail is excellent for this."


## Commuting Routes

This map shows the commuting routes identified by 22 survey respondents. The frequency that the routes are used is depicted by their width, with most frequently used routes being the thickest. The primary commuting corridor in Tama is Highway 63 from 13th Street north to US 30. Some people travel on US 30 Business, and some take the Lincoln Highway Historic Byway. East-west travel takes place mainly on 13th, 9th, and 5th Streets.
The circulation patterns that emerge when routes for biking, walking, and commuting are overlaid suggest suitable types of transportation enhancements. For example, where pedestrian and vehicular traffic intersect, such improvements could include creating better visibility, defining crossing points, or improving signage.

## Why They Go That Way

On a scale of 1 to 5 , with 5 being the most important, survey participants ranked the characteristics and features that factored into their choice of commuting route. Among Tama participants, time to destinations is the most important factor, with a mean value of 4.15. Other reasons (3.50) include visibility, road conditions, and avoiding trains are also significant factors. Avoiding weather-related issues such as snow and ice is considered somewhat important, with a mean value of 3.48 , followed by avoiding vehicular traffic (3.42). Scenic views, seasonal beauty, and avoiding neighborhoods are not critical factors in determining commuting routes.



## Walking Routes

This map shows the walking routes identified by 34 survey respondents. The frequency that the routes are used is depicted by their width, with most frequently used routes being the thickest. The Cherry Lake trail and the South Tama Recreation Trail, especially between the country club and the lake, are the most popular walking venues among survey participants. Streets near Cherry Lake and the rec trail, such as Siegel Street, are more heavily used than other city streets.

## Why They Go That Way

On a scale of 1 to 5 , with 5 being the most important, survey participants ranked the characteristics and features that made their walking experience better. These features are categorized as either "connections" or "conditions and elements." Among Tama participants, connections are roughly the same in importance as conditions/elements, with mean values of 3.46 and 3.45 , respectively. In terms of connections, access to trails is most important with a mean value of 4.08. In terms of conditions and elements, other factors (4.67)-such as low traffic, proximity to shopping or parks, and safety-are most important. Good sidewalks (4.08) are the next most important element to walkers, followed by seasonal beauty (3.89) and well-kept surroundings (3.81).



## Biking Routes

This map shows the biking routes identified by 13 survey respondents. The frequency that the routes are used is depicted by their width, with most frequently used routes being the thickest. Like walkers, cyclist most frequently use the South Tama Recreation Trail and the trail at Cherry Lake. People also bike on the Iowa Valley Scenic Byway (Highway 63) and west out of town on the Lincoln Highway Heritage Byway. Broadway and State Street are the primary north-south routes in town, and 13th Street, 9th Street, and 5th Street are the most frequently used east-west routes.

## Why They Go That Way

On a scale of 1 to 5 , with 5 being the most important, survey participants ranked the characteristics and features that made their biking experience better. These features are categorized as either "connections" or "conditions and elements." Among Tama participants, connections are significantly more important than conditions/elements, with mean values of 3.84 and 3.13 , respectively. In terms of connections, access to trails is most important with a mean value of 4.36 , followed by access to natural areas (4.27). In terms of conditions and elements, seasonal beauty is most important (4.27), followed by birds/ watchable wild life (4.09), and well-kept surroundings (3.91). Other factors (4.00)-including designated trails or paths and safety-are also significant.



## Regional Bike Routes

This map shows the out-of-town biking routes identified by 13 survey respondents. The frequency that the routes are used is depicted by their width, with most frequently used routes being the thickest. The most popular out-of-town biking route is east on the Lincoln Highway Heritage Byway into and beyond the Sac and Fox/Meskwaki Settlement. Some cyclists make a loop around the settlement. People also like to bike to the many natural areas in the region, including the West Salt Creek Wildlife Area in Vining, the Otter Creek Marsh State Wildlife Refuge, and the Izaac Walton Tract Recreation Area.

## Why They Go That Way

On a scale of 1 to 5 , with 5 being the most important, survey participants ranked the characteristics and features that made their out-of-town biking experience better. These features are categorized as either "connections" or "conditions and elements." Among Tama participants, connections are more important than conditions/elements, with mean values of 3.71 and 3.48 , respectively. In terms of connections, access to the route from one's neighborhood, access to the countryside, and access to natural areas are considered equally important, each with a mean value of 4.33. In terms of conditions and elements, other factors (5.00) -namely safety from vehicles-are most important, followed by little vehicular traffic (4.33), and route distance and seasonal beauty (4.00 each).



## Interview with Hispanic Residents

The Hispanic population in Tama and Toledo is significantly higher than that of the state of Iowa, which is only $6.3 \%$. In Tama and Toledo, $34.6 \%$ and $14.2 \%$, respectively, of the populations are Hispanic. $1^{1}$ The Tama and Toledo visioning committees recognized the importance of engaging with this substantial group of residents. To capture the transportation behaviors, needs, and desires of this demographic group, the ISU research team conducted an interview with two members of the Hispanic community, one from Tama and the other from Toledo. The interview was conducted via Zoom, and, like with the focus groups, the team annotated interviewees' comments on an aerial map.



Hispanic residents like to walk on the trail around Cherry Lake because it is safe and they enjoy the natural scenery.


Because many Hispanic residents do not drive, they have to walk to basic services, many of which are located along Highway 63.

[^4]
## Emerging Themes

## Desirable Qualities and Features

Members of the Hispanic community walk and bike for recreation. Safety is the primary factor affecting their choice of walking and biking routes. Hispanic residents like Toledo Heights Park because there is no traffic, the drive is paved, and the park layout allows parents to keep an eye on their kids. Interviewees also identified Cherry Lake and the South Tama Recreation Trail as both safe and scenic places to go. Tama and Toledo focus-group participants and survey respondents also value these recreation venues for similar reasons.

## Undesirable Qualities and Features

The absence of sidewalks and designated pedestrian crossings throughout Tama and Toledo is the most significant barrier to Hispanic residents in the two communities. Specifically, interviewees cited the Highway 63 corridor, from which people access Fareway and Dollar General in Toledo and the elementary and high schools in Tama, as particularly hazardous for pedestrians. One interviewee shared that they had seen parents pushing a stroller through the grass, trying to manage kids, and carrying groceries along Highway 63. Interviewees also talked about frequent car accidents at the entrance to the high school. Focus-group participants in both Tama and Toledo share this view, particularly parents and older adults.

## Desired Improvements

Hispanic residents would benefit most from additional sidewalks and controlled pedestrian crossings, according to interviewees. Specifically, they would like sidewalks along the Highway 63 corridor to provide better pedestrian access to the Toledo business district and the elementary and high schools in Tama. Interviewees also suggested several stoplights, primarily to make it safer for kids walking to school, including at the entrance to the high school, at 12th and Harding Street, 9th and State Street, and 5th and State Street. These suggestions are consistent with the priorities expressed by survey respondents, which include creating safer routes to school.

Interviewees said that a bus or taxi service would be beneficial to Hispanic residents, many of whom do not drive. Older-adult focus-group participants would also like some sort of public transportation.

Finally, Hispanic residents would like the South Tama Recreation Trail to be paved, a view expressed by participants in the Toledo parents and actives focus groups.

## Transportation Inventory and Analysis

Knowledge of the transportation systems in and around a community is critical for sustainable transportation enhancement planning. Tama's transportation system includes roadways, sidewalks, an active railroad and a multi-use trail.

The Tama visioning design team met with the local officials to identify existing, past, and future transportation system capital improvements, maintenance activities and issues, and other transportation-related constraints and opportunities in the area.

The design team met with local community members and officials to determine which factors and existing conditions would affect the implementation of proposed designs, as well as the strengths and liabilities of current transportation systems in Tama.

Tama officials were largely concerned with the jurisdictional, maintenance, and financial aspects of any proposed improvements and provided the design team with insights for potential existing funding sources. They also identified the limited existing streetscape guidelines and maintenance costs as transportation-related threats.

Tama residents cited incomplete sidewalk networks as transportation threats while praising the existing recreation opportunities such as Oak Park, Toledo Heights Park, the South Tama Recreation Trail, and the Cherry Lake Trail. However, pedestrian access to these recreation opportunities is limited, and the community feels strongly about providing a safe transportation network connecting these strengths.
-


## Community Concept Plan

Based on review of the bioregional assessment, feedback from survey respondents and focus group participants, and input from the Tama and Toledo Community Visioning steering committees, the design team proposed the following transportation improvement concepts:

- Traffic calming measures and signage for increased pedestrian and vehicular safety.
- Connect existing sidewalks to provide better connections between existing amenities such as the Tama-Toledo Water Park, STC High School and Elementary School, and both Tama and Toledo's downtown areas.
- Improving downtown Tama with better wayfinding, on-street parking, and community projects such as pocket parks and wall murals.
- Connecting the Tama Rec Trail and Cherry Lake.
- Rethinking Oak Park between State and McClellan Street to better accommodate residents and their children.
- Improving downtown Toledo with better wayfinding, pop-up outdoor spaces for businesses and activities, and increased on-street parking.
- Increasing access to existing amenities such as Toledo Heights Park and South Tama Recreational Trail.
- Improve existing sidewalks within the areas south of downtown Toledo.

These concepts seek to improve community identity, aesthetics, way-finding, and walkability throughout Tama and Toledo, addressing a range of community issues that were identified in the information gathering and analysis phase.

## Tama and Toledo Community Concept Plan

The two communities of Tama and Toledo have integrated transportation networks, and to address the issues facing both cities the design team decided to look at these systems as a whole rather than separately. Various improvement projects will require collaborative efforts between Tama and Toledo, and certain design concepts may technically be located within another town's borders but will affect the residents of both communities.


| CONCEPT 1 | CONCEPT 2 | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | POTENTIAL PARTNERS |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\$ 123,178$ | $\$ 1,563,848$ | Tama and Toledo | lowa DOT, South Tama Community School District, Local Artists |
| $\$ 1,321,820$ |  | Tama and Toledo | Tama County Parks |
| $\$ 42,775$ |  | Tama and Toledo | lowa DOT |
| $\$ 5,284,200$ |  | Tama and Toledo | lowa DOT |


| TAMA PROJECT |
| ---: |
| DOWNTOWN TAMA |
| STATE STREET AND US 63 |
| HARDING AND US 63 |
| OAK PARK |
| TAMA PROJECTS TOTAL |


| CONCEPT 1 | CONCEPT 2 | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | POTENTIAL PARTNERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$438,770 | \$841,653 | City of Tama | Local Business Owners, Local High School Students (art competition), Main Street USA |
| \$113,100 | \$82,900 | City of Tama | Iowa DOT, Casey General Store, South Tama Community School District, Local Artists |
| \$75,400 | \$85,057 | City of Tama | Iowa DOT, South Tama Community School District, Local Artists |
| \$1,405,520 |  | City of Tama | Tama County Parks, Local Business Owners, Lions / Kiwanis / Community Organizations |
| \$2,032,790 | \$1,009,610 |  |  |


| TOLEDO PROJECT |
| ---: |
| DOWNTOWN TOLEDO |
| 2ND STREET AND US 63 |
| HIGH STREET AND US 63 |
| TOLEDO HEIGHTS CONNECTION PLAN |
| (Segment A) |
| 2ND AND PROSPECT CONNECTION PLAN |
| (Segment D) |
| TOLEDO PROJECTS TOTAL |


| CONCEPT 1 | CONCEPT 2 | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | POTENTIAL PARTNERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$655,400 | \$799,516 | City of Toledo | Local Business Owners, Local High School Students (art competition), Main Street USA |
| \$98,159 |  | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, Local Businesses Owners/Banks, Artists |
| \$54,504 | \$70,174 | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, Downtown Business Owners, Cultural Institutions, Local Artists |
| \$361,485 |  | City of Toledo | Tama County Parks |
| \$237,075 |  | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, Downtown Business Owners, Senior/Assisted Living Institutions, Cultural Institutions, Local Artists |
| \$1,406,623 | \$869,690 |  |  |


| $\$ 10,211,386$ | $\$ 3,443,147$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Copyright © 2021 site design group, Itd.
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Proposed Trail Network + Project Sites


## Enhanced Pedestrian Network

The primary goals of the improved pedestrian network and enhanced connections include:

- Establish a functional, safe pedestrian network that links the two communities, their downtowns, the Tama-Toledo Aquatic Park, Oak Park, and STC High School;
- Establish a functional safe pedestrian network that provides residents and community members with limited mobility options (i.e. lack of car) to access basic goods and services;
- Selectively upgrade sidewalks, targeting portions with heavy use, evident mud/ ice issues, and conditions that limit accessibility or fail to adhere to ADA standards; strengthen Tama and Toledo community identities through wayfinding, signage, and environmental graphics (e.g., gateways, follys, etc.) ; enhance pedestrian safety through painted or constructed bump outs, pedestrian refuge islands, painted / enhanced crosswalks, and signage; and, create an iconic and uniquely Tama/Toledo space at Oak Park, establishing it as the "Central Park" of the communities.


## Tama and Toledo Enhanced Pedestrian Network

The two communities of Tama and Toledo have integrated transportation networks, and to address the issues facing both cities the design team decided to look at these systems as a whole rather than separately. Various improvement projects will require collaborative efforts between Tama and Toledo, and certain design concepts may technically be located within another town's borders but will affect the residents of both communities.

| CONCEPT PLAN - TRAIL SEGMENTS |
| :---: |
| SEGMENTA |
| segment b |
| segment c |
| Segment d |
| segmente |
| segment f |
| Segment g |
| SEGMENTH |
| SEGMENTI |
| segment J |
| segment k |
| segment l |
| Segmentm |
| SEGMENTN |
| TRAIL SEGMENT TOTAL |
| GRAND TOTAL COSTS: |


| NCEPT 1 | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | POTENTIAL PARTNERS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$237,075 | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, South Tama Community School District, Local Artists |
| \$136,155 | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, South Tama Community School District, Local Artists |
| \$445,875 | City of Toledo | Tama County Parks |
| \$361,485 | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, Local Businesses Owners/Banks, Artists |
| \$139,035 | City of Toledo | Local Business Owners, Local High School Students (art competition), Main Street USA |
| \$932,814 | City of Toledo | Iowa DOT, Local Businesses Owners/Banks, Artists |
| \$798,370 | Tama and Toledo | Tama County Parks |
| \$159,152 | City of Tama | Tama County Parks |
| \$93,830 | Tama and Toledo | Iowa DOT, South Tama Community School District |
| \$484,735 | City of Tama | Tama County Parks |
| \$796,050 | City of Tama | Iowa DOT, Downtown Business Owners, Senior/Assisted Living Institutions |
| \$282,750 | City of Tama | lowa DOT, Downtown Business Owners, Cultural Institutions, Local Artists |
| \$245,775 | City of Tama | Tama County Parks |
| \$171,100 | City of Tama | Iowa DOT, Downtown Business Owners, |
| \$5,284,200 |  |  |
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## ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN NETWORK SEGMENT COSTS

| TAMA-TOLEDO JOINT PROJECTS |
| ---: |
| SEGMENT B |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| $6 \cdot$ Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 4600 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 36,800$ |
| 3800 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 19,000$ |
| 7700 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 23,100$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 42,255$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 6 , 1 5 5}$ |


| SEGMENT C |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6. Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 17000 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 136,000$ |
| 14200 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 71,000$ |
| 28500 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 85,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 138,375$ |


| SEGMENT E |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 4722 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 37,776$ |
| 3900 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 19,500$ |
| 7870 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 23,610$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 43,149$ |


| SEGMENT F |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 8' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 42240 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 337,920$ |
| 26400 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 132,000$ |
| 52800 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 158,400$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 289,494$ |
|  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3 2 , 8 1 4}$ |  |


| SEGMENT F |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 8' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 42240 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 337,920$ |
| 26400 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 132,000$ |
| 52800 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 158,400$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 289,494$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 9 3 2 , 8 1 4}$ |


| SEGMENT G |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 31200 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 249,600$ |
| 26000 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 130,000$ |
| 52000 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 156,000$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 247,770$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 7 9 8 , 3 7 0}$ |


| SEGMENT H |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 5520 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 44,160$ |
| 4600 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 23,000$ |
| 9200 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 27,600$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 49,392$ |


| SEGMENT I |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 2900 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 23,200$ |
| 2410 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 12,050$ |
| 4820 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 14,460$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 29,120$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 93,830$ |


| SEGMENT J |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 18600 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 148,800$ |
| 15500 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 77,500$ |
| 31000 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 93,000$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 150,435$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| SEGMENT K |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 28500 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 228,000$ |
| 32700 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 163,500$ |
| 47500 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 142,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 247,050$ |


| SEGMENT L |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 10500 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 84,000$ |
| 8700 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 43,500$ |
| 17500 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 52,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 87,750$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 2 , 7 5 0}$ |


| SEGMENT M |
| ---: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 9000 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 72,000$ |
| 7500 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 37,500$ |
| 15000 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 45,000$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 76,275$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 2 4 5 , 7 7 5}$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| Site Prep and Demolition |
| ---: |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Landscape Enhancements |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| Indirect Costs |
| TOTAL |


| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6000 | SF | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 48,000$ |
| 5000 | SF | $\$ 5$ | $\$ 25,000$ |
| 10000 | SF | $\$ 3$ | $\$ 30,000$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $45 \%$ | $\$ 53,100$ |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{\$ 1 7 1 , 1 0 0}$ |

## GRAND TOTAL COSTS:

## $\$ 4,685,640$

## NOTES:

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, ltd. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing.
4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)

## Copyright © 2021 site design group, ltd.
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Enhanced Pedestrian Network Primary goals of the improved pedestrian network and enhanced connections include:

- Establish a functional, safe pedestrian network that links the two communities, their downtowns, the Tama-Toledo Aquatic Park, Oak

Establish a functional, safe pedestrian network that provides residents and community members with limited mobility options (i.e. Establish a functional, safe pedestrian network;
lack of car) to access basic goods and services;

Selectively upgrade sidewalks, targeting portions with heavy use, evident mud/ice issues, and conditions that limit accessibility or fail Selectively upgrade sidewa
to adhere to ADA standards

Strengthen the Tama and Toledo community identities through wayfinding, signage, and environmental graphics (e.g., gateways, Strengthen the
folly's, etc.) Enhance pedestrian safety through painted or constructed bump outs, pedestrian refuge islands, painted/enhanced crosswalks,
and signage.

Create an iconic and uniquely Tama/Toledo space at Oak Park, establishing it as the "Central Park" of the communities.

site design group
LA: Cassandra Rice, PLA, ASLA, Hana Ishikawa, A|A Landscape Designer: Richard Meagher Intern: Paul Hsu

## South Tama Recreational Trail

The South Tama Rec Trail is another joint project that will need to be accomplished with the cooperation of both Tama and Toledo, and may not be the first project either town decides to tackle due to the existing, workable conditions of the current South Tama Rec Trail. However, laying a concrete path along the current trail would better accommodate elderly or mobility-challenged residents, as well as improve the current conditons for biking and running.

SOUTH TAMA REC TRAIL

| TAMA-TOLEDO JOINT PROJECTS |
| ---: |
| ITEM: |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 8' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| TOTAL |
| INDIRECT COSTS |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION |
| PERMITS, INSURANCE AND BONDS |
| OVERHEAD AND PROFIT |
| DESIGN AND ESTIMATION CONTINGENCY |
| ESCALATION CONTINGENCY |
| DESIGNERS FEES (15\%) |
| OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY (5\%) |
| TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS |


| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ | 75,000 |
| 107700 | SF | $\$$ | 8 |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ | 50,000 |
|  |  | $\$ 75,000$ |  |

GRAND TOTAL COSTS

## NOTES:

|  |
| ---: |
| $\$ 36,464$ |
| $\$ 9,116$ |
| $\$ 27,348$ |
| $\$ 136,740$ |
| $\$ 18,232$ |
| $\$ 136,740$ |
| $\$ 45,580$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 0 , 2 2 0}$ |

\$1,321,820

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, Itd. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing.
4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)
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Tama
South Tama Rec Trail
COMMUNITY FEEDBACK
The Tama and Toledo Steering Committee would like a
concrete trail to allow for easier biking and running, as
well as a pedestrian path for mobility challenged and
elderly individuals. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESPONSE
"Better Pedestrian Connections" 1. While the South Toma Rec Trail already serves as g great




 either downtown Tama or Toledo either on their own or
Mobliy C Chatemomed
with the assistance of a holper.

## Downtown Tama

## Overview

Downtown Tama is recognized as a destination by residents and visitors, but can be improved by celebrating it's unique sense of place. The design team created two different concepts to accomplish this goal, one focusing on tactical urbanism which can be deployed quickly with low costs, while the second concept features permanent, but higher cost improvements. This gives the city of Tama a degree of flexibility in how they approach and accomplish the goals listed by community residents. Both concepts also accomplish two of Tama's listed goals, connecting the existing Cherry Lake Trail and South Tama Rec Trail, as well as unique wayfinding and identity signage to help attract both residents and visitors to downtown Tama.

1. Concept One: Tactical Urbanism Approach

The first concept uses quick-to-employ methods such as paint, chalk and potted street trees to reclaim space for pedestrians. "People spots" are traced over existing asphalt to create areas for outdoor dining, gathering places, and sidewalk retail for local businesses. Murals are drawn by local artists and students on vacant building walls add color and vibrancy, and the current crosswalks will be improved with more creative designs that make walking area more noticeable to both pedestrians and vehicular traffic.
2. Concept Two: Enhanced Connections and Streetscape Improvements

The second concept for downtown Tama focuses on more permanent improvements to downtown Tama's streetscapes, albeit more costly. Curbs are extended into the street for seating areas and planted street trees, giving the downtown area a more classic 'Main Street' feel. The connection between Cherry Lake Trail and Tama Rec Trail is more formalized with a paved trail that forks towards the enhanced Civic Plaza behind Tama's City Hall with a larger gathering space for events, giving visitors and residents another reason to come celebrate in the downtown. The existing Gateway Park, which currently has an ice cream stand and small play area is re-designed and given a new city sign, welcoming drivers traveling on US Highway 63. Finally, festoon lights help provide night-time atmosphere but also address community concerns about safety at night due to lack of lighting.

## Design Expertise Recommended

Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

DOWNTOWN TAMA


| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 50,000 | \$50,000 |
| 3200 | SF | \$ 7 | \$22,400 |
|  | LF | 28 |  |
| 19 | EA | \$ 2,500 | \$47,500 |
| 18 | EA | \$ 2,500 | \$45,000 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 30,000 | \$30,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ 2,500 | \$10,000 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 20,000 | \$20,000 |
| 2 | EA | \$ 500 | \$1,000 |
| 28 | EA | \$ 2,000 | \$56,000 |
| 26 | EA | \$ 750 | \$19,500 |
|  | SF | \$ |  |
|  | SF | \$ |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 1,200 | \$1,200 |
|  |  |  | \$302,600 |


|  |
| ---: |
| $\$ 12,104$ |
| $\$ 3,026$ |
| $\$ 9,078$ |
| $\$ 45,390$ |
| $\$ 6,052$ |
| $\$ 45,390$ |
| $\$ 15,130$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 3 6 , 1 7 0}$ |


| CONCEPT 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 3200 | SF | - | \$22,400 |
| 5200 | LF | \$ 28 | \$145,600 |
|  | EA | \$ 5,000 |  |
| 18 | EA | \$ 2,500 | \$45,000 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 30,000 | \$30,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ 2,500 | \$10,000 |
| 1 | EA | \$ 20,000 | \$20,000 |
| 2 | EA | \$ 500 | \$1,000 |
| 22 | EA | \$ 2,000 | \$44,000 |
| 43 | EA | \$ 750 | \$32,250 |
| 9200 | SF | \$ 3 | \$27,600 |
| 12200 | SF | \$ | \$97,600 |
|  | ALLOW | \$ 5,000 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  | \$580,450 |


| INDIRECT COSTS |
| :--- |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION |
| PERMITS, INSURANCE AND BONDS |
| OVERHEAD AND PROFIT |
| DESIGN AND ESTIMATION CONTINGENCY |
| ESCALATION CONTINGENCY |
| DESIGNERS FEES (15\%) |
| OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY (5\%) |
| TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS |
| GRAND TOTAL COSTS |

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, ltd. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing.
4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature
Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)



## State Street + Highway 63 Intersection

## Overview

The State Street and Highway 63 intersection was identified by community members as dangerous for pedestrians due to cross due to vehicular speeds and lack of crosswalks, but also because the US Highway 63 trucking route travels through this crossing southbound right turns do not stop. The goal of both concepts is to slow down truck traffic without stopping it, addressing the concerns of Tama officials that IDOT would reroute this traffic through another town.

1. Concept One: Yield for Highway 63

The first concept uses yield signs for right turning traffic onto Highway 63, allowing for vehicles to turn without stopping. Pedestrians are given crosswalks at the north and east crossings, allowing them to continue north along State Street towards both Oak Park and the Tama/Toledo Aquatic Center using the proposed extended sidewalk network. A painted curb bump out is also used to shorten the distance pedestrians need to cross along State Street while also narrowing State Street, making drivers more aware of pedestrian crossing.

## 2. Concept Two: Stop Except for Right Turn

In the second concept, eastbound traffic stops while southbound traffic does not, although vehicles using this route still need to slow down as if turning right on a red light. Crosswalks are also provided at every crossing opportunity, and a more permanent, planted curb bump-out is used to again shorten the distance to cross State Street. The planted curb bump-out also avoids the snow plow maintenance issues that a painted curb bump out with reflective stakes poses, depending on how the city of Tama chooses to address the issue.

## Design Expertise Recommended

Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering
Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

STATE STREET AND US 63

| TAMA PROJECT |
| ---: |
| ITEM |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 8' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| B6-12 Concrete Curb |
| Pavement Painting |
| 6'-wide Crosswalk Striping |
| ADA Curb Ramp |
| Signage - Stop Sign |
| Signage - Yield Sign |
| Flexible Delineators |
| Shade Tree |
| Turf Seed |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| TOTAL |


| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT |  | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 3500 | SF | \$ | 7 | \$24,500 |
|  | LF | \$ | 28 |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 7,500 | \$7,500 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 5,000 | \$5,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ | 1,000 | \$4,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ | 500 | \$2,000 |
|  | EA | \$ | 500 |  |
| 10 | EA | \$ | 100 | \$1,000 |
|  | EA | \$ | 900 |  |
| 2600 | SF | \$ | 3 | \$7,800 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 1,200 | \$1,200 |
|  |  |  |  | \$78,000 |


| INDIRECT COSTS |
| ---: |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION |
| PERMITS, INSURANCE AND BONDS |
| OVERHEAD AND PROFIT |
| DESIGN AND ESTIMATION CONTINGENCY |
| ESCALATION CONTINGENCY |
| DESIGNERS FEE (15\%) |
| OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY (5\%) |
| TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS |

## GRAND TOTAL COSTS <br> NOTES:

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, Itd. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing.
4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)

| CONCEPT 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT |  | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 5000 | SF | \$ | 7 | \$35,000 |
|  | LF | \$ | 28 |  |
|  | ALLOW | \$ | 7,500 |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 5,000 | \$5,000 |
| 8 | EA | \$ | 1,000 | \$8,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ | 500 | \$2,000 |
| 3 | EA | \$ | 500 | \$1,500 |
|  | EA | \$ | 100 |  |
| 3 | EA | \$ | 900 | \$2,700 |
| 2600 | SF | \$ | 3 | \$7,800 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ | 5,000 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$92,000 |


|  |
| ---: |
| $\$ 3,680$ |
| $\$ 920$ |
| $\$ 2,760$ |
| $\$ 13,800$ |
| $\$ 1,840$ |
| $\$ 13,800$ |
| $\$ 4,600$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 4 1 , 4 0 0}$ |

$\$ 133,400$
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## Harding Street + US Highway 63 Intersection

## Overview

The Harding Street and Highway 63 intersection has similar issues with vehicular speeding and pedestrian safety as State Street and Highway 63, but South Tama County High School is located along this stretch of Highway 63. Students of all ages walk across this intersection to school, and Tama community members identified this crossing as particularly dangerous for pedestrians. To address these concerns, both concepts attempt to slow down Highway 63 traffic without stopping, and shorten the distance on Tama County E49 with a crossing island for pedestrians to cross the street safely. Both concepts also take advantage of the extended sidewalk network that safely takes Tama students to both the elementary and high school.

1. Concept One: Yield for Highway 63

The first concept uses a yield sign to allow for north and westbound traffic to continue without stopping. Crosswalks are used along Harding Street and Tama County E49 to provide students with an uninterrupted route towards school, and stop signs at all crosswalk locations. This concept also uses painted curb bumpouts for a low-cost, quickly-implementable solution to address community concerns about pedestrian safety.
2. Concept Two: Stop Except for Right Turn

Concept Two uses the Stop except for Right Turn sign to allow northbound traffic to continue without stopping, while eastbound traffic is stopped to increase awareness of pedestrians crossing along Tama County E49. More permanent curb bump-outs are used instead of paint to physically narrow the size of the roads and reduce speeding, as crosswalks are provided at all crossing opportunities. The sidewalks on the north and east side of Highway 63 is also extended to Siegel Street in this concept, expanding the sidewalk network further and giving pedestrians a more direct route to wherever they are going.

## Design Expertise Recommended

Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

HARDING AND US 63

| TAMA PROJECT |
| ---: |
| ITEM |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 6' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| B6-12 Concrete Curb |
| Pavement Painting |
| 6'-wide Crosswalk Striping |
| ADA Curb Ramp |
| Signage - Stop Sign |
| Signage - Yield Sign |
| Signage - Pedestrian Crossing |
| Flexible Delineators |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| TOTAL |


| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 3200 | SF | \$ 8 | \$25,600 |
| 100 | LF | \$ 28 | \$2,800 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 10,000 | \$10,000 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 5,000 | \$5,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ 1,000 | \$4,000 |
| 3 | EA | \$ 500 | \$1,500 |
| 1 | EA | \$ 500 | \$500 |
| 1 | EA | \$ 500 | \$500 |
| 9 | EA | \$ 100 | \$900 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 1,200 | \$1,200 |
|  |  |  | \$52,000 |


| CONCEPT 2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 3200 | SF | \$ 8 | \$25,600 |
| 270 | LF | \$ 28 | \$7,560 |
|  | ALLOW | \$ 7,500 |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 10,000 | \$10,000 |
| 8 | EA | \$ 1,000 | \$8,000 |
| 4 | EA | \$ 500 | \$2,000 |
|  | EA | \$ 500 |  |
| 1 | EA | \$ 500 | \$500 |
|  | EA | \$ 100 |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 5,000 | \$5,000 |
|  |  |  | \$58,660 |


| INDIRECT COSTS |
| :--- |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION |
| PERMITS, INSURANCE AND BONDS |
| OVERHEAD AND PROFIT |
| DESIGN AND ESTIMATION CONTINGENCY |
| ESCALATION CONTINGENCY |
| DESIGNERS FEE (15\%) |
| OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY (5\%) |
| TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS |



1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, ltd. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing.
4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature
Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { (1) Painted Curb Bump Out / Curb Extension - painted area with flexible } \\
\text { delineators that both physically and visually narrows the roadway, } \\
\text { creating safer pedestrian crossings. Enhances visibility and reduces } \\
\text { speeds of approaching vericles. } \\
\text { (2) Pedestrian Crossing Sign - Provides advance notice of areas of high } \\
\text { pedestrian activity so drivers can be prepared to slow or stop. } \\
\text { (3 Crosswalk - Ladder style, white crosswalk no less than } 5 \text { ' wide. } \\
\text { (4) ADA Curb Ramp - ADA ramp on both sides with detectable warnings. } \\
\text { (9ield Sign } \\
\text { (6) New Sidewalk - b' wide (minimum) concrete sidewalk connection. } \\
\text { (5) Lane Markings - Painted lane markings to guide turning movements. }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$


site design group
LA: Cassandra Rice, PLA, ASLA, Hana Ish
Landscape Designer: Richard Meagher Intern: Paul Hsu


COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESPONSE
"Heavy Traffic"
"Heavy Traffic"
 $\begin{aligned} & \text { it, addressing the concerns of Tama ofticials that IDOT } \\ & \text { would re-route this traffic through another town. }\end{aligned}$
"Better Pedestrian Connections" "Better Pedestrian Connections" A.4. Acocrdingtothe Tama Priorties, residents folt that better ATher
 1/ $\begin{gathered}\text { identified by Tama community members nicluang } \\ \text { Better Pedestrian Connections and Beoter Neighborhood } \\ \text { Streesscapes. }\end{gathered}$ The Tama Priorities a sos identified lack of access for
 WhI $\begin{gathered}\text { Enhancement } \text { ssue, and both con cepts for State Street } \\ \text { and USHHghway } 6 \text { 3 address } h \text { is issue by providing ADA }\end{gathered}$
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Harding St + US 63

## 17th Street + US Highway 63 Intersection

## Overview

Community members identified the 17th Street and US Highway 63 intersection as another threat to pedestrian safety, citing its location along Highway 63 as a source of speeding and truck traffic near where students are crossing the street to get to school. Seventeenth Street also connects to Oak Park, a key community destination, but there are no sidewalks on either side of this street. To address this and provide pedestrian access to Oak Park, both concepts propose a road diet along 17th Street, narrowing the street down to a one way heading east and proposing a sidewalk that connects to Oak Park. The sidewalk network is also extended on both concepts to connect to an existing dead-end sidewalk at Myrtle Street, giving students coming from the neighboring community of Toledo a safe way to school. However, this intersection also faces the issues associated with the Highway 63 truck route, and Tama city officials feel strongly that traffic along this route should not be brought to a stop. The design team proposed two different strategies for prioritizing pedestrian safety, allowing the this community to decide on how to address these issues.

## 1. Concept One: Yield for Highway 63

The first concept attempts to stop both north and southbound traffic along Highway 63 using a push-button stop sign for northbound traffic that students can use to signal drivers to a stop while they are crossing 17th Street. A blinking yield sign cautions southbound drivers, slowing down traffic to a stop when there are pedestrians actively trying to cross the street. An ADA ramp is also provided, connecting the proposed crosswalk along Highway 63 to the existing sidewalk which currently only has concrete stairs to navigate the grade change, preventing ADA access to both schools. The ADA ramp also provides the opportunity for a small planting space and identity signage location.
2. Concept Two: Stop Except for Right Turn

Tama city officials felt that it would not be in the city's best interest to bring Highway 63 truck traffic to a stop, and were interested in exploring the idea of a pedestrian overpass to accomplish both goals of keeping pedestrians safe and allowing the truck route to continue unobstructed. The overpass creates a potential location for identity signage as well, and murals could be placed on either side, greeting drivers going to both Tama and Toledo depending on which direction they are driving. Both sides of the overpass are also ADA accessible, creating a unique structure that leaves an impression on both visitors to either town as well as commuters just driving along Highway 63.

## Design Expertise Recommended

Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

17TH STREET AND US 63
$\left.\begin{array}{|r|}\hline \text { TAMA-TOLEDO JOINT PROJECTS } \\ \hline \text { ITEMS } \\ \hline \text { Site Prep and Demolition } \\ \text { 8' Concrete Trail (SF) } \\ \text { B6-12 Concrete Curb } \\ \text { Pavement Painting } \\ \text { 6'-wide Crosswalk Striping } \\ \text { ADA Curb Ramp } \\ \text { ADA Access Ramp } \\ \text { Signage - Stop Sign } \\ \text { Signage - Yield Sign } \\ \text { Wayfinding Signage } \\ \text { Turf Seed }\end{array}\right\}$

| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 25,000 | \$25,000 |
| 4500 | SF | \$ | \$36,000 |
| 40 | SF | \$ 30 | \$1,200 |
|  | SF | \$ 28 |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 5,000 | \$5,000 |
| 3 | EA | \$ 1,000 | \$3,000 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 10,000 | \$10,000 |
| 1 | EA | \$ 500 | \$500 |
| 1 | EA | 500 | \$500 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 2,000 | \$2,000 |
| 250 | SF | \$ | \$750 |
| 1 | ALLOW | \$ 1,000 | \$1,000 |
|  | SF | \$ 250 |  |
|  |  |  | \$84,950 |


| CONCEPT 2 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |  |
| 4500 | SF | $\$$ | 25,000 |  |
| 4500 | SF | $\$$ | 8 |  |
| 40 | LF | $\$$ | 28 |  |
| 32 | LF | $\$$ | 28 |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ | 2,500 |  |
| 3 | EA | $\$$ | 1,000 |  |
|  | ALLOW | $\$$ | 10,000 |  |
|  | EA | $\$$ | 500 |  |
|  | EA | $\$$ | 5000 |  |
|  | 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ |  |
|  | SF | $\$$ | 10,000 |  |
|  | ALLOW | $\$$ | 1,000 |  |
| 4000 | SF | $\$$ | 250 |  |


|  |
| ---: |
| $\$ 3,398$ |
| $\$ 850$ |
| $\$ 2,549$ |
| $\$ 12,743$ |
| $\$ 1,699$ |
| $\$ 12,743$ |
| $\$ 4,248$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 , 2 2 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 3 , 1 7 8}$ |


|  |
| ---: |
| $\$ 43,141$ |
| $\$ 10,785$ |
| $\$ 32,355$ |
| $\$ 161,777$ |
| $\$ 21,570$ |
| $\$ 161,777$ |
| $\$ 53,926$ |
| $\$ 485,332$ |
| $\$ 1,563,848$ |

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, (td. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing. 4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing

Lemalumpoadurnity
visioning

## Oak Park

## Overview

Oak Park is an existing community asset within Tama that has become outdated over time, and community members had plenty of ideas for updated facilities and amenities that would bring more residents to the park. Existing facilities no longer meet code or safety requirements (ADA, ASTM, CPSC, etc) and there have been regular maintenance complaints about existing bathrooms. Community members also find it difficult to get to the park, as sidewalks in Tama do not extend to Oak Park and there is no connection for Toledo residents from the north. However, there is plenty of space for re-programming, large trees provide plenty of shade to relax in, and the topography on the north end of the park presents interesting opportunities.

1. Design Concept

Community members felt that the park would be greatly improved if new amenities were provided such as a skate park, a bandshell for small music events, and a dog park. They also hoped that the existing playground could be improved and that the bathrooms could be updated and better maintained. The programming concept tries to find ways to fit these new elements within the existing park while taking advantage of the sloped terrain and existing facilities to create a more fully featured community resource.

## Design Expertise Recommended

Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

## OAK PARK

| TAMA PROJECT | CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM | QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |
| Site Prep and Demolition | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 150,000 | \$150,000 |
| 6' Asphalt Trail (SF) | 18400 | SF | \$ 6 | \$110,400 |
| Topo Play Area | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 120,000 | \$120,000 |
| Splash Pad | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Bandshell | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Skatepark | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 50,000 | \$50,000 |
| Volleyball Improvements | 1 | EA | \$ 10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Restroom Improvements | 1 | EA | \$ 350,000 | \$350,000 |
| Parking Lot | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 150,000 | \$150,000 |
| Landscape Enhancements | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 75,000 | \$75,000 |
| Turf Seed | 30000 | SF | \$ 3 | \$90,000 |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control | 1 | ALLOW | \$ 15,000 | \$50,000 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,075,400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| INDIRECT COSTS |  |  |  |  |
| GENERAL CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION |  |  |  | \$43,016 |
| PERMITS, INSURANCE AND BONDS |  |  |  | \$10,754 |
| OVERHEAD AND PROFIT |  |  |  | \$32,262 |
| DESIGN AND ESTIMATION CONTINGENCY |  |  |  | \$161,310 |
| ESCALATION CONTINGENCY |  |  |  | \$21,508 |
| DESIGNERS FEE (15\%) |  |  |  | \$7,500 |
| OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY (5\%) |  |  |  | \$53,770 |
| TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS |  |  |  | \$330,120 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAND TOTAL COSTS |  |  |  | \$1,405,520 |
| NOTES: |  |  |  |  |

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor price ranges from similarly sized projects of similar scope along with our opinion of costs for unique or custom items as compiled by site design group, ltd. (site) and our subconsultants base don our experience. Therfore, our opinion of probable costs should not be interpreted as a representation of what to expect during a contractor bid process but simply as our opinion of costs based on our experience on similar projects and scope. Our opinion of probable costs are based on the work scope of this project and all associated finishes and components at the time of the execution of this document. Our opinion of probable costs may fluctuate further than factored above if the work scope increases or decreases, material choices are modified, the project is phased or if the project is delayed based on the assumed schedule at the time of execution of this document.
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking and deliveries, toilets, dumpsters, final cleaning and document reproduction.
3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing.
4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time of the execution of this document.

## EXCLUSIONS:

1. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)


## Broadway Street + Lincoln Highway

## Overview

The intersection of Broadway Street and Lincoln Highway was identified by the design team as an important point of connection between Tama and Toledo. This intersection is a key point for pedestrian safety as community members said that they will occasionally walk, run, or bike along the side of Lincoln Highway because it is the only road where pedestrians are given a wide berth to occupy. This is also an important walking route to lowa Premium Beef. Track traffic taking a left turn onto South Broadway Street does not stop, creating an increasingly dangerous pedestrian environment. Increasing pedestrian safety is important because Broadway Street also serves as an important pedestrian artery for the extended sidewalk network, connecting residents from both communities to both Oak Park and the Tama/Toledo Aquatic Center, two strong community resources. Finally, 2nd Avenue intersects with the Toledo Business District to the west, and providing a pedestrian route would allow community members to safely walk to businesses such as the State Bank, Medicap Pharmacy, and Fareway Grocery.

## 1. Concept One: Tactical Urbanism Approach

The concept attempts to stop and slow traffic on Lincoln Highway for a safer pedestrian crossing at this important point of connection between Tama and Toledo. A blinking yield sign cautions drivers, slowing down traffic to a stop when there are pedestrians actively trying to cross the street. An ADA ramp is also provided, connecting the proposed crosswalk along the north side of Broadway Street to the existing sidewalk.

## Design Expertise Recommended

Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

BROADWAY AND LINCOLN AVE

| TAMA-TOLEDO JOINT PROJECTS |
| ---: |
| ITEM |
| Site Prep and Demolition |
| 8' Concrete Trail (SF) |
| B6-12 Concrete Curb |
| 6'-wide Crosswalk Striping |
| ADA Curb Ramp |
| Signage - Stop Sign |
| Signage - Yield Sign |
| Wayfinding Signage |
| Grading, Drainage, and Erosion Control |
| TOTAL |


| CONCEPT 1 |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| QTY | UNIT | COST | TOTAL |  |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ | 7,500 | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 2300 | SF | $\$$ | 8 | $\$ 18,400$ |
| 50 | LF | $\$$ | 28 | $\$ 1,400$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ | 2,500 | $\$ 2,500$ |
| 4 | EA | $\$$ | 1,000 | $\$ 4,000$ |
| 1 | EA | $\$$ | 500 | $\$ 500$ |
| 1 | EA | $\$$ | 500 | $\$ 500$ |
| 2 | EA | $\$$ | 500 | $\$ 1,000$ |
| 1 | ALLOW | $\$$ | 1,200 | $\$ 1,200$ |

INDIRECT COSTS
GENERAL CONDITIONS AND SUPERVISION
PERMITS, INSURANCE AND BONDS OVERHEAD AND PROFIT
DESIGN AND ESTIMATION CONTINGENCY
ESCALATION CONTINGENCY DESIGNERS FEES (15\%)
OWNER'S CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY (5\%)

|  |
| ---: |
| $\$ 1,180$ |
| $\$ 295$ |
| $\$ 885$ |
| $\$ 4,425$ |
| $\$ 590$ |
| $\$ 4,425$ |
| $\$ 1,475$ |

## GRAND TOTAL COSTS

NOTES:

1. The unit pricing in the above opinion of probable costs represents in part, both historical average contractor
2. Contractors General Conditions may include, but are not limited to, items such as project management, trucking 3. All "Landscape" scope on-structure opinion of probable costs are limited to components above waterproofing. 4. This opinion of probable costs is based on information and the accuracy of that information available at the time EXCLUSIONS:
3. All site and subconsultant fees, Permitting and/or Expediting Fees, All Removals and/or Demolition of Existing Materials, Uitility scope, Lighting System Scope, Security System Scope, Audio System Scope, Water Feature Scope, Signage and/or Wayfinding Scope, Site furnishings Scope and All "NIC" items noted in Deatail or Summary Sheets. (Unless Inlcuded Herein)
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## Implementation Strategies

## Implementation Overview

The Community Visioning Plan created by the design team for both Tama and Toledo are the first step towards implementing the transportation network changes that can improve the safety and livability of both communities. Using these documents as a foundational first step in the design process, projects can progress towards the point of construction with the continued help of allied professionals.
The design team, site design group.Itd (site), would like to continue our effort to improve the cities of Tama and Toledo by serving as landscape architectural consultants in the future for both communities. Our familiarity with the Community Visioning Plan and the members of both Steering Committees, as well as our experience with implementing these types of projects while able to help secure future funding, makes site design group a strong candidate for further inclusion in the improvement of both Tama and Toledo.
Projects may require help beyond the capability of the Tama Visioning Steering Committee or available city staff. For this improvement project, the steering committee should expect to engage the services of a Landscape Architect and a Civil Engineer.

## YEAR 1

Schedule monthly steering committee meetings, confirm understanding of scope and estimated costs of identified projects, and prioritize the top three projects for design refinement and implementation.

TASK Determine the most practical project for implementation and identify all applicable and eligible funding sources and other resource opportunities.

Utilizing Community Visioning deliverables along with assistance from Trees Forever and a landscape architect, submit application(s) for eligible and related grant programs.

Upon a successful grant application and securing funding, develop a schedule for project design, bidding, and construction. Select and execute a contract with a landscape architect as the lead design consultant. This begins the Design development phase.

## YEAR 2-10+

Each year re-assess the top three priority projects based on grant application success and


## Landumpanausity visioning

## Available Resources

There are many creative ways that communities can raise the resources necessary to fund and implement projects. The following list is a compilation of various sources and opportunities for funding the projects conceptualized during the visioning process. This list is not all-inclusive; it is meant to serve as a tool to assist in brainstorming ideas.

Funding Opportunities

- Grants
- Partnerships (private and public)
- Trusts and endowments
- Fund-raising and donations
- Memorials
- Volunteer labor
- Low-interest loans
- Implementation of project in phases

Funding Sources

- Iowa Department of Transportation
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources
- lowa Department of Education
- Iowa Department of Economic Development
- Utility companies
- Trees Forever


## Grant Programs

- Alliant Energy and Trees Forever Branching Out Program
- Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- Iowa Clean Air Attainment Program (ICAAP)
- lowa DOT/DNR Fund lowa
- lowa DOT Iowa's Living Roadways Projects Program
- Iowa DOT Living Roadways Trust Fund Program
- Iowa DOT Pedestrian Curb Ramp Construction Program
- Iowa DOT Statewide Transportation Enhancement Funding
- Iowa DNR Recreation Infrastructure Program
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- National Recreational Trails Program
- Pheasants Forever
- Revitalization Assistance for Community Improvement (RACI) Grant Program
- State Recreational Trails Program
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)


[^0]:    1 J.E. Ebinger, "Presettlement Vegetation of Coles County, Illinois," Transactions of the Illinois Academy of Science (1987): 15-24, quoted in Michael Charles Miller, "Analysis of historic vegetation patterns in lowa using Government Land Office surveys and a Geographic Information System" (master's thesis, lowa State University, 1995), 8.

[^1]:    1 This map shows the difference between the present day tree canopy gathered from the DNR's Land Cover data and past landscape cover, as defined in the General Land Office (GLO) surveys from 1836 through 1859 and the A.T. Andreas' Illustrated Historical Atlas of the State of lowa from 1875.

[^2]:    1 Sigma: A Profile of lowa Small Towns 1994 to 2014 (Ames, IA: lowa State University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 2015).

[^3]:    2 Sigma: A Profile of lowa Small Towns 1994 to 2014 (Ames, IA: lowa State University College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 2015)

[^4]:    1 "American Community Survey (ACS)," accessed May 21, 2021. https://www.census.gou/programssurveys/acs.
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