



# TRANSPORTATION





## 9. Transportation

### A. Introduction

With four interchanges located within or just outside of the City limits, Sidney has excellent access to the interstate highway system, better than most cities of its size. This access, in combination with industrial land expansion in the west, is expected to generate more traffic on the City's street network. The transportation infrastructure is one of the important elements in determining the City's quality of life. The transportation network is important in carrying people and goods from one place to another, and for work, business, social, recreation, etc. Efficiency and safety are the two important components to any surface street system. The Transportation Plan addresses the following topics:

- **Road Network**
- **Access Management**
- **Truck Traffic**
- **Public Transportation**
- **Bike Routes**

### B. Planning Issues

The planning issues raised by the community in 1997, 2002 and 2008, focused on the roadway network. Hoewisher Road extension, and roadway infrastructure improvements were the major concerns. In general, transportation received more attention than any other potential infrastructure issue (i.e. water, sewer). The following is a summary of the planning issues:

#### 1. Hoewisher Road Extension

The need for a northeast/southwest bypass or east/west connector in the northern part of the City has been a continuing planning issue in the community for the last 10 years. The City previously planned to extend Hoewisher Road and connect to Fourth Avenue at Russell Road but was unable to complete the project as originally designed. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to investigate this issue and provide recommendations for an alternative bypass corridor.

#### 2. Roadway Infrastructure

The Comprehensive Plan is intended to assess the impact of the proposed growth on the transportation system and provide recommendations to ensure the road network can accommodate future expansion and infill development.

#### 3. Truck Traffic

Three major streets (SR 47, SR 29 and CR 25A) that pass through the City's downtown are suspected of carrying abnormally high percentages of truck traffic. The 2002 Plan assessed this issue and provided recommendations which still remain valid during this 2008 Plan update. An "alternate" truck route around the downtown business district has been approved and funded through ODOT. Three intersections are to be provided with a larger turning radius for semi-trucks to follow along SR 47. (Ohio & North; North & West; West & Court)

Total Estimated Cost: \$210,700  
Partially Funded by ODOT with \$168,600  
City Portion of Project Cost: \$42,100



#### **4. Redistribution of Traffic**

The City of Sidney is served by four interchanges with Interstate Route 75. The interchanges are located along the west side of the city and connect to, from north to south, Wapakoneta Rd. (CR 25A), St. Mary's Avenue (SR 29), Michigan St. (SR 47), and Fair Rd. (CR 8). The interstate generally separates the industrial area and regional commercial areas of the City from the residential and downtown areas. The Michigan St. interchange is by far the most heavily traveled, due to the concentration of regional business venues along Michigan St. from I-75 to Kuther Rd. and on Vandemark Rd. from Michigan St. to Russell Rd. The Wapakoneta Rd. and St. Mary's Ave. interchanges continue to be underutilized; primarily due to the impacts of lower intensity land uses and the amount of undeveloped land in the areas. Improvements that would redistribute traffic to these interchanges, and reduce the traffic at the Michigan St. interchange, would be beneficial. More specifically, a reduction in east-west traffic flow across the Michigan St. Bridge over I-75 is envisioned. The idea would be to encourage access to the business venues further west on Michigan St. and partially reverse the directional traffic flow.

#### **5. Traffic Flow**

The need to move traffic between the northeast section of the City, which is principally residential, and the commercial areas on Michigan St. and Vandemark Rd. to the southwest remains the principal transportation need of the City. A number of options have been examined for facilitating this traffic flow over the years, yet SR 47 (Michigan St.) traffic continues to increase as corresponding commercial land use increases west of I-75. Reconstruction of the Russell Rd Bridge over I-75 will allow more traffic to flow to the west industrial and commercial areas of Sidney without passing through the Michigan Street corridor. This new bridge is targeted for completion by September, 2009.

### **C. Existing Conditions**

This section provides a summary of existing conditions related to the roadway network. The City has compiled, and maintains, a catalogue of technical data on traffic dating back some 25 years.

#### **1. Current Thoroughfare Plan**

The City's 1982 Comprehensive Plan provided a Local Highway Classification System that serves as a precursor to today's Transportation Network map. The system classified roads based on function, providing for main thoroughfares (with proposed main thoroughfares), secondary thoroughfares, collector streets and local streets. A map accompanying this chapter shows the current Thoroughfare Plan.

Of particular importance are the proposed main thoroughfares, with the 1982 Plan recommending the following:

##### **a) Hoewisher Road**

The 1982 Plan recommended extending Hoewisher Road east to SR 47, west through CR 25A to Russell Road (intersecting with Fourth Avenue) and extending Fourth Avenue south to Fair Road. This improvement would provide a major arterial paralleling I-75. Portions of this Fourth Avenue arterial have been completed, especially between Campbell Road and Fair Road, but the Hoewisher improvements have not been completed.

##### **b) Vandemark Road**

Vandemark Road was recommended to be extended north to Russell Road. This has been completed, but following a slightly different alignment than presented in the 1982 Plan.

##### **c) Downtown-SR 47 Connector**

The 1982 Plan recommended constructing a new arterial parallel to Port Jefferson Road from the downtown to Overland Drive. The plan also recommends constructing a bridge across the Great Miami River, intersecting with SR 47. This proposal was never undertaken by the City, and is currently considered undesirable.



## 2. Findings

### a) Traffic Patterns and Congestion

Major traffic flows within the City are from the north/northeast quadrant, to the west/southwest quadrant during the morning peak (and vice versa during evening peak). Because a direct route is nonexistent, several major intersections are congested during peak hours. The three most congested intersections are SR 47 and Vandemark Road, Russell Road and Wapakoneta Avenue, and SR 47 and Fourth Avenue. This was also the case during the 2002 Plan Update. Table 9.1 shows the location of these congested intersections.

Reconstruction of the Russell Rd Bridge over I-75 will allow more traffic to flow to the west industrial and commercial areas of Sidney without passing through the Michigan Street corridor. The new bridge is targeted for completion by September, 2009.

### b) Bypass

The need exists for an internal bypass in the City's north/northwest quadrant, based upon the Hoewisher Road alignment. This would serve to ease congestion at key intersections noted above. The City has been attempting to implement a strategy for several years to achieve this goal.

### c) Truck Traffic

Recent (year 1997) traffic counts taken at the corporation line by the City on major routes, indicate these routes carry 7% to 26% of the truck traffic, compared to total traffic. For details see the following Table 9.1 with Figure 9.2

**Table 9.1**  
**Traffic Counts**

<u>Location</u>	<u>Direction ADT</u>	<u>Trucks</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1	Eastbound	4,474	13%
	Westbound	4,113	19%
2	Northbound	3,099	26%
	Southbound	3,204	10%
3	Eastbound	2,555	19%
	Westbound	2,471	13%
4	Northbound	1,988	24%
	Southbound	1,964	7%
5	Eastbound	4,010	23%
	Westbound	3,903	22%
6	Eastbound	11,080	14%
	Westbound	13,460	14%
7	Eastbound	8,701	19%
8	Southbound	8,823	9%

Source: City of Sidney, 1997  
Prepared By: Wilbur Smith Associates, 1997



**3. Capital Improvements**

The City’s current five-year capital improvement Plan has programmed about \$14.3 million between 2009 and 2013, for projects related to the transportation network, specifically bridges and streets. In addition to a number of maintenance projects, major planned transportation improvements include:

- a) **Bridges** - Removal of the abandoned CSX bridge over State Route 47, west of downtown in 2020.
- b) **Streets** –
  - 1. Russell Road widening, including replacement of a 4-lane bridge over I-75 during 2009.
  - 2. Wapakoneta Avenue reconstruction from Parkwood to I-75 in year 2011
  - 3. Annual Street resurfacing

**Table 9.2  
Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Generation**

<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Basis per Acre</b>	<b>Existing Acreage</b>	<b>Land Use Trip Ends</b>	<b>Proposed Land Acreage</b>	<b>Use Plan Trip Ends</b>
Low Density Res	1.5 units	2,200	25,940	2,286	26,872
Medium Density Res	3.0 units	910	21,788	3,444	74,129
High Density Res	6.0 units	67	2,566	192	7,074
Commercial	5,700 sf	448	143,075	687	219,374
Office	10,000 sf	39	3,804	266	16,685
Industrial	7,550 sf	950	53,473	2,000	112,695
Public/Semi Public	10,000 sf	206	5,871	250	7,125
<b>TOTAL</b>	n/a	4,820	256,517	9,125	463,954

Source: Wilbur Smith Associates, 1997, Jacobs Engineering 2008

**D. Transportation Plan**

**1. Introduction**

The Transportation Plan focuses on improving the City’s transportation facilities. This Plan will provide the City with an opportunity to accommodate the future growth of traffic.

**2. Policies**

The following summarizes the mission statements, objectives and strategies that serve as the policy foundation for the Transportation Plan:

**a) Mission Statement**

The transportation mission is a *transportation system that relieves congestion, ensures safety, enhances traffic flow and supports transportation alternatives and promotes industrial growth.*

**b) Objectives**

The following are the objectives for Transportation:

**Objective 1 - Traffic Flow - Improve traffic flow and reduce congestion.**

As identified earlier, the major traffic flow in the City is between northeast residential, and southwest industrial areas, resulting in several congested streets and intersections. Increasing residential land on the northeast corner, on industrial land in the north and on the southwest corner, is expected to aggravate traffic conditions. In general, with full build-out conditions, traffic is projected to increase roughly 80% over the existing traffic counts (Table 9.2 for details on Average Weekly Vehicle Trip Generation). To accommodate the northeast and southwest traffic flow, and the projected traffic increase on the existing street system, a bypass, new connectors, widening, intersection improvements, etc. will be part of the City’s agenda.



**Objective 2 - Truck Traffic - Reduce through truck traffic.**

Three major highways (SR 47, SR 29 and CR 25A) route most truck traffic through the downtown via Courthouse Square (defined by Main Avenue, North Street, Ohio Avenue and Court Street). The percentages of trucks at these locations are not exceptionally heavy compared to some of the locations at corporation lines (see Table 1.1), but turning movements of trucks on this block create major traffic problems. Additional intersections in the City are also impacted by truck traffic. Therefore, through truck traffic should be managed differently in the future, especially with the anticipated growth outline in the Land Use Plan.

**Objective 3 - Public Transportation - Expand public transportation services.**

Currently, the City is operating Dial-a-Ride program on weekdays to provide public transportation. This is limited to certain places with restricted timing. This public transportation system should be expanded to provide better access throughout the City, with flexible timing and weekend services.

**Objective 4 - Downtown Parking - Improve downtown parking.**

The number of parking spaces should be increased downtown to accommodate weekday and weekend parking demands if warranted. Improvements should include off-street surface parking, decked parking (garages) as appropriate with available funding. However, the city should be careful not to provide too much parking, which will increase traffic and trips by individuals in personal automobiles. Partnerships will be necessary to provide parking facilities downtown, working with Shelby County and the business community will be necessary. Wayfinding signage to locate public parking areas should be implemented as a less costly way of promoting parking within the downtown area.

**Objective 5 - Access Management - Implement access management requirements.**

Access Management preserves and restores the capacity of roadways. The City needs to restrict the number of access points, on higher classified streets, to preserve the functional capacity, and to carry higher speed traffic, and trips of longer length. The objective of roadway functional classification as shown in Figure 9.3 should be preserved. Traffic movement is the primary priority on major thoroughfares, with access as a secondary priority. Whereas local streets have access as a primary priority, and traffic movement is a secondary priority. Review and revise, as necessary, the City's adopted access management plan in order to ensure safe and efficient access to properties in the City.

**Objective 6 - Road Infrastructure - Improve road infrastructure.**

Along with major roadway improvements (widening, etc.) the City will continue to resurface existing streets, especially in residential neighborhoods. Sidney currently budgets an average of \$440,000 annually for street maintenance (high of \$627,000 in 2007 to a low of \$243,000 in 2009). It is assumed that the average amount, as identified above, will continually be budgeted annually for future projects.

**Objective 7 - Bike System - Expand bike system.**

The City should expand its current on-street bike route to additional major corridors and off street bike path system. This would provide an expanded bike route system to access parks and other recreational places, especially if it connects with the Veterans Memorial Walkway, and extensions along the Great Miami River. In addition, the City should make an effort to make the bike route a transportation route, not just a recreation corridor. This will promote the use of bicycles as alternative transportation sources reducing traffic and pollution generated by automobiles, and encourage healthy lifestyles.

**3. Standards**

The intent of this section is to recommend standards for main thoroughfares, secondary thoroughfares, collector streets and local streets. The following table provides a summary of minimum roadway standards for the City of Sidney.



**Table 9.3  
Roadway Standards**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Main Thoroughfare</b>	<b>Secondary Thoroughfare</b>	<b>Commercial Street</b>	<b>Collector Street</b>	<b>Local Street</b>
Level of Service <sup>1</sup>	C	C	C	D	D
Right-of-Way	100 ft	80 ft	60 ft	60 ft	50 ft
Lane Width <sup>2</sup>	12 ft	12 ft	11 ft	11 ft	10 ft
On Street Parking	No	No	No	Restricted	Yes
Sidewalks	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required
Legal Speed	35-50 mph	35-50 mph	25-35 mph	25 mph <sup>3</sup>	25 mph

Key: ft=feet, mph=miles per hour

Notes: 1. Definitions are as per Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Number of lanes will be determined based upon the desired level of service and amount of traffic. 2. Requires additional width for edge lane where on-street parking is allowed. 3. If no STOP within one-mile distance, legal speed is 35 mph.

Prepared by: Wilbur Smith Associates, 1997

#### 4. Transportation Plan

The Transportation Plan focuses on improving traffic flow and circulation, reducing truck traffic in the downtown, improving public transportation and downtown parking, addressing access concerns and extending bike routes as an alternative transportation mode and ensuring the safety of the motoring and non-motoring public.

Several key roads and intersections are recommended for improvement, including: extending Hoewisher Road and Stolle Avenue, widening SR 47 corridor in the vicinity of I-75, and improving intersections at SR 47 and Fourth Avenue, and Russell and Wapakoneta roads. Special emphasis in the transportation plan is also directed towards maintaining and funding roadway infrastructure.

Regarding truck traffic, the Plan recommends enforcing truck weight restrictions, providing alternative truck routes that bypass the downtown (plans developed for late 2009), and reducing the number of 90-degree turns along several state and county routes in the downtown. Public transportation should be strengthened through an oversight council, extending Dial-a-Ride services, providing dedicated bus routes and additional transportation to meet elderly needs, and making bike routes a major mode of transportation.



Thoroughfare Plan





The Plan addresses parking in the downtown specifically, and recommends limiting the amount of time delivery vehicles can block alleyways, developing a parking garage and carefully expanding the amount of surface parking. Access management is recommended as a means of improving traffic flow on SR 47 and Vandemark Road, especially given their commercial emphasis.

## E. Implementation

### 1. Introduction

The following strategies focus on key implementation to enhance and improve Sidney's transportation system.

### 2. Strategies

#### Objective 1 - Traffic Flow

##### Strategies

##### 1a) Extending Hoewisher Road.

Increasing residential land use at northeast corner, and industrial land use at southwest corner of the City, requires the extension of Hoewisher Road. Connecting the existing Hoewisher Road on the east side of the City, and Vandemark Road on west side; and extending Fourth Avenue on north to join Hoewisher Road extension are part of this Plan. This requires two overpasses (CSX and I-75) and possible signals at Vandemark Road and SR 29.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead), Planning Commission  
*Timeframe:* Partially Completed, Ongoing  
*Estimated Cost:* \$4,500,000 (total)

##### 1b) Improving intersections at SR 47-Fourth Avenue and Russell Road-Wapakoneta Road.

These are two of the most congested intersections in the City, and each is impacted by truck turning movements. Both intersections are operated with traffic signals. Though these intersections have separate left turn lanes, travelers can wait for more than one cycle during peak hours. These intersections require geometric and/or operational improvements.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead)  
*Timeframe:* Study Underway  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On A Project Specific Basis

##### 1c) Extending Stolle Avenue.

In order to improve the level of service of Vandemark Road, and the intersection of SR 47 and Vandemark Road, an alternate link for Vandemark Road between SR 47 and Russell Road is recommended. The extension of Stolle Avenue is the most appropriate alternative to create this link, and would provide alternative access to the congested commercial area.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead), Planning Commission  
*Timeframe:* Mid Term  
*Estimated Cost:* \$80/lane-ft.

##### 1d) Extending McClosky School Road.

The extension of McClosky School Road, to Vandemark Road, is an alternate access for south side of the City, to the proposed industrial expansion on west side of I-75. This requires an underpass/overpass at I-75.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead), Planning Commission  
*Timeframe:* Long Term  
*Estimated Cost:* \$80/lane-ft.



**1e) Extending Fourth Avenue.**

Fourth Avenue should be extended north from its present terminus at Russell Road, to the Hoewisher Road extension. This would provide improved access on the east side of I-75.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead) and Planning Commission  
*Timeframe:* Long Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On A Project Specific Basis.

**Objective 2 - Truck Traffic**

**Strategies**

**2a) Enforcing truck weight limits.**

A study is recommended to determine whether there are trucks that use Sidney streets as alternatives to avoid weight limitations on more direct and preferred routes. A request can be made to State Highway Patrol to carry out this study. Current permitting of oversize and overweight trucks is being permitted at no cost through the Engineering Department and enforced by the City Police Department.

*Responsible Party:* Police Chief (Lead) and State Highway Patrol  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing  
*Estimated Cost:* In-House Staff Time

**2b) Providing alternate truck routes.**

In order to reduce the number of trucks passing through downtown, it is recommended alternative truck routes should be provided for SR 47 and SR 29. These routes are the highest truck traffic routes through the City. Close coordination with the Ohio Department of Transportation is recommended. The City proposes the following alternatives for further consideration:

- a) Alternate truck route for SR 47 - Bypass Port Jefferson using Mason Road and Kuther Road.
- b) Alternate truck route for SR 29 - Use Mason Road and Pasco-Montra Road.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (Lead) and Ohio Department of Transportation  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing; Study Underway  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On A Project Specific Basis

**2c) Reducing number of turns.**

2009 plans are to allow for an “alternate” truck route around the downtown business district have been approved and funded through ODOT Three intersections are to be provided with a larger turning radius for semi-trucks to follow along SR 47. (Ohio & North; North & West; West & Court)

Total Estimated Cost: \$210,700  
 Partially Funded by ODOT with \$168,600  
 City Portion of Project Cost: \$42,100

**Objective 3 - Public Transportation**

**Strategies**

**3a) Providing transportation needs for elderly.**

Provide transportation needs for elderly from Sidney to other cities/counties, airport, etc. The City’s public transportation authority should coordinate with other public transportation authorities in the surrounding counties and cities to provide these services.

*Responsible Party:* Transportation/Contract Administration Director (Lead)  
*Timeframe:* Mid Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On A Project Specific Basis



## Objective 4 - Downtown Parking

### Strategies

#### 4a) Developing parking garage.

The City should consider developing a parking garage. A study would be necessary to confirm revenue and the demand for garage parking. This garage can relieve some parking problems on the surrounding streets. Study should cover funding sources for the construction of garage. These funds can be public grants/funds, or private funds. The design of the garage should be conducive to the architectural character of the downtown area.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead), City Manager and City Council  
*Timeframe:* Mid Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On A Project Specific Basis

## Objective 5 - Roadway Infrastructure

### Strategies

#### 5a) Restoring and maintaining alleys.

While major roads are improved in the City, it is also important to restore and maintain alleys. The City should continue to fund and implement its alley maintenance program.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead) and Streets Department  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing - In Progress  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On Annual Budget Cycle

#### 5b) Requiring the implementation of road infrastructure (new or improvements to existing) concurrent with development.

Developers will be responsible for any traffic impacts that will degrade the level of traffic services on the existing street system. All required improvements that restore the level of service of the street system should be undertaken concurrent with the development. Where necessary additional funds should be escrowed to ensure required improvements are completed to the City's satisfaction.

*Responsible Party:* Public Works Director (Lead), City Engineer and Streets Department  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing  
*Estimated Cost:* To Be Determined On A Project Specific Basis

#### 5c) Establishing alternative funding sources.

Investigate and establish alternative funding sources, such as a Transportation Improvement District and local infrastructure funding pools or special improvement district.

*Responsible Party:* City Manager (Lead) and Finance Officer  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing  
*Estimated Cost:* In-House Staff Time

#### 5d) Implementing roadway standards for developments.

Roadway standards depend on the functional class of the roadway. Major and minor thoroughfares, which carry trips of longer length and higher speed, should require higher standards compared to collector and local streets. The City already has established standards in use, in addition to these, more standards are recommended in Table 9.3.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (Lead)  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing  
*Estimated Cost:* In-House Staff Time



**Objective 6 - Bike System**

**Strategies**

**6a) Implementing a bike master plan.**

The bike path has been completed from the Miami River to Johnston Park. The remaining phases of completing the bike path from Johnston Park to Memorial Walkway should be completed.

*Responsible Party:* Parks and Recreation Director (Lead) and Recreation Board  
*Timeframe:* Ongoing; Study Complete, Implementation Ongoing  
*Estimated Cost:* In-House Staff Time

**6b) Extending Great Miami River bike path (Veterans Memorial Walkway).**

Please see Objective 6a.

**6c) Requiring bike racks and on-site connections to bike paths in major developments.**

Providing bike path connections from major developments to the nearby City’s bike paths should be made as a requirement for site approval. This requirement must also ask for proper location of bike racks inside parking lots of the development.

*Responsible Party:* Parks and Recreation Director (Lead) and Parks and Recreation Department  
*Timeframe:* Long Term  
*Estimated Cost:* In-House Staff Time

**Objective 7 – Northwest Traffic Network**

**Strategies**

**7a) Construct new arterial roadway to join Michigan St. and Russell Road**

Construct a new arterial from Michigan Street to Russell Road to provide alternate access to businesses further west on Michigan Street.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (lead)  
*Timeframe:* Mid Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To be Determined

**7b) Extend and improve Hoewisher Road**

The extension and improvement of Hoewisher Road, from Wapakoneta Road, to Russell Road, provides access from the existing northeast residential developments, to the Michigan Street business areas. Widening Hoewisher between N. Broadway Avenue and Wapakoneta Avenue should be considered, even though much of the northern most section of this road is located out of the City and in Franklin Township.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (lead)  
*Timeframe:* Mid Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To be Determined.

**7c) Extend and improve the above arterial from Russell Road to St. Mary’s Ave.**

The continuation of the new arterial recommended in 7a, above, from Russell Road to St. Mary’s Avenue to provide an alternate route from the existing northeast residential neighborhoods to the Michigan St. business areas, as well as to serve the proposed high and middle density residential neighborhoods and the mixed-use commercial district west of I-75.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (lead)  
*Timeframe:* Mid Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To be Determined.



**7d) Extend and improve the above arterial from St. Mary's Ave. to the intersection of Mason Rd.**

Continuation of the arterial from St. Mary's Ave. to the intersection of Mason Rd. and Wapakoneta Road. This further serves the medium density residential areas north of St. Mary's Ave. and west of I-75 and allows redundant access to the residential neighborhoods straddling Mason Road, east of I-75.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (lead)  
*Timeframe:* Long Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To be Determined.

**7e) Provide additions off the Hoewisher Road Extension**

The addition of branches to the arterial in the following three locations to provide better traffic flow at intersections:

- i. From Mason Rd. southeast to the arterial, just west of the intersection of Mason Road and Wapakoneta Rd.
- ii. From Cisco Rd. southeast to the arterial, just west of St. Mary's Ave.
- iii. From the arterial south to the intersection of Russell Road and Vandemark Ave, between the high density residential and mixed-use commercial areas located there.

*Responsible Party:* City Engineer (lead)  
*Timeframe:* Long Term  
*Estimated Cost:* To be Determined.

