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1. Introduction

The Brownfield Action Plan Program

The Brownfield Action Plan Program, currently in its pilot round, was created by the Ohio Development Services Agency to help communities struggling with the impacts of brownfields on an area-wide scale (such as corridors, neighborhoods, and clusters of blocks) resulting in a more rapid, efficient, and comprehensive revitalization of Ohio’s communities.

The signature feature of the new program is its utilization of an area-wide approach to create plans addressing multiple brownfield sites in a community. The area-wide approach views vacant and contaminated sites of a defined area as a connected whole rather than in isolation, thereby ensuring the compatibility of redevelopment with the larger area. An integral part of this approach is connecting brownfield redevelopment goals to the housing, transportation, and infrastructure goals of the community resulting in a comprehensive revitalization of the area.

The two-tiered structure is designed to offer both technical assistance to develop a plan and subsequent seed funding to begin implementation of the plan. The technical assistance helps communities expand capacity when resources and staffing are limited, provide expertise, build partnerships, and engage the community. The seed funding is intended to then provide a jump-start to implementation, producing noticeable results and encouraging further action and investment in the area. Upon completion of the program, communities will be better prepared to conduct assessments and cleanup activities, apply for grant and loan funding, market their property to developers, and utilize funds effectively.

Piqua’s Planning Area

In the fall of 2011, the City of Piqua applied for a Brownfield Action Plan Pilot Program grant. Through its efforts in putting together a strong application and showing a solid understanding of the area-wide planning concept, the City of Piqua was named one of the six award recipients for the pilot round.

The City's Action Plan focuses on the 26-acre Riverfront District, located just south of the city’s central business district and adjacent to the Great Miami River. With a history of commercial and industrial uses, the area has been challenging to redevelop, but provides great opportunities because of its location and existing assets. This plan was developed to address not only the brownfield issues in the District, but the redevelopment challenges of the District as a whole.

Image 1: Historic view of the Miami-Erie Canal that ran through the planning area. source: epodunk
Goals

The goals for the Riverfront District were developed as a team and are intended to guide both the planning and the redevelopment of the District. The City should ensure that as proposals are made for the District, they support these goals.

Primary Goal: Attract public and private investment to the Riverfront District

- Create an inviting public realm
- Provide community spaces that support entertainment and tourism
- Expand opportunities for downtown living
- Increase access and connectivity from downtown to the river
- Upgrade the physical environment to reflect the standards of the surrounding area
- Create development-ready parcels through environmental remediation
2. Existing Conditions

Background of Planning Area

Dating back to the early 1800s, the Riverfront area of Piqua was home to several industrial businesses which decided to locate along the Miami-Erie Canal. The canal reached Piqua in 1837 and had its terminus there until 1842. Canal traffic dwindled in the 1860s, but the Miami and Erie continued to support heavy traffic loads such as coal, lumber, and stone until 1912.

In the spring of 1913, the Great Dayton Flood damaged much of Piqua’s waterfront. Within a three-day period, eight to 11 inches of rain fell throughout the Great Miami River Watershed, as well as the rest of the state. Some consider this event to be the greatest natural disaster in Ohio’s history. Between 1918 and 1922, the Miami Conservancy District built a flood protection system throughout the Great Miami River to prevent floods like this from occurring again.

Today, the Riverfront District contains a mix of both commercial and industrial uses, as well as some passive recreational space along the Great Miami River. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources has determined that the river is an excellent warm water habitat for fish and wildlife and the protection of the river should be a priority in any planning effort.

The District also contains Lock Nine Park, located just east of downtown adjacent to the river. The park was developed nearly twenty years ago with the signature piece of the park being the restoration of an abandoned canal lock from the Miami-Erie Canal. Additionally, the Linear Park Bike Trail and the Great Miami Recreational Trail intersect within the District. The intersection of these two trails has made the City of Piqua a destination for bicycling enthusiasts around the region. At the completion of the bike trail development, this intersection will allow trail users to travel to Sidney, Cincinnati, Urbana, or Union City, Indiana.

![Image 2: Current Riverfront look and feel](source: Ohio Development Services Agency)
Left, Image 3: Piqua Central Business District encompasses a majority of the historic downtown and includes the planning area (boxed).
source: Bing

Below, Image 4: Aerial of planning area with the Riverfront District outlined in blue. The boundaries of the 26-acre District are loosely defined by South Wayne Street to the west, East High Street to the north, East Main Street to the south, and Harrison Street to the east. source: City of Piqua
Properties

Six potential brownfield sites have been identified as priorities for investigation and redevelopment. A majority of these sites are located on the east side of North/South Main Street and several also border the river.

The identified sites have a rich history of various commercial and industrial uses. While there are some that are currently occupied, most are vacant and all are suspected to have environmental contamination based on their past uses and date of construction.

Image 5: Brownfield Planning Area properties
source: City of Piqua
Existing Conditions

1. **Weaver’s**
   - Northeast corner Water/Main St.
   - Parcel Acreage: 0.0896 acres
   - Year Built: c. 1913
   - **Characteristics:**
     - Former use: Edison Electric Illuminating Company, tin shop/blacksmith, furnace shop, auto repair garage, paint and décor store.

2. **Old Laundry**
   - 117 East Water Street
   - Parcel Acreage: approx. 0.07 acres
   - Year Built: 1922
   - **Characteristics:**
     - Former use: Laundry, battery station, tire hospital, print shop, cigar shop, church, upholstery shop, and apartments. Currently vacant.
     - Views of Great Miami River from 2nd and 3rd floors

3. **Piqua Granite**
   - 123 North Main Street
   - Parcel Acreage: 0.587 acres
   - Year Built: 1913
   - **Characteristics:**
     - Former use: Barber shop, ladies hat retailer, ice cream parlor, restaurant, billiards hall, auto dealership, clothing store, motor sales, tire store, ceramic shop, granite and marble store.

4. **Piqua Milling Co.**
   - 111 North Main Street
   - Parcel Acreage: approx. 0.2 acres
   - Year Built: 1901
   - **Characteristics:**
     - Former use: Linseed oil company, blanket company, wholesale groceries. Currently vacant.
     - Two buildings
     - Location backs up to Lock Nine Park

5. **Mo’s Lounge**
   - 111 South Main Street
   - Parcel Acreage: 0.1 acres
   - Year Built: 1930
   - **Characteristics:**
     - Former use: Retail sales, bottling, furniture shop, contractor trade office, restaurant, bus stop, Moose Lodge, and Mo’s Lounge. Currently vacant.
     - Adjacent to Great Miami River and linear park

6. **Zollinger’s**
   - 101 South Wayne Street
   - Parcel Acreage: 0.225 acres
   - Year Built: 1913
   - **Characteristics:**
     - Former use: Retail sales, cottage hotel, restaurant, and wholesaler/warehouse. Currently vacant.
     - Building architecture based upon Florence, Italy City Hall
Demographic Characteristics - Piqua

City of Piqua
- **Population:** 20,522
- **Median Household Income:** $42,036
- **Poverty:** 13.7%
- **Primary Industries:** Manufacturing (32%), Educational, Health Care & Social Assistance (17%), Retail (13%)
- **Unemployment:** 6%
- **Total Housing Units:** 9,311 (8,138 occupied)
- **Total Owner- vs. Renter-occupied:** 61% Owner-occupied, 39% Renter-occupied

source: U.S. Census

Industries
The City's largest employment sector has historically been in **manufacturing**, and it remains so today, with a mix of **education, health care, and service industries**.

Housing
Total housing units in Piqua have increased from 8,886 in 2000 to 9,311 in 2010. During that period, the City experienced a slight increase in the share of **vacant housing** - from 7.0% to 10.7%.

Families
Piqua's population has been slightly aging, with increasing numbers of people 65 and over during the last 20 years. It has also been losing families with children while gaining single householders. The City has been losing family households faster than the State’s rate over the same period of time, especially the loss of families with children, as shown in the comparison chart below.

---

**Figure 1:** Changing trends from 1990 to 2010, City of Piqua.

**Figure 2:** Percent change from 1990 to 2010, Piqua and Ohio comparison.
Demographic Characteristics - Planning Area

Planning Area
The planning area is within two U.S. Census-defined census tracts: tract 3151 and 3153 of Miami County. These two tracts include most of Piqua's downtown as well as some of the surrounding rural region.

Census Tracts
- Median Household Income: $39,730
- Poverty: 14.9%
- Primary industry: Manufacturing (32.8%)
- Unemployment: 6.5%

At a smaller scale, the planning area falls mostly within a single “block group” in tract 3151, populated by around 600 people.

Block Group
- Block Group Housing Units: 310 (248 occupied) (31% owner-occupied, 69% renter-occupied)

Blocks
Ten census blocks contain the properties and immediate surroundings.
- Housing Units: 26 (12 occupied)
- Total property tax revenue collected: $91,404
- Total property valuations: $6,264,400

Source: U.S. Census & Miami County

Age Groups
The block group has been losing population since 2000, mostly in children and the age groups spanning ages 20-39, with fewer losses (and some increases) in the older age groups.

Housing
While total housing units in the planning area have slightly decreased in the past ten years (347 units to 310), the area has nonetheless experienced an increase in the share of vacant housing.

Age Groups

Vacancies

Figure 3: Percent change in age groups in the Planning Area Block Group from 2000-2010.

Figure 4: Percent vacant housing in Block Group, City, and State in 2000, 2010.
Piqua Brownfield Action Plan

Existing Conditions

Existing Plans - Plan It Piqua

Plan It Piqua (2007)
The City of Piqua has been very methodical in developing the necessary planning tools to begin the process of redeveloping brownfields. In 2008, the City of Piqua adopted the community’s first comprehensive plan in at least 30 years. An entire section was devoted to areas that are in need of redevelopment. These areas, which were broadly defined in the plan, provided the foundation to identify potential strategies that should be considered in the redevelopment process dealing with these areas.

Land Use Principles from Plan It Piqua

1. The small town **historic character** will be enhanced.

2. The **entryways** into Piqua will be enhanced through improving the existing and newly enhanced environment.

3. Underutilized **industrial, institutional, and manufacturing districts** and sites will be strategically redeveloped and incorporated back into the Community fabric.

4. New commercial retail developments will be developed with local architectural elements, pedestrian **amenities**, greenspaces, and accommodate future redevelopment/reuse of the structure and site.

5. **Future industrial development on the edges of the Community will be compatible with the surrounding areas**, and not burden the existing transportation infrastructure.

6. The downtown, and new commercial developments, will have a **mix of uses** that are distinctive and contribute to increasing the City’s overall identity.

7. Residential areas will have strong **neighborhood qualities**.

8. A broad **range of housing types and price levels** within neighborhoods will strengthen the community identity, and create new opportunities for residents to find housing.

9. **Streets will create an attractive public realm** and be exceptional places for people.

10. Places will be **better connected**, to improve the function of the street network and facilitate pedestrian mobility; better opportunities will be created to walk and bike to and from the local and regional trails.

11. Better opportunities will be created to connect people to the **Great Miami River**.
Existing Plans - ReDO Plan

ReDO Plan (2010)

Given the large number of redevelopment areas that were defined in the comprehensive plan, the City commissioned the Redevelopment Opportunities Plan, or ReDO Plan. The ReDO Plan began the process of specifically identifying the areas that were noted as needing redevelopment and prioritizing those areas to focus their efforts. The Riverfront Mill District was identified as one of the top five priority areas in the Plan.

Excerpt from ReDO Plan

Riverfront Mill District
Defined as: Great Miami River to Wayne and Green to Wood
Owners: 65
Parcels: 140
Acreage: 5.62

Observations:
The continued revitalization and redevelopment of this area will be the foundation for establishing Piqua as home base for both social and professional newcomers. As the city’s “ground zero”, expanding the current hub of activity at the Fort Piqua Plaza will help to stimulate development/redevelopment in other Areas of Interest. In this part of town, land banking properties as they become available will be a major step towards empowering the city to control the destiny of its core.

On either side of Main between Green and High Streets are a series of small storefronts with second floor apartments, some of which are vacant and available. The northeast corner of North Main and West Water Streets and the bank building at the corner of Ash and Main Streets are also for sale. These properties create opportunities for the city to control unwanted tenancy and redevelopment and encourage interest in leasing or revitalizing neighboring properties. This will expand options for downtown shopping, dining and office space.

With the size and location of the Zollinger building located on North Wayne Street adjacent to Piqua's municipal center, its ultimate use or redevelopment will have considerable influence on this area's future. A residential developer who specializes in loft conversions has approached the owners but no financial agreement has been reached.

Strengths:
1. Key redevelopment piece
2. Fronts on the GMR (Great Miami River)
3. Opportunity to connect the core district to the GMR
4. Potential for new types of mixed use development
5. Access to Piqua Linear Park
6. Proximity to newly developed municipal area
7. Easily accessed from all directions

Weaknesses:
1. Attracting Piqua residents to the core district
2. No residential facilities
3. Vacant and aging store fronts and buildings

Obstacles:
1. Numerous owners
2. Not controlled by the city
3. Difficulty of land assemblage
4. Acquisition, relocation and demolition costs

Threats:
1. Traffic, especially truck traffic
2. Changes in ownership
3. Continued loss of business
4. Continued deterioration of buildings
3. Community Input

Workshop #1

On April 9th, 2012 the planning team held a public workshop at the Fort Piqua Plaza to inform the public and stakeholders about the redevelopment efforts in the Riverfront District and solicit their input.

Developing a Vision

The team presented the existing conditions of the planning area and introduced examples of similar riverfront redevelopment projects in different communities. The team also shared smart growth principles, connectivity and mobility concepts, and downtown live, work, play benefits, and how these could be applied to the Riverfront District.

Desired Uses

Attendees broke into small groups and brainstormed ideas about future use possibilities for each of the six properties and the area as a whole.

Responses generally fell into six categories: Recreation, Dining, Arts, Lodging, Retail, and Design Details/Improvements. A stand-out theme was the desire for dining options including farmer’s markets and restaurants, and using food or drink as a Piqua destination such as ice cream shops or brewerries. Another was for recreation options utilizing the river, open spaces, and the bike paths.

The following are the transcribed brainstorming results, organized by table.

The two most recurrent themes are represented by:

- indicating a recreation-themed response
- ▶ indicating a dining-themed response

The transcriptions and results from Workshop #1 are included in the Appendix.

Figure 5: Results of the brainstorming exercise conducted during Workshop #1.
Prioritization
Attendees ranked each of the six identified properties in terms of four prioritization criteria, listed below:

**Urgency**
Are there safety, health, and wellness concerns with the property such as high levels of contamination, vandalism, and structural issues?

**Public Relations**
Will the redevelopment of the property significantly improve the image of the community? (current negative press, public complaints, etc.)

**Discongruity**
Is the property out of place with its surroundings?

**Development Potential**
Does the property have strong potential for redevelopment as evidenced by developer appeal, attractive location, and potential economic and community impacts?

The ranking exercise used a “dot selection” method in which each attendee placed a green, red, or yellow dot sticker on each criteria for each property. Green indicated a “yes” response, red a “no” response, and yellow a “neutral” response. A “yes” response indicates that the respondent generally agrees with the prioritization question. The results, listed by criteria are listed to the right. Numbers refer to properties as noted on page 6.

From the dot exercise, three properties stood out for higher prioritization:
- The old laundry building (property 2)
- The Piqua Milling Co. buildings (property 4)
- Mo’s Lounge (property 5)

While the team used these results to inform the second meeting, they were understood to be a snapshot of the attendees’ opinions and not necessarily the community’s opinions as a whole.

Figure 6: Results of prioritization criteria exercise conducted during Workshop #1.
Workshop #2

On July 19, 2012 the Ohio Department of Development and the City of Piqua held a follow-up workshop at the Fort Piqua Plaza to continue soliciting feedback for the Riverfront District redevelopment.

This workshop consisted of two exercises: selection of a preferred redevelopment scenario (out of three scenarios), and real-time voting of preferred design details and improvements.

Exercise 1 - Preferred Redevelopment Scenario

The redevelopment scenarios were structured around varying proportions of open space and infill. The rough proportions for land use in the three scenarios are illustrated at right, along with their development characteristics.

The development character of each scenario was presented to the participants who were asked to anonymously select one preferred scenario, write it on an index card and use the other side of the card to explain their decision. The index cards were collected and results presented at the end of the meeting. See the Redevelopment Scenarios section for details on each of the three options.

Exercise 2 - Design Details

Attendees were presented eight topics for design consideration, and asked to select their preferred concept using real-time voting devices. Concepts for each topic were presented as a scale of degree in intensity/concentration. See the Design Considerations section for details on the resulting preferences. The eight topics were:

- Farmers Market
- Car Parking
- Bike Parking
- Open Space
- Residential, Commercial/retail, lodging
- Open Space
- Commercial/retail, lodging
- Open Space
- Residential, Commercial/retail, lodging
- Open Space

The 3D visualizations used for Workshop #2 are included in the Appendix with the transcribed results.

Figure 7: Summary of each development scenario presented during Workshop #2.
This page left blank intentionally
4. Redevelopment Scenarios

Based partly on feedback from stakeholders in Workshop 1, the Planning Team offered three potential redevelopment scenarios to stakeholders during Workshop 2. The scenarios varied in development intensity, with Scenario 1 being the most intense (and therefore with the least amount of open space) and Scenario 3 being the least intense (with the greatest amount of open space). The different mix of infill, demolition, and open space among the three scenarios resulted in three significantly different environments for stakeholders to choose from.

The three scenarios, respectively named “Fill in and Energize”, “Active Riverfront”, and “Open Up and Play” are detailed in the following pages.

Workshop Results

During Workshop 2, participants learned about the three scenarios and their implications for the District. Voting was done privately and anonymously, then tallied. The results were announced at the close of the workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fill In &amp; Energize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Active Riverfront</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Open Up &amp; Play</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants also wrote down why they had chosen the scenario they did. These comments are listed in the Appendix.

The planning team used these results not just to gauge stakeholders’ preferences, but also as a basis to start additional analysis regarding potential costs and funding specific to each scenario. As a result of Scenarios 2 and 3 being clearly preferred, the planning team focused the cost and funding analysis solely on those. See the Scenario Analysis section for this evaluation.

A Note on Standard Components

Regardless of which redevelopment scenario is ultimately preferred, it is recommended that aesthetic improvements to the streetscape, building facades, and landscaping be part of the final design for the District. The focus, look, and feel may be different in each scenario but these aesthetic enhancements are critical to making the District a pedestrian friendly, business friendly, and visitor friendly area. These improvements will also help to create a cohesive district that is in harmony with the greater downtown area of Piqua.

Many of these recommended enhancements are outlined either in the Design Guidelines section of this plan, or in the Downtown Historic District Building Standards.

The images to the right demonstrate some façade and streetscape improvements already implemented in Piqua that should be part of the redevelopment of the Riverfront District.
Building facade improvements like this one are encouraged.  
*source: City of Piqua*

*Image 6:*

Streetscape improvements, including brick pavers, pedestrian-scale lighting, street trees, and waste receptacles should be implemented throughout the District.  
*source: Ohio Development Services Agency*

*Image 7:*

Other streetscape improvements include benches, banners, and bike racks.  
*source: Miami County Visitors and Convention Bureau*
Scenario 1 - Fill In & Energize

Focus:
The Fill In and Energize development scenario is centered around **filling in empty spaces** to ultimately create a **dense district of mixed uses**.

Details:
- Existing buildings are either retained, or are demolished with new construction on the same site.
- Infill is oriented toward the street and built to enhance the pedestrian experience along Main Street and Water Street.
- The assets of the river and the parks are maintained with improvements, but efforts are mostly directed to filling in the vacant and underutilized built environment.
- Uses could include hotels and hostels centered around the cycling community, specialty shops, restaurants, and potentially even residential.
- Cleanup, renovation, and construction are favored over demolition.

Experience:
This scenario would create a bustling, main street environment with lots of activity on Main Street and Water Street. The public space along the river would feel intimate until exiting the District area when it would open up to more traditional park space. Shoppers, workers, and residents would all coexist in this lively District.

Environmental needs:
Environmental assessments of each property would be needed to determine the presence and/or extent of contamination. The level of remediation needed for each property would also be dependent on its end use. For example, a residential use requires a higher level of remediation than a commercial use.

Pros and Cons
- Property tax base increases (not factoring in potential tourism)
- River, park, and bike trail are improved and serve as supporting elements to the development, but not the focus
- History wall and park acreage remain much the same
- Potential pull away from Main Street shops
- Phased in over time
- Historic structures remain

Workshop Votes: 1

Figure 8: Proposed land use breakdown for Scenario 1.
Figure 9: Conceptual development character for the Fill In and Energize scenario.

- Blue = new infill structures
- Purple = private hardscaped spaces such as patios or informal gathering places
- Green = potential park or open space (plazas or green space)
- Yellow lines = routes of connectivity and continuous sight lines
Scenario 2 - Active Riverfront

Focus:
The Active Riverfront development scenario is centered around creating a mix of structures and open space for entertainment and recreation.

Details:
• Targeted demolition opens up the existing riverfront while retaining and improving historic properties.
• Structures and park space supplement each other by creating a mix of activities and experiences.
• Infill is focused on the west side of Main Street.
• Strong element of connectivity among the open space, hardscaping, and buildings, encouraging pedestrian circulation and heightened activity.
• Uses could include a small hotel/hostel, amphitheater, market/pavilion, restaurants, shops, and river activities.
• Historic elements of the District (lock, wall, structures) are highlighted.

Experience:
This scenario would create a more open feel throughout the District, highlighted by several rehabilitated historic structures that provide space for lodging, community space, and/or dining and entertainment. Multiple public spaces would be connected by pathways, plazas, and patios, as opposed to being one expansive space. Parts of the District would feel more open and focused on recreation, while others would feel more lively and entertainment-focused.

Environmental needs:
Environmental assessments of each property would be needed to determine the presence and/or extent of contamination. The level of remediation needed for each property would also be dependent on its end use. For example, a residential use requires a higher level of remediation than a commercial use.

Pros and Cons
• Property tax base increases moderately (not factoring in tourism)
• River, park, and bike trail are seamlessly connected with the commercial/retail uses
• History wall is modified or moved and park acreage increases
• Opportunity for year-round entertainment area
• Opportunity for business to increase their commercial frontage to include both waterfront and street sides
• Spotlight on cultural and historical resources

Workshop Votes: 10

Figure 10: Proposed land use breakdown for Scenario 2.
Figure 11: Conceptual development character for the Active Riverfront scenario.

- **Blue** = new infill structures
- **Purple** = private hardscaped spaces such as patios or informal gathering places
- **Green** = park or open space (plazas or green space)
- **Yellow lines** = routes of connectivity and continuous sight lines
Scenario 3 - Open Up & Play

Focus:
The Open Up & Play development scenario is centered around opening up the riverfront to create large spaces for community events and recreational activities.

Details:
- All buildings adjacent to the riverfront would be demolished, leaving a large area that can provide different types of spaces for different recreation uses.
- Recreation uses could be active and/or passive, and indoor and/or outdoor.
- All infill is directed to the blocks west of Main Street and north of Water Street.
- The park and bike trail are the primary recipients of investment to the area.
- Uses could include an amphitheater, market/pavilion, ice skating rink, spray park, river activities, along with more passive spaces (bike path, benches, open lawn, etc.).

Experience:
This scenario would create a riverfront that is solely focused on providing community space. It would feel completely open, with the potential for small structures in the form of a market or pavilion and shelters. Different types of spaces would provide environments and activities for a variety of ages and interests. Programming would be essential to keep the space active. All supporting businesses and restaurants would be located across the street and throughout the rest of the District as opposed to being next to the river.

Environmental needs:
Environmental assessments of each property would be needed to determine the presence and/or extent of contamination. Depending on the intended end use, some parcels will require remediation such as capping or removal of contaminated soil.

Pros and Cons
- Property tax base decreases moderately (not factoring in tourism)
- River, park, and bike trail are the main focus
- History wall is modified or moved and park acreage increases
- Space for large events and extensive programming
- Maintenance is key
- Opportunity for large public event/gathering space

Workshop Votes: 5

Figure 12: Proposed land use breakdown for Scenario 3.
Figure 13: Conceptual development character for the **Open Up and Play** scenario.

- **Blue** = new infill structures
- **Green** = park or open space (plazas or green space)
- **Yellow lines** = routes of connectivity and continuous sight lines
5. Scenario Analysis

As noted in the Redevelopment Scenarios section, the Fill In and Energize scenario was favored by significantly fewer responding stakeholders (1 of 16) than the other two. The planning team therefore moved forward with analysis of the Open Up & Play scenario and the Active Riverfront scenario.

Process

To determine if there was any significant difference between the two scenarios in terms of costs, the planning team took the following steps:

1. Estimate and compare site preparation costs
2. Estimate and compare redevelopment costs
3. Estimate and compare funding opportunities

A note on cost estimates:
Without complete information on a property, cost estimates developed are only general estimates and should not be used as concrete, verified costs for the categories listed. The more information that is collected for a property, the more accurate the cost estimates can become. The planning team encourages a thorough collection of this data before making any funding decisions.

Figure 14: Each scenario was compared on the basis of site preparation costs, redevelopment costs, and available funding.
Site preparation

Information on each property was collected which included:
- Building size (footprint and number of stories)
- Former uses
- Potential contamination based on past uses
- Vacancy status
- Auditor and tax values

From this baseline information, cost estimates were developed for demolition, asbestos abatement, and remediation. The probability of severe contamination for each property was given a low, medium, or high value based on the past use (see Figure 15).

Remediation costs have a wide low and high range as these are based on end use and level of contamination, neither of which are certain at this point. Abatement varies depending on the amount of asbestos. A demolished building will incur lower asbestos abatement costs than a redeveloped building, but will still require some level of abatement.

The details and assumptions used can be found in the Appendix.

Probability of severe contamination

*Probability of severe contamination could be either high or low depending on exact past use.

Figure 16 (below): Former uses of key properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Former use</th>
<th>Potential contaminants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zollinger's</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Building</td>
<td>Grain Mill</td>
<td>Asbestos, Lead, Creosote, Arsenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piqua Granite</td>
<td>Car Dealership</td>
<td>Asbestos, Petroleum, Solvents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo's Lounge</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot (next to Mo's)</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Asbestos, Lead, Creosote, Arsenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>Laundromat/Dry cleaners</td>
<td>Chlorinated solvents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver's</td>
<td>Power Company, Hardware</td>
<td>Asbestos, VOCs, PAHs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Asbestos, Petroleum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Results**
The analysis that follows provides estimated low and high costs for the aforementioned categories.

The figures are based on amount of potential demolition in each scenario as well as the square footage of remaining structures and their potential clean up levels. Regardless of scenario, this analysis assumes that all properties will require some amount of remediation and/or asbestos abatement and costs are figured accordingly.

**TOTAL SITE PREPARATION COSTS:**

**Active Riverfront:**
$663,000 (low) ---------> $2,489,000 (high)

- Requires acquisition for one full property and portions of two others
- Requires demolition of one full and half of two buildings
- 0.61 acres of additional park space created

**Open Up & Play:**
$1,019,000 (low) ---------> $2,921,000 (high)

- Requires acquisition for all waterfront properties
- Requires demolition of all waterfront properties
- 1.14 acres of additional park space created

The chart illustrates that the two scenarios have slightly differing cost characteristics for site preparation, which will affect funding sources, but there is not a clear financial advantage of one scenario over the other based on the information currently available on each property.
### COST ESTIMATES PER CATEGORY:

#### REMEDIATION COSTS:

**Active Riverfront:**
- Low: $270,420
- High: $1,839,000

**Open Up & Play:**
- Low: $248,220
- High: $1,594,000

#### DEMOLITION/ABATEMENT COSTS:

**Active Riverfront:**
- Low: $193,356
- High: $451,164

**Open Up & Play:**
- Low: $416,772
- High: $972,468

#### ACQUISITION COSTS:

**Active Riverfront:**
- Low: $199,200
- High: $199,200

**Open Up & Play:**
- Low: $354,300
- High: $354,300

---

*Figure 18: Comparison of site preparation costs per category.*
Redevelopment

The second step in measuring the cost differences between the two scenarios was to estimate the costs associated with redevelopment. This step is more likely to render a difference in cost than the remediation or funding analyses.

Because the two scenarios differ in terms of their ultimate components, look, and feel, their costs will vary widely as well. In any case, the costs will also be dependent on the final details of the items within the space, both in terms of quantity and quality. For example, a park could consist of open lawn which would be relatively inexpensive, or it could be highly designed and cost much more.

Additionally, the cost to maintain the space should be considered. More public space, with more landscaping and manicured green space may require more maintenance than a space containing hardscape and privately-owned structures.

Active Riverfront:
The major costs involved in this scenario are likely to be the cost to renovate the existing historic structures and the cost to develop a high quality public plaza and green space. As presented, more of this scenario includes hardscape compared to Open Up and Play, so a greater cost will be put into components like pavers, seating, and potentially lighting. While these items may be present in the other scenario, the cost will be greater in this scenario because of the scale and focus. However, the owners of private parcels may be willing to contribute to a portion of the cost leaving the City with less to bear.

Open Up and Play:
The major costs involved in this scenario are likely to be the costs for grading, landscaping, and recreation facilities (fields, courts, skating rink, spray park, etc.). As this scenario contains more green space, the final costs will also depend on the quantity and quality of these components. Again, while these recreational features may be present in the Active Riverfront, the cost may be greater in this scenario because of the larger scale and singular focus.

What might the Active Riverfront scenario look like?

sources: clockwise from top left - Waterfront Restaurant San Francisco; Portland Monthly Magazine; Williston Crossings; Ohio Development Services Agency; World Landscape Architecture.
### Scenario Analysis

#### Redevelopment cost considerations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active Riverfront</th>
<th>Open Up and Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Master Plan</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Engineering Fees</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development (grading, paths, parking, landscaping, etc.)</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Utilities (electrical, drainage, etc.)</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Furnishings and Wayfinding (signs, seating, trash/recycling, etc.)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Structures (pavilion, restrooms, amphitheater, rehab, etc.)</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>$ — $$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities (fields, courts, rink, spray park, etc.)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Maintenance Needs</td>
<td>$$</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ low  $$ medium  $$$ high

*Figure 19: Comparison of redevelopment costs.*

Note: These cost estimates are for general guidance and will vary based on the preferred scenario and the chosen details within that scenario. Completion of a site master plan for the area will provide detailed cost estimates for the area based on the specifics of the design. For example, lower cost components might include a playground, open lawn, and concrete paths and/or pavers. Higher cost components might include a spray park, amphitheater, intensive landscaping, and brick pavers.

What might the *Open Up and Play* scenario look like?

*sources: clockwise from top left - 48StateRoadTrip.com; River Market, Little Rock, Arkansas; DC Mud, DC Real Estate.com; Ohio Development Services Agency; Landscape Structures, Inc.*
### Funding Opportunities

To determine if one scenario would have more funding opportunities than the other based on the status of brownfields, demolition needs, and proposed redevelopment components, the planning team put together a list of potential funding sources relevant to each scenario. This list does not cover all the funding sources that are available, but includes most brownfield funding at the federal and state level, and several other state programs aligned with the City's redevelopment vision.

Additionally, the primary focus of the funding analysis is the portion of the planning area immediately adjacent to the river. Other buildings, infrastructure, and public spaces throughout the planning area could be eligible for this funding as well, but are not included in this particular analysis.

The chart to the right outlines potential funding sources, including grants, loans, and technical assistance. Many of the programs are brownfield related (appearing at the top of the chart). Fortunately, both the state and federal government have many programs that can help fund both assessments and remediation, as well as additional planning if needed. There also are other federally-funded programs that include brownfield planning, assessments, and/or remediation as qualified expenditures. These programs include the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program (administered locally or through the Ohio Development Services Agency), and the Water Pollution Control Loan Fund (WPCLF; administered by the Ohio EPA).

Applying for a program may require extensive preparation in some cases, so it is always advised to contact the program manager in advance to gather all information needed and to make sure you have a qualified project. Also, some programs are competitive while others accept and award applications on a rolling basis. This should also be noted to ensure the redevelopment timeline is met.

All programs in Figure 20 can be utilized for the Active Riverfront scenario, while only part of list can be utilized for the Open Up and Play scenario for the riverfront portion of the planning area. These specific programs incentivize historic rehabilitation, business investment, and housing, and therefore would not apply to the Open Up and Play scenario as presented.

### Results

Based on the information presented in this plan, there are several more funding opportunities available if the site has structures on it (Active Riverfront). That being said, the availability in funding for structures (new or existing) could be serving to fill a gap that is created by potentially higher redevelopment costs in the Active Riverfront scenario compared to the Open Up and Play scenario, which could cost significantly less depending on the level of design, and scale and quality of components within the space.

The City of Piqua can implement either of these scenarios in cost-efficient or extravagant ways. The key will be identifying the exact past uses of the existing buildings (which will provide a more informed cleanup estimate), and determining the components, details, and materials to be used in the final space. Additionally, private funds could be applied to either scenario and phasing can be used to spread out costs. **Because of this, the planning team recommends that the final use and desired feel of the space be the ultimate determinant of which scenario is chosen for the City of Piqua to develop and ultimately, enjoy.**
## Scenario Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Appx. Amount</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA Brownfield Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>Loan or Grant</td>
<td>Ohio Development Services Agency</td>
<td>up to $1M</td>
<td>2%/10 years</td>
<td>Asbestos, lead-based paint, petroleum remediation</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWDA Brownfield Loan</td>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>Ohio Development Services Agency</td>
<td>up to $5M</td>
<td>2%/10 years</td>
<td>Hazardous waste and petroleum remediation</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>up to $500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%/5 years</td>
<td>Phase II Environmental Assessments</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA Cleanup Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>up to $200,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Hazardous waste and petroleum remediation</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA Assessment Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>up to $400,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phase I and Phase II Environmental Assessments</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Brownfield Assistance Program</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Ohio EPA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phase I Assessments, Asbestos Surveys, Limited Phase II sampling</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Stormwater Infrastructure Loan</td>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>Ohio Development Services Agency</td>
<td>up to $5M</td>
<td>2%/10 years</td>
<td>Demolition, infrastructure installation, consulting costs, etc.</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Ohio Development Services Agency; Local government</td>
<td>varies widely</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Building improvements, infrastructure, demolition, streetscape, limited planning</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Ohio Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>up to 85% of costs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Boat ramps, marinas/boat docks, restroom facilities, signage, native landscaping, technical assistance for park development</td>
<td>Active Riverfront, Open Up and Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Loans/Loan guarantees</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Loans and Loan Guarantees for projects benefiting low-income and elderly persons</td>
<td>Active Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program</td>
<td>Tax Credit</td>
<td>Ohio Development Services Agency</td>
<td>25% of eligible rehab costs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of historically significant buildings</td>
<td>Active Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program</td>
<td>Tax Credit</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>20% of eligible rehab costs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of historically significant buildings</td>
<td>Active Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio New Markets Tax Credit Program</td>
<td>Tax Credit</td>
<td>Ohio Development Services Agency</td>
<td>39% of qualified investment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Investment in business located in low-income communities</td>
<td>Active Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal New Markets Tax Credit Program</td>
<td>Tax Credit</td>
<td>U.S. Department of the Treasury</td>
<td>39% of qualified investment</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Investment in business located in low-income communities</td>
<td>Active Riverfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 20:** Breakdown of potential funding sources.
6. Design Considerations

Design Principles

With any redevelopment scenario, it is important to establish specific design principles and guidelines for details to ensure that the area functions well, encourages certain types of activity and discourages others, and conveys a sense of importance and value to the community.

These principles must support the established goals for the District as well. These goals, as originally stated on page 2, are:

Attract public and private investment to the Riverfront District.
- Create an inviting public realm
- Provide community spaces that support entertainment and tourism
- Expand opportunities for downtown living
- Increase access and connectivity from downtown to the river
- Upgrade the physical environment to reflect the standards of the surrounding area
- Create development-ready parcels through environmental remediation

The following design principles will guide the redevelopment of the area. They are meant to inform the planning and design of new buildings and spaces and provide guidance to the formal design review process. These general principles can and should be met regardless of the final end uses within the planning area to create a vibrant, successful space.

DESIGN PRINCIPLES
Design and development of the planning area will:

- Support and complement the existing businesses, spaces, and context of the historic downtown;
- Encourage street-level activity and be comfortable for pedestrians;
- Contain a variety of prominent, accessible, and attractive public spaces;
- Preserve and protect unique and sensitive natural resources;
- Utilize high-quality materials that are attractive, long-lasting, and convey the space as being valuable to the community;
- Respect the unique history of the planning area and river corridor; and
- Be diligently maintained in order to remain a cherished community asset for years to come.
**Design Guidelines**

The design guidelines are meant to build off of the principles and provide more specifics for what the area looks and feels like. Whereas the principles create a framework for these concepts, the guidelines define aesthetics of the planning area more clearly. These recommended guidelines answer questions such as:

- How tall should buildings be?
- What should park spaces look like?
- Where should art pieces be located?
- What kind of materials should be used?

**Public Input:**

Many of these components were discussed in Workshop #2 with the attendees. A range of options was presented for each component and the attendees voted on which types of details they preferred in that range. The eight categories presented at the meeting are shown on the following pages, along with their options and the resulting preference that attendees chose denoted by the green star.

Within each category, several examples of recommended guidelines related to that category are presented. These are merely recommended guidelines and would need to be reviewed and tailored specifically for Piqua before ultimately being approved by the City Commission.

**Farmer’s Market**

1. More open and temporary
2. Semi-permanent, open structures
3. More closed and permanent

**Figure 21:** Design details as presented at Workshop #2.

**Image 11:** Preferred concept for Farmers Market option, from Workshop #2.

*source: Findlay Market, Wikipedia.*
EXAMPLE GUIDELINES: Structures

- The scale of new structures should be compatible with the size and scale of existing downtown buildings.
- The form of the building should be prioritized more strongly than the use.
- New structures should be oriented toward the street with minimal or zero setback from the sidewalk.
- Structures should occupy the corner of a block whenever possible.
- New structures should adhere to the existing Historic District building standards.

- Retail or restaurant functions should be located on the first floor, with office or residential uses on the upper stories when possible.
- Buildings should be built or renovated to have a high level of transparency on the street-level frontage.
- Store fronts should have elements such as wide display windows, window boxes, awnings, and appropriately scaled signs.
- Event spaces such as pavilions or plazas should be open-air, encouraging the flow of pedestrians in and out of the space.

*Image 12: New structures should be oriented toward the street with minimal or zero setback.*
*source: Coon Restoration

*Image 13: Buildings should be built or renovated to have a high level of transparency on the street-level frontage.*
*source: Ohio Development Services Agency

*Image 14: Store fronts should have elements such as wide display windows, window boxes, awnings, and appropriately scaled signs.*
*source: Ohio Development Services Agency
Piqua Brownfield Action Plan

Design Considerations

**Bike Parking**

More individual, dispersed, and open — More grouped, centralized, and secure

**Car Parking**

More spread out — More centralized

**EXAMPLE GUIDELINES: Parking**

- Develop a shared parking supply for event users, daily users, and visitors.
- Parking areas should utilize pervious materials when possible due to the proximity to the river.
- Centralized parking areas should be placed behind and to the side of buildings where possible. Parking that fronts the street should be minimized.
- Parking lots should be adequately screened with decorative fencing and/or landscaping.
- On-street parking is encouraged to slow the speed of vehicles and protect the pedestrian from moving traffic.
- Bike parking should be dispersed throughout the district in groupings of one to ten, as opposed to large shelters or bike lockers.
- Art pieces serving as bike parking are permitted and encouraged to provide character to the area as long as they provide all the functionality of traditional bike parking.

*Figure 22: Design details as presented at Workshop #2.*

*Image 15: On-street parking in a downtown setting.*

(source: Ohio Development Services Agency)

*Image 16: An example of non-traditional bike parking.*

(source: Flickr, Lynn Gardner)
Piqua Brownfield Action Plan

Design Considerations

Open Space

Image 17: An example of a seating area integrated into the landscape.
source: Louisville Waterfront Park

Recreation

Image 18: Seating in both sun and shaded areas should be provided.
source: Flickr, Fleur-de-louis

EXAMPLE GUIDELINES: Public Spaces

- Open space should be varied in terms of purpose, design, and intended users.
- Event spaces such as pavilions or plazas should be open-air, encouraging the flow of pedestrians in and out of the space.
- Seating areas should be created both in shaded and open areas for use by a variety of people.
- Open lawn should be mixed with hard surfaces to provide both visual interest and spaces for different activities.
- Seating areas, tables, and chairs should be placed throughout the area to create inviting spaces for people to stop and enjoy the views.
- Both visual and physical access to the riverfront should be provided.
- Public restrooms and food and drink vending are recommended for maximum usability.
- Ensure that all new public spaces meet high standards of design quality.
EXAMPLE GUIDELINES: Signage

- Signage should reflect the aesthetic of the existing historic district signage.
- Create gateways to the Riverfront District with signage, public art, or other built features. (at N. Water and N. Main; N. Main and E. Main)
- Signage should be provided for parking areas, main event areas, recreational paths, and for upcoming and currently occurring events.
- Signage should be lit for visibility in evening and night hours.
- Banner signs are encouraged for both signage and streetscape purposes.

Figure 24: Design details as presented at Workshop #2.

Image 19: Example of directional signage
source: Redwood City, California, Wikipedia

Image 20: Visibly lit signage
source: MyClayton.com

Image 21: Example of a banner sign
source: Ohio Development Services Agency

Image 22: Example of gateway signage
source: Carmel Arts and Design District
EXAMPLE GUIDELINES: Art

- Public art should be encouraged and permitted as murals, sculptures, and lighting displays throughout the District.
- Art pieces should be approved by the City Commission before installation.
- Art should not contain verbiage or images that are offensive.
- When art is part of a larger project, the artists should be included from the beginning of the planning process in order to best integrate their work into the project.
- Artists should explore opportunities to express Piqua’s local history and identity through their public work.

Art

Outside and spread out

Inside and centralized

Bridge Treatments

More low-key and traditional

More funky and unique

Figure 25: Design details as presented at Workshop #2.

Image 23: Piece of art along Indianapolis’s riverfront
Source: Civic Arts Project

Image 24: An example of a mural on the side of a building
Source: Ohio Development Services Agency

Image 25: Potential bridge lighting
Source: Vera Araminta @ veyvevEra
OTHER POTENTIAL GUIDELINES:

**Streetscape**
- Sidewalks and pathways should be at least five feet wide and be present on both sides of the street.
- Utilities should be buried when possible.
- Driveway access should be minimal off of Main Street.
- Streets should be designed and constructed to safely and comfortably accommodate bicyclists, preferably with sharrows or bike lanes.
- Crosswalks should be delineated with different pavement colors or materials.
- Amenities should include pedestrian-scale lighting, benches, trash receptacles, trees, plantings, bike parking, and pole banners.
- Streetscape components should be used to close significant gaps in the street wall that are the result of buildings set back from the sidewalk, vacant properties, drive-thrus, parking lots, and other visually empty spaces.

**Materials**
- Utilize sustainable, renewable, and locally sourced materials whenever possible.
- Employ pervious surfaces where and when possible due to the proximity to the river.
- Utilize high-quality materials that are attractive, long-lasting, and convey the space as being valuable to the community.
- Avoid materials that would detract from the historic quality and character of the adjacent historic district.
7. Implementation

Next Steps

With the completion of the Brownfield Action Plan for the Riverfront District, the City of Piqua has established a preliminary vision for the area and set the stage for both cleanup and redevelopment of its key properties. Based on the input from the public, the cost and funding analysis, and feedback from the City Commission, the planning team recommends moving forward with the next step of planning and design work for the Riverfront District.

This next step should take the plan and further its level of detail, resulting in a final vision and comprehensive redevelopment plan for the area. The redevelopment plan should focus primarily on the riverfront properties – those parcels to the east of S. Main Street and south of E. Water Street (see Image 29). These parcels contain four out of six of the potential brownfield properties identified in the Action Plan. Because of how underutilized this area is, the desire for large-scale improvement became a natural focus of discussion and planning activities throughout the process.

Work being completed in this next step should include addressing components from both the Active Riverfront and Open Up and Play scenario. While the Commission members and community members participating in the public meetings preferred the Active Riverfront scenario, the Open Up and Play scenario drew a close second. Both have desirable qualities and are worth investigating further to determine which components of each are ultimately feasible. To utilize the information gathered in this planning process, the following immediate implementation steps should be completed:

Image 29: Target properties from the Brownfield Action Plan that should be the focus of the next steps of planning and design work. source: Ohio Development Services Agency

1. Piqua Milling Co. building
2. Piqua Granite building
3. Former Laundry building
4. Former Mo’s Lounge building
1. Phase 1 Environmental site assessments and Asbestos surveys

*Need:* Detailed investigation into the past uses of the four target properties, most importantly the Laundromat/Dry Cleaners (117 E. Water Street) as the past use could highly impact its cleanup costs.

*Action:* Utilize the non-competitive Targeted Brownfield Assessment (TBA) grant funds from the Ohio EPA to fund these assessments.

2. Market feasibility of potential uses

*Need:* Analysis of relevant areas and resulting demands for specific uses in the riverfront area.

*Action:* Hire consultant to perform market feasibility study.

3. Rehabilitation vs. Demolition decision

*Need:* A final decision regarding rehabilitation or demolition for each of the four target properties (see ‘Target Properties’ on page 43 for more details).

*Action:* The City should make this final determination by taking into account the results of the market study, along with previous research and public input.

4. Conceptual site design for riverfront area

*Need:* A design concept that conveys the final vision for the area to begin marketing to funders, city leaders, and potential businesses.

*Action:* Hire a consultant to develop the conceptual site design once the final vision has been determined.

5. Phasing plan for acquisition, demolition, and development

*Need:* A detailed plan for timing to ensure that the process is coordinated and cost-effective.

*Action:* Include this deliverable in the scope of services for consultant developing the site plan.

6. Acquisition of target properties

*Need:* Properties in the hands of the City in order to carry out a large-scale redevelopment project.

*Action:* Develop a plan to acquire properties if needed as well as relocation assistance for Piqua Granite. Approach property owners with concept and proposal to acquire.

7. Funding strategy

*Need:* Knowledge of which funds to target and timing of when to apply, as well as who is responsible for the applications.

*Action:* The City and the consultant (if they have expertise in public financing) should collaborate to determine these items based on the phasing plan for redevelopment. Ohio Development Services Agency (ODSA) can assist in identifying funding programs as well.
General Recommendations

While the next steps identified on the previous page are fairly specific and should be taken in the near future, there are several goals and recommendations that should be implemented in the final design and construction of the space. Because they are more general, they may not have a specific timeframe. Their importance is crucial though and should be reflected in future documents guiding the riverfront redevelopment.

Each recommendation is briefly described below and is noted on the adjacent map of the planning area.

» Provide vista to the river
Open up space in the planning area in a way that will allow pedestrians along Water Street and North Main Street to see the river at key points.

» Remove or relocate history wall
The history wall should remain a part of the final space, but in a different form to allow for an opening up of the park space. As it is currently placed, the wall creates a barrier between the properties along North Main Street and the park/river.

» Clean up existing sites
The planning area should appear to be well-kept regardless of the final design. Utilities, trash, and debris from businesses should not remain in the open, but be removed and/or placed in screened areas.

» Redesign park for multiple uses
The existing park should be redesigned and expanded to accommodate multiple users and uses. The current park does not provide a variety of flexible, usable spaces for events and activities.

» Retain historical features
Make a concerted attempt to retain the historical features, such as the history wall, lock, and historic structures within the planning area. Utilize these elements to help create an identity for the area.

» Make both safety and aesthetic improvements to the bridge
Upgrade the bridge to safely accommodate pedestrians and cyclists. Make aesthetic improvements to complement the redesigned riverfront, increase visibility, and to appear more accessible.

» Continue streetscape improvements
Streetscape improvements should be compatible with both the new riverfront redevelopment and the existing downtown. Design focus should be placed on the pedestrian experience.

» Create continuity between North and South Main Street portions of planning area
Repair the disconnect that currently exists between North and South Main Street, particularly where the bike path meets the western edge of the river. Use the design process to create a space that is thought of as one cohesive area.

» Discuss potential river activities with the Conservancy
Initiate a dialogue with the Conservancy regarding the feasibility of returning water-related activities and recreation to the river. Determine the pros and cons of the change and gauge community interest.
Image 30: Diagram of general plan recommendations. (not specific to any one scenario)
source: Ohio Development Services Agency
Target Properties

How the city handles the four target properties along the riverfront will strongly influence the redevelopment outcome. The items below outline the key considerations regarding acquisition, rehabilitation, and demolition for each property. These items should be kept in mind at each stage of the planning and design process to ensure an outcome that meets the original goals for the area.

Piqua Milling Co. building - 111 N. Main Street

- **Priority for rehabilitation:** #1 (retain one or both buildings)
- **MOST historic value** of the four target properties and desirable location
- Could remain under **current ownership** or be transferred to **new ownership**
- Use next steps to determine rehabilitation or demolition - demolition should only be undertaken if there is no feasible way to salvage the building.

*Image 31: Photograph of the former Piqua Milling Company.  
source: Ohio Development Services Agency  
Image 32: Recommendation of portion of building to rehabilitate if only part can remain.*
Piqua Granite building - 123 N. Main Street

- **Priority for rehabilitation:** #2 (retain part of structure)
- Some historic value in the building
- **New ownership** is recommended, with relocation assistance going to current building owners
- Use next steps to determine rehabilitation or demolition

*Image 33: Photograph of the Piqua Granite building.*

*Source: Ohio Development Services Agency*

*Image 34: Recommendation of portion of building to rehabilitate if only part can remain.*
**Former Laundry building - 117 E. Water Street**

- **Priority for rehabilitation:** #3 (retain all of structure)
- Some historic value in the building
- **New ownership** is recommended
- Use next steps to determine rehabilitation or demolition - the potential for high cleanup costs should be considered

*Image 35: Photograph of the former Laundry building under renovation.*
*source: Miami County Auditor*

*Image 36: Recommendation of portion of building to rehabilitate if decided to rehabilitate.*
**Former Mo’s Lounge building - 111 S. Main Street**

- **Priority for rehabilitation:** #4 (retain all of structure)
- **LEAST historic value** of the four target properties
- **New ownership** is recommended
- Use next steps to determine rehabilitation or demolition

*Image 37: Photograph of the former Mo's Lounge building.*  
*source: Miami County Auditor*

*Image 38: Recommendation of portion of building to rehabilitate if decided to rehabilitate.*
Timing

While it is unlikely that acquisition, assessments, and cleanup activities will occur on all four target properties at the same time, the entire riverfront area should still be thought of and approached as one redevelopment ‘site’. **The more design and construction is done together, the more the end product will look and feel like one cohesive space.** It is the planning team’s recommendation that the redevelopment of each property not be rushed once acquired, but rather **the city should wait until all or a majority of the area has been acquired to begin redevelopment.**

Once properties have been acquired, individual parcels should be consolidated into multiple, or even one, larger parcel. This is dependent on ownership and structures present in the area, but given the desired future use(s) of the riverfront, consolidated parcels will make funding and redevelopment of the space much simpler.

To the right is an example development timeline that shows the different phases of work typically part of a large-scale redevelopment. Included in these phases are tasks associated with programming which is essential in any space used for events, recreation, etc. The timeline is a guide for hypothetical development and is flexible depending on the needs of the community and specifics of the design.

Additionally, phasing may need to be incorporated into the plan if the city is unable to acquire, fund and/or develop sites on this large scale. Phasing involves incrementally constructing portions of a site according to a development plan for a greater site. Design of the site would still occur at one time, but construction of every component may not happen all at once. A detailed plan for phasing, if needed, can be produced by the consultant developing the site plan with sufficient information from the city on their plans for acquisition and funding.
Development Timeline

January 2013 ---------------------------------------2015

**One**
- Market Feasibility
- Phase I assessments
- Begin acquisition

**Two**
- Phase II assessments
- Conceptual site design
- Detailed phasing plan
- Seek tenants/vendors
- Site consolidation
- Demolition

**Three**
- Cleanup and rehabilitation
- Detailed site design
- Draft design guidelines
- Marketing Strategy
- Initial plan for programming
- Seek tenants/vendors
- Construction documents
- Maintenance plan
- Rezoning

**Four**
- Site construction
- Streetscape improvements
- Final design guidelines
- Development branding
- Final plan for programming
- Commitments from end users

**Ongoing**
- Seek funding
- Recruit tenants
- Program spaces
- Recruit event sponsors
- Acquisition

*Figure 26: Potential development timeline for the riverfront redevelopment. source: Ohio Development Services Agency*
Conclusion

The goal of this Brownfield Action Plan is to define a brownfields-impacted area, gather baseline information and identify key potential brownfields in that area, conduct a preliminary analysis on those properties, form a community-supported vision for the area, and determine what needs to happen in order for that vision to come to fruition. With this stage complete, the vision can begin to come to life with the implementation of the next steps as defined on pages 39-46.

Though the City of Piqua has not come to a conclusion regarding one final redevelopment concept, both options under consideration contain common elements such as entertainment, recreation, and community space. Additionally, the riverfront redevelopment area will be assessed, remediated, and elevated to the aesthetic standards of the portion of Main Street just north of the planning area regardless of the final concept that is decided upon.

The seven immediate implementation steps as listed on page 40 should be the focus of the next phase, but the general recommendations, property-specific recommendations, and timing should be a key part of all decisions related to the redevelopment of the planning area. The funding recommendations on page 29 should also be kept in mind throughout the process. ODSA will continue to assist the City in the short-term to carry out the next phase of the project, for which they are providing funding, and over the long-term to continually match funding opportunities to the city’s redevelopment goals.
8. Appendix
Public Meeting #1: April 9, 2012

Small groups: Identifying preferred use(s) of riverfront/redevelopment of properties

**Table A.**
Bike/Kayak/Canoe rental
Miamisburg as example – open area, parking
Kayaking – raising the water level
Outdoor entertainment area. Bennett
Mo’s building as a restaurant
Piqua Milling building as a micro-brewery
Piqua Granite as a farmer’s market
Murals on buildings
Behind Decker’s (BOE) – beach area for volleyball.
Bring in food/beer vendors
Open green space: splash park, flowers, seating
Metropark: splash park, ice rink, food vendor

**Table B.**
Boat Launch E. of SR 66 Roadside Park
Lot 1: Weaver’s – retail sales? And parking
Lot 2: [Drapp] bldg. – hostel for boater/bikers
Cut E. Wall on Lock 7 to get to grass area
N. end of lot 5: Steps, shade, deli shop, down to bike path
Boats on river: party barges
Re-do RR bridge
Lot 6: turn to farmer’s market
Boat exit launch at Bennett School
Open Park in sand bar behind Decker Bldg
Cron Furniture Factory – Shawnee restaurant

**Table C.**
Archway would be nice
1913 flood marker
Bike Hub
Dining at Mo’s – micro brew
Piqua Milling is key
Art Annex at Piqua Granite (Edison)
Chinese Laundry – B&B
Piqua Milling – archway, connect to Riverwalk
Mo’s – Dining opportunity, tiered garden

**Table D.**
Gahanna Creekside as a good example
Functional bike path, more accessible, better maintained
Enhance bike path
Focus on assets
Huge need for restaurants
Active uses for families
Example from Louisville – use of Mill building; floors with musicians in old tobacco warehouse
Specialty shops – from recent survey
Work with Conservancy District; lots of underutilized green space for festivals
2nd priority: Barefoot skiing once was active, skiing, kayaking (concerns)
Zollingers building as bike hotel
Destinations – shopping, ice cream shops
Restaurants, shops facing both river and Main Street
Public Meeting #1 cont’d.

Sorted by Use:

Recreation
- Bike/Kayak/Canoe rental
- Kayaking – raising the water level
- Outdoor entertainment area. Bennett
- Behind Decker’s (BOE) – beach area for volleyball.
- Open green space: splash park
- Metropark: splash park, ice rink...
- Boat Launch E. of SR 66 Roadside Park
- Boats on river: party barges
- Boat exit launch at Bennett School
- Open Park in sand bar behind Decker Bldg
- Bike Hub
- Active uses for families
- Work with Conservancy District; lots of underutilized green space for festivals
- 2nd priority: Barefoot skiing once was active, skiing, kayaking (concerns)

Dining
- Mo’s building as a restaurant
- Piqua Milling building as a micro-brewery
- Piqua Granite as a farmer’s market
- Bring in food/beer vendors
- ...food vendor
- N. end of lot 5: deli shop
- Lot 6: turn to farmer’s market
- Cron Furniture Factory – Shawnee restaurant
- Dining at Mo’s – micro brew
- Mo’s – Dining opportunity...
- Huge need for restaurants
- Destinations –...ice cream shops
- Restaurants...

Arts
- Art Annex at Piqua Granite (Edison)
- Example from Louisville – use of Mill building; floors with musicians in old tobacco warehouse

Lodging
- Lot 2: Laundermat – hostel for boater/bikers
- Chinese Laundry – B&B
- Zollingers building as bike hotel

Retail
- Lot 1: Weaver’s – retail sales? And parking
- Specialty shops – from recent survey
- Destinations...shopping...

Design Details (future discussion)
- Murals on buildings
- ...flowers, seating
- Cut E. Wall on Lock 7 to get to grass area
- Re-do RR bridge
- Archway would be nice
- 1913 flood marker
- Piqua Milling – archway, connect to Riverwalk
- Mo's... tiered garden
- Functional bike path, more accessible, better maintained
- Enhance bike path
- Focus on assets
- ...shops facing both river and Main Street
- N. end of lot 5: Steps, shade... down to bike path
- Nice signage
Piqua Brownfield Action Plan

Appendix

Public Meeting #1 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Urgency</th>
<th>Public relations</th>
<th>Discongruity</th>
<th>Development Potential</th>
<th>totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>neut</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prioritization activity:

Property 1 is Weaver’s
Property 2 is Laundromat (Chinese Laundry)
Property 3 is Piqua Granite
Property 4 is Piqua Milling Co.
Property 5 is Mo’s
Property 6 is Zollinger’s

Urgency: Are there safety, health, and wellness concerns with the property such as high levels of contamination, vandalism, and structural issues?

Public Relations: Will the redevelopment of the property significantly improve the image of the community? Has there been considerable negative press, public complaints, etc. on the property?

Discongruity: Is the property out of place with its surroundings?

Development Potential: Does the property have strong potential for redevelopment as evidenced by developer appeal, attractive location, and potential economic and community impacts?
Public Meeting #2: July 19, 2012

1st Half – Preferred Development Scenario

Attendees anonymously selected one of three possible development scenarios presented at the meeting and provided feedback on why they preferred it.

Scenarios
#1 – Fill In and Energize
#2 – Active Riverfront
#3 – Open Up and Play

Selections
#1) One vote.
   • “Using more of what you have. Lower maintenance of public areas, less displacement of landowners.”

#2) Ten votes.
   • “Did not care for historical buildings along river front being removed in #3 and did not care for all the buildings in #1 along the river.”
   • “It best utilized the beauty of the river and realizes practical use (restaurants, shops, etc.)”
   • “More economic opportunities (business) (tax base). A better mix of uses. Keep a more historical feel.”
   • “#2 is good mixture and probably most realistic/feasible. Retains good historic buildings, fewer new buildings (where would investment $$ come from?), does not lower tax base. Need mixture of open space, restaurants, plazas, etc. – like San Antonio’s new brewery river front district.”
   • “Middle of the road”
   • “Would allow dining with view of river if restaurants were on river. And would allow view of river from other areas.”
   • “Number 1 blocked river view. Number 3 gave up possibilities for development. Number 2 looks like a more positive utilization between 1 & 3 with more ways to balance nature and development.”
   • “Do not demolish historic fabric – the mill could be a great tourist site. Building lots of infill building to match historic nature of downtown – difficult and expensive. Too much “play” could make the city go away.”
   • “#2 retains some historic feel of area but also opens up for views. #3 opens all up. Loses its downtown feel but is nice.”
   • (one respondent voted but left no comment)

#3) Five votes.
   • “It is inviting and an attractive destination for bike path traffic”
   • “Open space creates a community asset and provides an anchor for downtown”
   • “#3 maximizes riverfront recreation. Keeps focus on filling and maintaining existing Main St. area businesses without creating competition and potential for more empty storefronts. Creates opportunities for new entertainment options.”
   • “Aesthetically more pleasing. Hopefully buildings across from river view not be all bare and dilapidated structures. Maintenance concerns me...especially after bike bridge put on fire 3-4 times.”
   • “I love two buildings (Mo’s and Chinese laundry), but like the open space concept. Increases value of other
Public Meeting #2 cont’d.

“downtown structures. Totally different look, cost much lower.”

2nd Half – Design Concepts
Attendees were presented eight topics for design consideration, and asked to select their preferred design concept using real-time voting devices. Designs for each topic were presented as a scale of degree in intensity/concentration. Results are percentages. Respondents ranged from 15-17 people.

Topics and Results
Farmers Market
1) More open and temporary - 19
2) Semi-permanent, open structures - 75
3) More closed and permanent - 6

Car Parking
1) More spread out - 6
2) More centralized - 94

Bike Parking
1) More individual, dispersed, and open - 67
2) Semi-enclosed, grouped facilities - 27
3) More grouped, centralized, and secure - 7

Open Space
1) More natural - 6
2) Some structures and hardscaping - 88
3) More structured - 6

Arts
1) Outside and spread out (e.g. sculpture) - 24
2) Using existing structures (e.g. murals) - 53
3) Inside and centralized (e.g. arts incubator) - 24

Recreation
1) Place for reflection - 19
2) Some features for activity/play - 38
3) Place for interaction - 44

Bridge Treatments
1) More low-key and traditional - 18
2) Installing art on existing structure - 18
3) Installing aesthetic lighting on existing structure - 47
4) More funky, unique, possible new build - 18

Signage
1) More traditional - 81
2) Vintage, stylized - 13
3) More funky, artistic, or humorous - 6
3D Computer Modeling - Fill in and Energize
3D Computer Modeling - Active Riverfront
3D Computer Modeling - Open Up and Play
# Remediating Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Vacant?</th>
<th>Auditor’s Value</th>
<th>Annual Tax Value</th>
<th>Footprint (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Material Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>S. Wayne St.</td>
<td>Pensco Trust Co.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$139,300</td>
<td>$2,693</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27927 Brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>S. Wayne St.</td>
<td>Zollinger’s</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$61,200</td>
<td>$1,297</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24075 Brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>N. Main St.</td>
<td>Tappan Historic Properties</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$143,400</td>
<td>$2,869</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10775 Brick&amp;Metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>S. Main St.</td>
<td>Mill Building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$52,800</td>
<td>$1,086</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7400 Brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>S. Main St.</td>
<td>Vacant Lot next to Mo’s</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$48,800</td>
<td>$987</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>E. Water St.</td>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$48,800</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3300 Brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>E. Water St.</td>
<td>Weaver’s</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td>$34,500</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4060 Brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>E. Water St.</td>
<td>Keith &amp; Lisa Bowman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$48,800</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4060 Brick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>E. Water St.</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $519,300 $10,555
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Acreage</th>
<th>Former Use</th>
<th>Potential Contamination</th>
<th>Remediation Cost Est. Range (Ave. $203k/ac.)</th>
<th>Probability of Severe Env. Contam.</th>
<th>Demo Cost Est. Range ($6-18 sq.ft.)</th>
<th>Demo Asbestos Abatement ($3 sq.ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.225 Warehouse</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>$83,781</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$167,562</td>
<td>$502,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 Grain Mill</td>
<td>Asbestos, Lead, Creosote, Arsenic</td>
<td>$72,219</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$144,438</td>
<td>$433,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.587 Car Dealership</td>
<td>Asbestos, Petroleum, Solvents</td>
<td>$119,161</td>
<td>$729,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$64,650</td>
<td>$193,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 Restaurant</td>
<td>Asbestos</td>
<td>$22,200</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$44,400</td>
<td>$133,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.22 Restaurant</td>
<td>Asbestos, Lead, Creosote, Arsenic</td>
<td>$44,660</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04 Dry cleaners</td>
<td>Chlorinated solvents</td>
<td>$12,180</td>
<td>$729,000</td>
<td>High-Low</td>
<td>$24,360</td>
<td>$73,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Company, Hardware</td>
<td>Asbestos, VOCs, PAHs</td>
<td>$17,255</td>
<td>$729,000</td>
<td>High-Low</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td>$59,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4 Unknown</td>
<td>Asbestos, Petroleum</td>
<td>$81,200</td>
<td>$729,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.857</strong></td>
<td>$452,656</td>
<td>$3,542,000</td>
<td>$465,210</td>
<td>$1,395,630</td>
<td>$232,605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. From Miami County Auditor's Website
2. From Miami County Auditor's Website and Approximated
3. More info needed to determine appropriate cleanup.
4. From adjacent property
5. Assumptions (Low): Calculated using cleanup cost/acre based on average remedy costs for 93 Clean Ohio projects with an average size of 9 acres. However, few properties < 5 acres are represented in this data set so this estimate may not be accurate for smaller properties. Low estimate set equal to demo asbestos abatement estimate, at a minimum. The average remediation cost for all projects, regardless of size or contamination type, was $1.86M.
6. Assumptions (High): Estimate based on average remediation costs of soil and groundwater in 93 Clean Ohio projects for Asbestos=$245K, Soil Cont.=68K, Groundwater Cont.=729K. With the exception of the Mill Building, this produced a higher estimate than the methods for the Low estimate.
7. Opinion of authors. Based on history/use reported here.
8. Based on average residential demo costs ($5-15/ sq.ft.) + 20%
## Remediation Estimates cont’d.

Example: Asbestos Abatement Estimate  
(Dayton Ohio site, June 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9” x 9” Floor tile and mastic</td>
<td>$5/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Pipe Fitting TSI</td>
<td>$20/LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Pipe TSI</td>
<td>$10/LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Pipe TSI</td>
<td>$10/LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnace Insulation</td>
<td>$10/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duct TSI</td>
<td>$12/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaskets</td>
<td>$20/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sink Soundproofing</td>
<td>$25/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-rated Doors</td>
<td>$100/door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window glazing</td>
<td>$206/window</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Redevelopment Misconceptions

**Myth:** We have buildings in the downtown that are vacant now, so why would we build more?

There could be multiple reasons for the vacancy in downtown buildings, and it isn’t always because of the oversupply of space. For example, the space may not be the right size, shape, in the right condition, or have the necessary infrastructure for the type of business or other tenant looking to use the space. New spaces allow the city to market to a larger segment of the population, give people something to be excited about, and may attract new users to the area, increasing the traffic and demand for the other currently vacant spaces as well. Destinations offering distinct experiences within a city can act synergistically, drawing on a broader clientele to produce the critical mass needed for a “vibrant city” feel.

**Myth:** We can only pick one of the redevelopment options so anything in the scenario we don’t choose, we won’t get.

No scenario has to be ‘chosen’ at all. The scenarios are meant to show options and get feedback regarding the desires and preferences of the community. Components of each scenario can be combined into the other as well, for example utilizing one building as the anchor for an expanded park. These components will not be finalized until the detailed site design is complete.

**Myth:** Rehabilitation is too complicated. It would be easier to demolish the buildings that need extensive work.

Rehabilitation work can be very complicated. However, not every project is this way. Rehabilitation can be less complicated and more valuable than demolition if you get the right owner/lessee since public funding is not mandated for development and upkeep of the property.

**Myth:** We cannot begin the design process until we know exactly what is going into the space, or who is going in the space.

Conceptual design can occur before or during a market study if the end result is truly focused on form before function. The exception to this would be if the end result is something very specific (for example, a contemporary art gallery, indoor golf facility, etc.). Also, the conceptual plan can be used to market the area to potential investors, tenants, and business owners making it a valuable tool to have in hand before that time comes.