1. Presentation by MAX on proposed FY-2020 service to the City-Josh Johnson of MAX (See attached information.)

2. Beech Circle residents to address the City Council regarding ownership of the proposed gate on their street. (See attached information.)

3. Cherokee Bend plaque options-Ronnie Vaughn and Sam Gaston (See attached information. This item may be added to the formal agenda.)

4. Green Initiative study and references-Ronnie Vaughn, Shanda Williams and Sam Gaston (See attached information. This item may be added to the formal agenda.)

5. Lochrane Smith to address the City Council on her concerns about the proposed sidewalks on Pine Ridge Road. (See attached information.)

6. Executive Session
Beech Circle Recap

June 24, Pre-Meeting Discussion

1. Beech Circle was originally opened (early 1980’s?) to one way thru traffic for easier access to Baptist Montclair Hospital. The hospital has now been closed for 4 years.

2. The hospital closure was followed by the construction of Tapestry Park Apartments which directly connected to Beech Circle. This drastically increased cut thru traffic volume, speeding drivers, and illegal One-Way violations.

3. GPS phone navigation directs drivers to use Beech Circle for access from Mountain Brook to Montclair as well as directs drivers into Mountain Brook through the WRONG WAY. (Especially ride share services Uber/Lyft and delivery drivers of all types)

   Note *The chief concern is that someone’s child will eventually be seriously injured or killed. From a safety perspective, the near miss incidents are too numerous to not take such a concern seriously. The benefit of this effort is the safety of MB residents.

Past Efforts

- Repeated past efforts to close Beech Circle spanning over 15 years were not completed due to prohibitive funding costs the residents were asked to raise. These costs ranged from $80,000 to almost $1,000,000 despite all stakeholders supporting the closure
- We assume these improvements would have been paid for by MB residents but owned by the city.

2019 Emergency Siren Activated Gate

1. Installation of a Siren activated gate to maintain emergency vehicle turn around access has been approved by both Mountain Brook and Birmingham fire departments.

2. MB residents have committed to funding both the installation ($12,000) and annual maintenance ($175/yr.) of the gate

Emergency Gate Ownership Options:

A. City of Mountain Brook
B. Residents of Mountain Brook

Questions:

1. Insurance? - Gate covered under city insurance policy vs. questionable ability of MB residents to attain insurance policy for a structure on city property (Plus the issues of creating an LLC to hold ownership, bank accounts, tax filings etc. will be a perpetual burden on MB residents. An HOA is not an option due to legal requirements being placed on separate personal homesteads)

2. Liability? - City immunity and capped damages vs. MB residents without same protections. (regardless of ability to annually buy insurance for limited protection)

3. In all the past plans for construction of a new cul-de-sac or hammer-head turnaround, who would have owned these improvements?

Our Request: If the area residents agree to donate the money needed to pay for and maintain the gate, will the city agree to owning the gate? If in the future the gate is not maintained to city standards, it is free to remove the gate.
Sam Gaston

From: Phillips, Caleb
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:03 PM
To: gastons@mtnbrook.org
Subject: Public works and gate

Sam, wanted to keep you in the loop. Spoke with Ronnie on his opinions for the maintenance piece and our talk for Monday night. Main question I had for his side was what the process would be if gate is ever hit by either a hit and run vs an incident with a filed police report. Ronnie concurred that the annual maintenance piece would be minimal and if there was ever a damage incident that had a police report that city insurance would cover. If it was a hit and run and wasn’t something his guys could fix, then the outstanding risks to spending any operating budget money would be a repair. Even if this thing is hit and blown straight through, the gate arms are not that expensive to replace and the operators or battery are not expensive by themselves.

So one idea to ask council Monday night would be that if the city would be willing to maintain ownership, we could pledge up front money to the city to cover installation $12,000, 10 year annual maintenance reserve $2,000 , and a damage repair reserve of say an additional $2,000. For total check to the city of $16,000.

Just an idea but worth thinking about. Ronnie liked the idea of getting this thing closed too so that was good to hear.

Caleb Phillips
Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC
205.447.1944

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of all or part of the transmitted information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by responding to this transmission. Thank you.
Caleb, here are my quick thoughts about your last message.

In the past, the group’s request to close Beech Cir to southbound traffic into the City of Birmingham (or unauthorized northbound traffic from Birmingham into Mt. Brook) has proved problematic. That is primarily due to the fact that, if Beech Cir were closed (or vacated in the City of Mt Brook), Mt. Brook Public Safety vehicles must continue to serve all houses along the street, but would not have a point at which to turn around. The concept of the siren activated gate appears to address this concern as it would allow public safety vehicles the option to pass through the gate going either direction after activating their signals. The installation of this type gate – plus the City of Mt. Brook passing an Ordinance that would proscribe southbound travel along Beech Cir except for local traffic (excepting public safety vehicles) - appears to be the best idea yet to address the “turnaround problem.”

Now it appears you have enough group members who will contribute to the expense of buying and installing the gate. If the City Council decides that the citizen group (who will benefit from the gate and want it installed) should have the future maintenance responsibility for the gate, I question whether or how your group could perform this responsibility without an organization that could raise funds for maintenance. For this reason, I have previously suggested that your group might form a “single purpose HOA”. One of the advantages of such a HOA is that your group would have a structure in place whereby it could require its members/landowners (or their successors in title who later own their land) to pay amounts assessed by the HOA as future maintenance needs arise. That is, these HOA obligations would “run with the land” of its members. This may sound complicated, but HOAs are pretty common in the real estate world when different persons have the same interest.

Thank you for discussing the HOA concept with your lawyer. After that meeting, you indicated the group is concerned that, if an HOA were formed, its Board members might be personally liable for its operation. As with any organization, Board Members are responsible for holding meetings, having elections of officers and taking other administrative actions pertaining to the operation of that organization. Further, any officer or Board member of an organization (regardless of its type) has an obligation to act in the interest of that organization; there is nothing different about those responsibilities in a HOA setting versus other types of organizations. I do not know if you are familiar with or discussed the subject of “Director’s Liability Insurance” with your attorney. Persons who serve as Board members of corporations or other organizations often have the same concern you have expressed about their personal liability related to their service. Indeed, to address these concerns, it is common for corporations and other organizations to buy this type of insurance (at the expense of the organization) that to cover their Directors from the risk of claims arising from management decisions that they make in the exercise of their reasonable discretion. I would not think that the expense of Director’s Liability insurance would be high for a single purpose HOA, and perhaps the availability of this insurance could assuage some of the “Board liability” concerns the group now has.

Steve
Thanks Steve, I am traveling this week but will be back on Thurs so we will follow up with an update soon. Briefly though, we had already spoken with real estate lawyers on the HOA idea and it was that feedback that prompted our concerns. We were told board members can be held personally liable and we should avoid any instrument that would encumber or be attached to personal homesteads. In short, such arrangements could be very messy. That said, we will speak further with all the stakeholders and follow up.

Caleb Phillips
Brasfield & Gorrie, LLC
205.447.1944

On May 31, 2019, at 5:40 PM, Steve Stine <sstine@bishopcolvin.com> wrote:

Ch

Caleb, thanks for your email. I know everyone is trying to figure out how to get this done.

I understand from what was said at the May 13 Council meeting that the citizen organization to is to be formed and enter the “Agreement” with the City was going to own, install, and fully maintain the gate; I consider maintenance also includes insuring it for liability and replacement damage purposes. It appears to me from your 5/29/19 email that individuals in your group may be now concerned about this approach because they perceive they might have personal liability with it.

I do not know if you or others in the group have had a chance to talk to a real estate lawyer about forming a HOA. I recently suggested that, and have a name of a lawyer who is familiar with formation and operation of them if you don’t already have an attorney. I previously suggested this might be the structure your group needs as the HOA would buy, install, own, and maintain (including insure) the gate. Also, with an HOA, your group would have an organization in place that could fund future operational costs related to the gate as funding responsibilities would run with the land owned by its members (and not be dependent on community leaders perpetually having to gain community consensus). I cannot be your group’s lawyer and also represent the City, but I also understand that, subject to you verifying these matters with your group’s own lawyer, no individual member of the HOA would have personal liability for operation or maintenance of the gate if the group formed an HOA.

I understand that Sam is going to again include this matter as an item for discussion at an upcoming City Council Meeting agenda.

Steve Stine
1910 First Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Phone: (205) 251-2881
Fax: (205) 254-3987
Email: sstine@bishopcolvin.com

From: Phillips, Caleb [mailto:CPhillips@BrasfieldGorrie.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 4:19 PM
To: Steve Stine; Blair Badham; Randall Pitts
From: Sam Gaston  
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 8:10 AM  
To: 'VIRGINIA C SMITH'; 'Billy Pritchard'  
Subject: FW: Draft Agreement - Beech Circle

Sam S. Gaston  
City Manager  
City of Mountain Brook, AL.  
58 Church Street  
P.O. Box 130009  
Mountain Brook AL 35213  
(205) 802-3803 Phone  
(205) 870-3577 Fax

From: Phillips, Caleb [mailto:CPhillips@BrasfieldGorrie.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2019 4:19 PM  
To: Steve Stine; Blair Badham; Randall Pitts  
Cc: Sam Gaston; Ronnie Vaughn; Whit Colvin  
Subject: RE: Draft Agreement - Beech Circle

Steve,

First off let us say thank you for all the efforts of your office and the city on our behalf, it is greatly appreciated. You have invested significant effort into this issue over the years and for the first time there seems to be a workable solution that will satisfy all the stakeholders. Now the only question is, how do we get there?

As far as an HOA delivery model, the major hurdle at this point is the personal liability of the families who have pledged money for this project. This part of Crestline is not a subdivision or planned development so the 30+ families donating money would then be asked to accept lawsuit risks against their personal homes and families for a structure on city property. We believe this is a risk that the city would have immunity and limited liability from but offers no such protection for private citizens. As these families cannot afford to accept the legal risk of defending themselves against litigious plaintiffs like a city could, it seems more appropriate for the city to ultimately own the gate.

Given this, we would ask you to consider the following alternative delivery model. In short, this project would be viewed like any other city infrastructure that Mountain Brook residents raise funding for such as new playground equipment, athletic facilities, or city signage.

- **Capital Costs and Annual Maintenance** –
  1. Residents would form organization responsible for raising the total $12,000 capital costs needed for installation
  2. Also raise an amount equal to cover the $300 annual maintenance for 10 years or $3,000.
  3. This organization would then enter into an agreement with the city to install and maintain the gate
  4. In return, we would ask that the city include in the agreement that as long as the gate is maintained, the city agrees to leave it in operation.

- **Ownership** – Provided the gate passed all city inspections, the city would maintain ownership of the gate thus giving the city the adequate control over insurance and liability coverage it would need, eliminate the need for complicated easement agreements, and protect the Mountain Brook residents donating the funding from undue litigation risks.
• **Replacement Insurance Coverage** - In the event a driver's insurance did not cover damages, the city's insurance would cover any damage repairs. If there was any increase to the city insurance premium for this addition, we could discuss donating money for this as well.

The emergency vehicle gate access solution is now a common goal by all the concerned stakeholders. This is good news! It is also worth mentioning that the adjacent Hagood sidewalk connector project will be a great complement to this proposed traffic change to further benefit the public safety of both Mountain Brook and Birmingham neighborhood communities.

We are looking forward to the final public hearing for this agreement. There will be many Crestline children and parents attending in support so if you think it would help to approach city council with these revisions prior, please let us know and we will do so.

Thanks again for your help with everything and we are looking forward to a solution that is best for all.

Caleb

Caleb Phillips  
BRASFIELD & GORRIE, L.L.C.  
cphillips@brasfieldgorrie.com  
d: 205.714.1631  m: 205.447.1944  
brasfieldgorrie.com  

-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Stine <sstine@bishopcolvin.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 10:49 AM
To: Phillips, Caleb <CPhillips@BrasfieldGorrie.com>; Blair Badham <Blair.Badham@butlersnow.com>; Randall Pitts <irp@southlawllc.com>
Cc: Sam Gaston <gastons@mtnbrook.org>; Ronnie Vaughn <vaughnr@mtnbrook.org>; Whit Colvin <wcolvin@bishopcolvin.com>
Subject: RE: Draft Agreement - Beech Circle

Caleb, Blair & Randall:

As I see it, your group now needs to consider forming an organization that will be responsible for all matters related to the gate. These responsibilities would include installing, paying the installation expenses (including surveying expense), maintaining, insuring the gate for liabilities (including naming the City as an additional insured on the organization's GL policy) and property damage, and future operation of the gate. This organization would be the entity with whom the City would enter the "Agreement". I understand that the current thinking is that the Gate would lie in the City right of way; in connection with this Agreement, the City would grant this organization a right to place and operate the gate there.

I am not a real estate specialist and, as the City attorney, cannot advise your group on how to form and operate your organization. However, it strikes me that the type of organization that your group may want to form to handle these matters is a Home Owners Association. Perhaps you already have legal counsel in mind for your group, but I know a real estate legal specialist who is very knowledgeable about HOAs and could advise your group on the formation and operation of such an organization.
Would you like me to provide you the name of that lawyer?

Steve Stine
1910 First Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Phone: (205) 251-2881
Fax: (205) 254-3987
Email: sstine@bishopcolvin.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Phillips, Caleb [mailto:CPhillips@BrasfieldGorrie.com]
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2019 1:48 PM
To: Steve Stine
Subject: RE: Draft Agreement - Beech Circle

Hi Steve, are there any times next week not good for you? I was going to call Sam's office to set up a time for us all to get together. Thanks!

Caleb Phillips
BRASFIELD & GORRIE, L.L.C.
cphillips@brasfieldgorrie.com
d: 205.714.1631 m: 205.447.1944
brasfieldgorrie.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Stine <sstine@bishopcolvin.com>
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2019 10:54 AM
To: Sam Gaston <gastons@mtnbrook.org>; Blair Badham <Blair.Badham@butlersnow.com>
Cc: Phillips, Caleb <CPhillips@BrasfieldGorrie.com>; Randall Pitts <jrp@southlawllc.com>; Christopher Mullins <mullinsc@mtnbrook.org>
Subject: RE: Draft Agreement - Beech Circle

Sam and Blair, I was not at the last City Council meeting. My colleague was and he has asked me to help on the Agreement between the City and the Citizen Organization, but I need some preliminary information before I can start on that.

Has the Citizen Organization been legally formed? If so, what is its name?

Also, I saw a recent email about the subject of insurance regarding the gate, which will be a requirement in the Agreement. Has the Citizen Organization resolved the matters with its insurer regarding insurance, and will it be able to secure coverage regarding damage to and claims regarding operation of the gate?

FYI, I understand that Fire Chief Mullins is still working with his counterpart at the City of Birmingham on the first responder agreement needed with them that arises from gating the road.
### Iron City Stone
2749 Crestwood Blvd
Irondale, AL 35210

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Brook, City of Revenue Department P.O. Box 130009 Mountain Brook, AL 35213 Mountain Brook, AL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Estimate
6/19/2019 259

 handwritten note: $1,000 donation from private donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quote for Cherokee bend plaque for column similar to column on Green Valley Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install a stone column approximately 6' long x 3' wide x 6' tall (height is based from footing to top of first cup section). Install cmu filled with concrete and rebar tied into footing and veneer with building stone and moss rock. Footing to be provided by City of Mountain Brook unless otherwise instructed. Price includes all labor and material other than footing. Iron city stone can excavate and pour footing if necessary. Recommended footing size 6.5' x 3.5' x 10-12&quot; thick Price also includes setting plaque in column. Alternate size: 6' x 3' x 5' column cost $4500.00 Alternate size: 6' x 3' x 5.5' column cost $4750.00 Sales Tax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 10.00% | 0.00 |

| Total | $5,000.00 |
Iron City Stone
2749 Crestwood Blvd
Irondale, AL 35210

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Brook, City of Revenue Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 130009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Brook, AL 35213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Brook, AL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Estimate #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2019</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee Bend Plaque Estimate for 15' long wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install Block column approximately 4.5' W x 4.5' L x 5.5' T and veneer with building stone to match City of Min Brook Columns and install donated plaque. Attach a 15' L x 3.5 T curving stone wall veneered on both sides and a 2'W x 2'L x 3.5'-4' T. Columns and wall cap to be integrated will wall stone unless solid cap is requested. Both wall estimates do not include footings for columns and walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                                                      |     |        | $8,500.00 |
Iron City Stone  
2749 Crestwood Blvd  
Irondale, AL 35210

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherokee Bend Plaque Quote for 24' long wall</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install Block column approximately 4.5' W x 4.5' L x 5.5' T and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>veneer with building stone to match City of Mtn Brook Columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and install donated plaque. Attach a 2'W x 2'L x 3.5'-4' T. Columns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and wall cap to be integrated will wall stone unless solid cap is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         | requested.  
|         | Sales Tax                                                                  |     | 10.00%    | 0.00     |

Total

$10,500.00
I spoke to Jon Erwin from Southhampton.

This is a summary of our conversation:

They have been using it for 2 years and really like it. He was skeptical at first because other times they have tried it, it failed.
When they started out, they bought a string trimmer from each vendor to try out and experience on their own.
They chose a Mean Green zero turn mower and everything else is DeWalt. Everything else consists of:
String trimmers, blowers, chainsaws, pole saws, and hedge shears.
He said the DeWalt equipment comes with 2 batteries per unit. Stihl does not even include one battery.
He also said he was not impressed with equipment from Lowes/Home Depot. He felt it was weaker and they just labeled it commercial.
Keeping all the small equipment with the same brand is good because everything uses the same battery.
He said the chainsaw is for small limbs and they don’t use it for cutting down whole trees.
The blower is good except for using on large amounts of wet leaves.
They have an enclosed trailer that is set up with charging stations for the batteries and they plug the trailer up to a 110 outlet each night.
This way they have everything together when they are working.
The batteries come in a case of 6 and they can tote the case with them if they go to a certain part of the park alone. It can be connected to a power source to charge while they are working.
They have not had any maintenance issues except for one guy pressure washed the mower and got water past a seal in the wrong place and messed up the motor. They were able to replace it within 2 days.

They have two areas that are Green Zones that they can only use electric equipment, but they use their equipment everywhere else too.
It makes no sense to travel to those parks and then bring the equipment back to swap out.

I asked about the Green Zone program versus just doing this on our own.
He said they have some positives- Can give statistics between gas vs electric, they do good for helping the environment, branding as green
Downsides: He felt that he did most of the leg work for them, they tried pushing certain brands- but he preferred to test them all out personally as stated above.
The parks that are deemed as Green Zones have regulations: They have limited exemptions to use gas powered equipment in those areas.
He gets 6 times per year that he can use gas powered equipment in the parks and he uses them during their heavy wet leaf season. They also have exemptions for emergencies like storm damage.
The director has to declare an emergency before they can use any gas powered equipment in those areas.
The forwarded email is the reply from David Pinsonneault of Lexington MA.

---

Ronnie Vaughn  
Public Works Director  
City of Mountain Brook AL  
3579 East Street  
Birmingham, Alabama 35243  
205.802.3865 Office  
205.967.2631 Fax  
vaughnr@mtnbrook.org

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: David Pinsonneault <dpinsonneault@lexingtonma.gov>  
Date: Thu, Jun 20, 2019 at 7:01 AM  
Subject: RE: Green Initiative  
To: Ronald Vaughn <vaughnr@mtnbrook.org>

Dear Ronald,

I provided some answers below. Lexington is a community that is very focused on the environment. Noise and emissions are two areas they have targeted. We wanted to be in front of the issues so we could control how we were affected. Hope this helps.

David

---

From: Ronald Vaughn [mailto:vaughnr@mtnbrook.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 4:27 PM  
To: David Pinsonneault <dpinsonneault@lexingtonma.gov>  
Subject: Green Initiative

David,
I was given your name as a contact person for Lexington green initiative where you converted most of your hand/power tools over to electric.

We are considering a similar study and I have read the article about your program.

A few questions:

1. What were the reasons your community decided to consider this option? Did you receive complaints from nearby residents as city workers were using backpacks and other equipment?

   A couple of things led us in this direction. We have a Noise Bylaw which is still being reviewed annually and we had some complaints from residents. We looked at our operation and some of our tasks and targeted areas where we could introduce electric equipment without decreasing productivity and efficiency.

2. How was the implementation? Any major problems?

   So far we have purchased 4 electric push mowers, 8 electric blowers and 8 electric string trimmers. We use the electric push mowers and the electric blowers primarily in our downtown corridor (public buildings and green spaces). We use the electric blowers from mid-May to mid-September and then switch back to gas powered blowers for the spring and fall leaf cleanups. We have begun using the electric string trimmers at all of our properties and are phasing out the gas powered trimmers.

3. Has the use of electric equipment slowed down the progress of your workers in getting their jobs done?

   When we started the program a year ago there was push back from our staff but we have found in the areas we use the electric equipment and the tasks we have assigned that there is no effect on production.

4. Was the training and education received by your city workers in using green equipment satisfactory?

   We had a couple of trainings that were very helpful as was engaging with the manufacturers.

5. Any other advice or comments you can give us?

   Our approach was to be proactive. We identified areas where electric equipment could be used without impacting what we do. We were clear with our Committees and our Selectmen that we still needed our gas powered zero turn and large area mowers and that we still need the gas powered leaf vacs, backpack blowers and other equipment for our spring and fall cleanups. Finding a mix of the two types of equipment and consistently monitoring their use and effectiveness have helped us to build a program that satisfies goals of the Town but keeps us efficient.

   Again my advice is to start small, involve your staff, talk to manufacturers and be proactive. Good luck.

David
$60K--enough for all capital costs

On Wednesday, June 19, 2019, 1:07:57 PM PDT, Sam Gaston <gastons@mtnbrook.org> wrote:

Thank you! Very helpful information.

What was the amount of the grant you received from the county air pollution agency?

Sam S.Gaston
City Manager
City of Mountain Brook, AL.
56 Church Street
P.O. Box 130009
Mountain Brook AL. 35213
(205) 802-3803 Phone
(205) 870-3577 Fax

---

From: S. D. Colomé [mailto:scolome@pacbell.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 12:16 PM
To: Sam Gaston
Subject: Re: Green Initiative

Sam,

I am happy to answer your questions regarding the Public Works conversion from IC engine to battery-electric equipment in the City of Ojai, CA. In response to your numbered questions:

1. We had a history of complaints of noise and dust from gasoline-powered leaf blowers, used by both commercial and city workers. Prior to converting equipment in the Public Works Dept., an ordinance was passed prohibiting use of gasoline leaf blowers in residential areas. The City proceeded with conversion of Public Works equipment when a grant application submitted to our county air
pollution agency was approved. This provided for conversion of all mowers (including ride-on), line trimmers, leaf blowers and smaller chain saws to battery-electric. The air agency required at the end of the first year trial period that all gasoline equipment be scrapped in order to remove conventional and greenhouse gas emissions.

2. Implementation went smoothly, in spite of initial reluctance from Public Works that the battery-electric equipment might not have sufficient power or battery life to match performance of the gasoline equipment. Careful selection of battery inventory, professional grade equipment, and protocol development were needed to avoid potential pitfalls. With planning there were no major problems. We relied heavily on American Green Zone Alliance (AGZA) to guide the process of equipment selection, training, monitoring and protocols. While we have a competent Public Works Dept., engagement of a consultant facilitated a smooth conversion.

3. Prior to purchasing the new equipment there were concerns regarding power and capability of the battery-electric equipment. However, currently available commercial equipment is a good match for the gasoline equipment. The key is purchase of commercial-grade rather than consumer-grade equipment. Maintenance time and costs are substantially reduced with the electric equipment, providing a positive ROI.

4. Training provided by AGZA was excellent and well received by city staff. Another key to our success was having a member of the Public Works staff taking the lead and providing a positive attitude. The largely Hispanic staff embraced the new equipment, happy that they were no longer breathing exhaust fumes, pleased with the noise and vibration reduction.

5. The City of Ojai is now receiving all of its electricity from renewable sources (wind, solar, geothermal and hydro); equipment use surveys and emission factors were used by AGZA to calculate that over 80 tons/year of conventional and greenhouse gas emissions are eliminated by the conversion.

My role in this project was writing the grant proposal and working closely with our Mayor, Council, City Manager and Public Works Director for what has been a win-win conversion. My background is in Public Health and air pollution epidemiology and my services were given pro bono to the city.

I hope these details help you as you consider a program for the City of Mountain Brook.

Regards,

Steven Colome, ScD

PO Box 478

Ojai, CA 93024

805.272.8499
Steve,

I was given your name as a contact person for Ojai’s green initiative where you converted most of your hand/power tools over to electric.

We are considering a similar study and I have read the article about your program.

A few questions;

1. What were the reasons your community decided to consider this option? Did you receive complaints from nearby residents as city workers were using backpacks and other equipment?

2. How was the implementation? Any major problems?

3. Has the use of electric equipment slowed down the progress of your workers in getting their jobs done?

4. Was the training and education received by your city workers in using green equipment satisfactory?

5. Any other advice or comments you can give us?

I appreciate you considering my questions and can provide us with additional information.

Sam S. Gaston
City Manager
City of Mountain Brook, AL.
56 Church Street
P.O. Box 130009
Mountain Brook AL 35213
(205) 802-3803 Phone
(205) 870-3577 Fax
I called and left a voicemail and followed it with an email.

Also:
I posted on the NRPA page asking for input from any others that have had experience with battery equipment.

I have had one reply on the post and a phone call.

Phil Weber from Oregon called me in response to the post. He was a fleet manager and now supervises a Parks Department. He stated that they have had one crew using 2 battery mowers for 2 months and like it. He is looking to convert a second crew by the end of the summer.

He said that their zero turn mowers are really impressive and work all day on one charge. They are not real impressed by the back pack blowers, but the zero turn has a blower attachment that they like.

He was able to do demo’s directly from the vendors.

This is the written reply:
Vermont State Parks has been striving toward more Electric/Battery powered equipment. From simple battery golf carts that we buy mildly used with new batteries, run for a couple years and then auction off for dangerously close to what we paid for them, to battery powered UTVs, GEM cars and our first commercial front end mower.

My tips
Involve the staff in trials and test runs. - Pilot the concept with something you know works elsewhere. Peer to peer conversation does wonders. We first demoed the commercial mower at our State RPA conference.
Don’t trial cheap or non-commercial products - You will need success right out of the gate.. even if its a bit pricey.
Run the numbers - Purchase price throws budget folks. compare the maintenance costs, fuel costs, time etc, and remember to factor in the oddities such as electric mowers have no belts, drive shafts or pulleys, to lubricate, line up or connect.
Don’t give up - Too many times I have heard "we tried that". Technology in this area is advancing and tried once means just that "tried once".

---------------------------
Frank Spaulding CPSI
Park Project Coordinator
Vermont State Parks
Montpelier VT
(802) 522-0798
Sam Gaston

From: Dan Mabe
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2019 1:29 AM
To: Sam Gaston
Cc: Jamie Banks; Stewart Welch; Clay Ragsdale; VIRGINIA C SMITH; Steve Boone (boones@mtnbrook.org)
Subject: Re: Draft proposal - AGZA Green Zone- Peer Referrals

Sam,

No, not one. You would and could be the first.

Regards,

Dan

On 6/13/2019 9:55 PM, Sam Gaston wrote:

Any examples or projects in southern states?

Sent from my iPhone
Sam Gaston

On Jun 13, 2019, at 5:57 PM, Dan Mabe <djmabe@agza.net> wrote:

Hello Clay,

Per our discussion I am sending some additional information regarding AGZA Green Zone Certification, and crew transition workshops and demonstrations. All of our Green Zone Certifications have been 100% successful. For any pointed operational or equipment questions I can be contacted directly.

Regards,

<ajfdgdnljogiikec.png>

(Green Zones)
https://www.agza.net/ojai-agza-green-zone
https://www.agza.net/agza-gz-ybhs

(Workshops)
https://www.agza.net/blog/agza-gz-fort-collins-kickoff
https://www.agza.net/blog/2019/3/31/agza-qc-go-electric-workshop
On 6/13/2019 4:37 PM, Jamie Banks wrote:

Sam, Stewart:

We're happy to put you in touch with managers involved with the successful implementation of AGZA Green Zones(R). When we embark on these projects, we invest time and effort upfront to engage staff and "meet them where they are." In the instance of Ojai, CA, this meant a wholesale move from gas equipment to battery electric equipment. In the case of Southampton, NY, it was a slower transition consistent with the desire to gain experience with equipment and with budget cycles. And in all cases, these transitions occur to the extent the technology allows.

A positive attitude and openness to learning are critical to success. In cases where there is initial resistance to change, we have seen over and over that once staff have a chance to try high quality, commercial grade equipment, their attitudes change. And, with all of our clients, we work closely and collaboratively to ensure the success of the project.

Here are some contacts (below).

Jon Erwin, Supervisor, Parks and Recreation
Town of Southampton, NY
Work: 631-728-4170
Cell: 631-786-5844
Email: JERWIN@southamptontownny.gov
See video

Sheila Pautsch, Community Services Director
City of South Pasadena, CA
Work: 626-403-7362
See press release

Steve Colome, Clean Air Advisor to the Mayor
City of Ojai, CA
Email: socolome@pacbell.net
See article

David Pinsonneault, Director of Public Works
Town of Lexington, MA
Work: 781-274-8314
Email: dpinsonneault@lexingtonma.gov
We hope these are helpful.

Best Wishes,
Jamie and Dan

Jamie L. Banks, PhD, MS
Executive Director
Quiet Communities, Inc.
Lincoln, MA 01773
Email: jamie@quietcommunities.org
Tel: 781.259.1717

quietcommunities.org
quietcommunitiesinc.org

Quiet Communities, Inc. (QC) is an independent non-profit organization hosting three programs -- Quiet Communities, The Quiet Coalition, and the Health Acoustics Project -- all addressing the growing problems of environmental noise and pollution.

The mission of the Quiet Communities’ program is to transition landscape maintenance to low noise, zero emissions practices with positive solutions to protect the health of workers, children, the public and the environment. We provide research, education, outreach, and solutions, working collaboratively with communities, businesses, schools, and government agencies.

On Tue, Jun 11, 2019 at 11:14 AM Stewart Welch <Stewart@welchgroup.com> wrote:

High Jamie,

Virginia and I took this matter before our council last night and they have requested a couple of peer references who our Public Works/Parks & Recreation department heads can call to discuss their experience with the program/equipment.

Can you provide a couple of folks to call?
CITY OF OJAI TO CELEBRATE CERTIFICATION AS THE FIRST AGZA GREEN ZONE® CITY IN VENTURA COUNTY.

The City of Ojai, along with the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD), will hold a ceremony celebrating certification as the first AGZA Green Zone City in Ventura County on Friday, 2018, at Libbey Park (320 S. Signal Street, Ojai, CA 93023). The event will be held at 11 a.m. and will include a demonstration of the City's battery-powered equipment used to service all municipal parks and landscape maintenance needs of the City. The City of Ojai joins the City of South Pasadena by becoming the second city-wide AGZA Green Zone in the United States.

According to Ojai Mayor Johnny Johnston, "We are thrilled to be formally certified as the first AGZA Green Zone City in Ventura County, and hope that our City serves as an example to other cities, in V County and beyond."

The City has worked closely with AGZA and VCAPCD for more than a year on the first municipal conversion to zero-emission landscape maintenance equipment in Ventura County. The City has realized benefits from the conversion, including air quality benefits, and reduced noise from the equipment. AGZA has estimated that the project will prevent the creation of over 82 tons of air pollution each year.

With the recent launch of the Clean Power Alliance, the City of Ojai is now using 100% renewable energy. Coupled with the conversion of the City's landscape maintenance equipment, the City strives to provide an example and demonstration for other communities showing the feasibility for improving local air quality along with the health and wellbeing of service personnel — all while doing something locally to combat climate change.

"The City of Ojai should be commended for this air quality and climate-friendly accomplishment; their successful conversion to zero-emission landscaping equipment will serve as an inspiration to other entities such as school districts in the county," said Mike Villegas, Air Pollution Control Officer for Ventura County.

The California Air Resources Board projects that by 2020 air pollution from gasoline-powered lawn and garden equipment will exceed the combined emissions from all passenger vehicles. The path to air lies in a new generation of electric equipment including mowers, line trimmers, chain saws and blowers.

According to the California Air Resources Board’s Catherine Dunwoodie, "The California Air Resources Board (CARB) commends the city of Ojai on the one-year anniversary of city groundkeepers using exclusively zero-emission lawn and garden equipment. Ojai serves as an example to all communities of the viability and the health and air-quality advantages of zero-emission equipment compared to gasoline. There are nearly 17 million pieces of gasoline-powered small off-road equipment in California, and the statewide smog-forming pollution emissions from these will surpass emissions from passenger cars in just a few years. CARB is committed to measures that will slash harmful emissions from these small engines with the goal of reaching zero emissions from them statewide. The commendable actions by Ojai and other forward-thinking cities help demonstrate the feasibility of this goal and the related benefits of cleaner air and improved public health for all Californians."

The City of Ojai is a small city in Ventura County set in a scenic valley. The City Council and commissions strive to maintain a high quality of life for all Ojai residents through exceptional community programs, support of the arts and cultural activities, and strong community involvement.

The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District is the local government agency in Ventura County that protects public health and agriculture from the adverse effects of air pollution by identifying pollution problems and developing a comprehensive program to achieve and maintain state and federal air quality standards.

The California Air Resources Board is the state agency responsible for protecting and promoting public health, welfare and ecological resources in California through the effective and efficient reduction of pollutants while recognizing and considering the effects of control programs on the economy of the state.

American Green Zone Alliance is a leader in zero-emission sustainable grounds maintenance strategies. Their mission is to transition the entire grounds maintenance industry from noisy, dirty fossil fuel-powered equipment to quieter zero-emission electric operations and sustainable practices.

---

AGZA GREEN ZONE® CITY WINS STATE AWARD

California Parks & Rec Society awards South Pasadena a 2016 Award of Excellence for their Green Zone City.

https://www.agza.net/green-zone-city
ARROYO PARK, SOUTH PASADENA, CA

"I CONGRATULATE THE CITY OF SOUTH PASADENA FOR BECOMING THE FIRST CITY IN THE NATION TO MAINTAIN THEIR PARKS ONE HUNDRED PERCENT GAS AND EMISSIONS FREE. SOUTH PASADENA IS PAVING THE WAY FOR OTHER CITIES TO FOLLOW WHEN IT COMES TO PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT."

— Chris Holden, California Assemblymember, 41st Assembly District
SOUTH PASADENA TAKES THE LEAD IN SUSTAINABLE GROUNDS MAINTENANCE STRATEGIES ON ALL MUNICIPAL PROPERTIES.

The City of South Pasadena is the first AGZA Green Zone® City in the United States. The American Green Zone Alliance (AGZA) officially certified the City’s municipal-wide transition to green groundskeeping operations at a public ceremony on September 9, 2016, in the City’s beautiful Arroyo Park. AGZA Green Zone City certification ensures that grounds maintenance on all municipal properties — mowing, hedging, edging, trimming, sawing, and blowing — are serviced exclusively with low-noise zero-emission battery-electric machinery and manual hand tools.

The results are astounding. The city’s 13 properties and medians span 41 acres, with 20 acres of mowing, 15 acres of blowing hardscapes, an acre of hedge surface trimming, and over 7 miles of edging. The transition from antiquated gas to cutting-edge electric instantly eliminated all of the hazardous emissions created by internal combustion engines: Carbon Dioxide (CO2), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), and Particulate Matter (PM 10 and PM 2.5). AGZA has calculated that South Pasadena’s new electric
equipment is preventing the creation of 31 tons of airborne pollutants into the local community every year.

In recognition of their groundbreaking sustainability efforts the City has been awarded the 2016 California Park & Recreation Society (CPRS) Creating Community Award of Excellence for Park and Facility Maintenance Management.

**In The Beginning**

The first time is always the hardest, and being the first municipality to transition its entire grounds maintenance operations from gas to electric required strong leaders, proactive partners, and deep commitment. This achievement caps more than three years of collaboration between AGZA, the City, and the grounds maintenance service provider Landcare (formerly TruGreen Landcare). This endeavor also benefited from key alignment at City Council, and support from the SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). Among the most important allies within the City were Mayor Michael Cacciotti, City Manager Sergio Gonzales, Public Works Director Paul Toor, P.E., and Community Services Director Sheila Pautsch. Sheila inherited the project mid-development, became a true believer, and championed the initiative across the finish line for the City.

South Pasadena’s AGZA Green Zone initiative got its start in a series of equipment demonstrations by AGZA and their partner The Greenstation, an LA-based electric equipment dealer. AGZA introduced the City, the SCAQMD, and TruGreen’s branch manager Joe Espinoza to the latest cordless electric equipment from Mean Green Machines and Stihl, showcasing the technology, features, and performance, as well as the potential health and environmental benefits. The cutting edge electric tools and the promise of quieter, zero-emission land care were
compelling, but of course the City and TruGreen needed proof. So with SCAQMD’s support, AGZA and The Greenstation pulled together a commercial-grade electric fleet for a trial at Garfield Park.

Over the course of 6 months, AGZA and TruGreen compared their Exmark 60-inch zero-turn gas mower against the Mean Green 60-inch zero-turn lithium-ion battery-powered mower. AGZA closely monitored the crew's operations — from charging and battery management, to on-the-ground tool efficiencies and run times — and the results were inspiring. Some electric hand tools, like hedgers, show virtually zero change in work production rates from gas. Others, like string trimmers and push mowers revealed a 5% -15% reduction in performance and require slight adjustments to operational planning. With AGZA's training, Espinoza’s crew reported that work production rates for the large electric riding mower rose to as high as 98% of their historical gas operations. On the other hand, workers who were not properly trained could have issues with charging procedures, trouble shooting, and operation. AGZA helped navigate these details to allow for a streamlined and effective electric crew.

**The First AGZA Green Zone**

Satisfied with proof-of-concept, South Pasadena approved the development of the nation’s first municipal AGZA Green Zone at Garfield Park, a pristine 7 acre public property nestled in a quiet upscale neighborhood. Based on the equipment trial, AGZA suggested a few operational changes and submitted recommendations for final equipment purchases that would allow Landcare to perform all routine maintenance with 100% electric equipment. AGZA also consulted with the City to update their RFP for the grounds maintenance contract. For the first time the City
would require that all bidding service providers use only
zero-emission battery electric equipment and hand tools on
all routine maintenance. In specific cases where no
commercially-capable electric equipment existed, as with
dethatching and aeration, exceptions were allowed for the
use of gas equipment two or three times a year.

The new RFP meant that if TruGreen wanted to renew their
contract at South Pasadena, they’d need to invest in an
electric fleet. Despite having just proven the performance
and benefits of electric to themselves in Garfield
Park, TruGreen’s corporate leadership was conspicuously
resistant to greening their services in South Pasadena.
Presumably, with a very large investment in gas fleets
across the country, they were reluctant to engage in the
coming electric revolution. Whatever the reason, TruGreen
chose not to heed AGZA’s full recommended equipment list
or formalized AGZA Service Provider Accreditation, and
predictably, the under-equipped and partially trained crew
found it challenging to keep the equipment running
efficiently and to maintain production rates. To ensure the
nascent project was still a success, AGZA and The
Greenstation shouldered additional crew monitoring, field
maintenance, and technical support.

With dogged commitment and managerial support from
Mayor Cacciotti and Community Services Director Pautsch,
AGZA was able to demonstrate that Garfield Park could be
maintained entirely with battery-electric equipment and a
crew trained to optimize those tools. The transition from
inefficient internal combustion gas engines to super efficient
electric motors instantly eliminated all hazardous emissions
during operations. The health and environmental hazards
that are prevented for the workers and community are hard
to overstate: stress and aggravation, hearing loss and
tinnitus, asthma, bronchitis, lung disease, hypertension,
vibration syndrome, cancer, toxic chemicals leeching in the soil and water, smog, greenhouse gases and climate change.

In February 2016, The City of South Pasadena and AGZA hosted a public celebration and media event to celebrate the certification of the nation’s first zero-emission AGZA Green Zone Park (more > https://bit.ly/AGZA_GZ_Park and https://bit.ly/AGZA_Garfield_Park_VIMEO). The City and AGZA each received a Congressional Recognition for their initiative. Representatives from the City, state, and environmental organizations praised the model program and encouraged the efforts be expanded to cover the entire city. City leadership already had their eyes on the prize.

**How AGZA Creates Its Green Zones**

1. Inventory Gas Operations
2. Evaluate Environmental Impacts
3. Determine Health Risks
4. Define the Green Zone
5. Design Equipment Fleet
6. Establish Facilities
7. Train and Accredit Crew
8. Optimize Operations
9. Certify the Green Zone
10. Celebrate Success!

**Scaling Success**
Over the following year, AGZA and The Greenstation continued to nurture TruGreen’s experience with the all-electric contract. Challenges were discovered and overcome, lessons were learned, and understanding was refined. AGZA collected feedback from the workers and shared it with the City and with the equipment manufacturers. And despite still being under-equipped per AGZA’s full tool recommendations, the newly rebranded Landcare crew developed the capacity to service the City’s entire municipal properties.

In the end AGZA monitored all crew operations and equipment run-times with electric equipment on each of the City’s 13 properties and 65 planted medians. AGZA merged their data with proprietary satellite mapping and meticulous EPA tables of small engine emissions to document just how much difference AGZA Green Zoning was making for the community.

AGZA calculated that South Pasadena’s city-wide Green Zone is eliminating the emission of 31 tons of airborne pollutants at every park, playground, sports field, and median, as well as at the library, senior center, and city hall. More specifically, this initiative actively prevents the annual creation of 26 tons of Carbon Dioxide (CO2), 7.5 tons of Carbon Monoxide (CO), 911 lbs of hydrocarbons (HC), 137 lbs of particulate matter (PM 2.5 and PM 10), 124 lbs of Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), 194 lbs of toxic waste, and 140 lbs of solid waste — all while being 40% to 70% quieter throughout the City.

South Pasadena’s families, schools, and businesses will enjoy more peaceful public spaces, and city grounds maintenance will no longer contribute to asthma-inducing air pollutants, local smog or climate change. The City’s grounds crews won’t be exposed to hazardous noise levels,
toxic fuel, carcinogenic fumes, or hand-numbing vibrations. The local water and soil will no longer absorb fuel and oil spills. And spent air and oil filters, spark plugs, and leaking cans of cleaning solvents will no longer pollute the landfill.

**Honoring The Achievement**

At a media event last September AGZA officially certified South Pasadena as the first AGZA Green Zone® City in the United States. For the second time the City and AGZA each received a Congressional Recognition, and representatives from the City and state praised the milestone collaboration. (more > https://bit.ly/AGZA_GZ_City and https://bit.ly/AGZA_GZ_City_overview_YT)

"In keeping with our pledge to become a more sustainable city, South Pasadena worked with AGZA to transition municipal grounds maintenance from fossil fuel based operations to advanced cordless battery equipment, manual tools, and ecologically friendly landscape practices. As a result, the City has been able to eliminate all fossil fuel consumption and toxic emissions, and has reduced noise by half."

"Michael Cacciotti, Mayor of the City of South Pasadena, and Governing Board Member of the South Coast AQMD

Speakers from the Sierra Club, American Lung Association, Coalition for Clean Air, and Quiet Communities all connected the dots between gas emissions and some of our nation’s most intractable health and environmental problems. The AGZA Green Zone model was held up as a practical and achievable solution with myriad benefits to workers, the community, local air quality, and the climate.

To raise awareness of the greener land care and increase sustainable thinking throughout the community, the City
posted informational AGZA Green Zone markers at each property. Further, prominent signs of the City’s leadership status as the nation’s first AGZA Green Zone City are displayed at the major entrances to the City.

A few months later CPRS also honored the City’s groundbreaking sustainability achievement with their Award of Excellence for Park and Facility Maintenance Management.

**Onward**

Despite its achievements, South Pasadena isn’t resting on its laurels. Community Services Director Pautsch continues to lead the City in partnership with AGZA. For the past year they have been applying the Green Zone model to bring quieter, cleaner grounds maintenance to the fairways and greens of the City’s own Arroyo Seco Golf Course.

In collaboration with Donovan Bros., LLC, the course managers and grounds crew, AGZA and the City have tested specialized equipment, monitored crews, and collected feedback. AGZA’s recommended electric tool fleet has been ordered, including a Jacobsen 3-gang electric reel mower and a non-electric Tier 4 compliant tractor to pull the 5-gang fairway reel mower. A formal ribbon-cutting ceremony at the nation’s first AGZA Green Zone Golf Course should take place this Spring.

Meanwhile, AGZA will also be celebrating the certification of the first AGZA Green Zone on the East Coast in Southampton, NY. And AGZA Green Zone initiatives are in various stages of development in several cities along the East and West Coast, as well as in Chicago.

The future of landcare certainly looks quieter, cleaner, and greener.
AGZA RECOGNIZED BY CONGRESS, CERTIFICATES ALL 'ROUND

Becky Cheng, representing the office of U.S. Congresswoman Judy Chu, presented AGZA and The City of South Pasadena with Certificates of Congressional Recognition. AGZA Green Zone signs were installed at the 3 main park entrances. And AGZA acknowledged the critical support and collaboration of Councilmember Cacciatto with a certificate of appreciation. Huzzah!
TRUGREEN LANDCARE'S GARFIELD PARK CREW: 
THE FUTURE OF SUSTAINABLE GROUNDS MAINTENANCE

Take a look — the future of quieter, cleaner, healthier lawn care is on the ground today. Making real and lasting change takes vision and commitment, but as soon as you begin reaping all the benefits of a truly sustainable long term strategy, you can't imagine going back.

AGZA is grateful to TruGreen LandCare for taking the leap, investing not only in the health and future of their workers and their business, but in a harmonious community and a sustainable planet.
PRISTINE PARK INSPIRES A 60-SECOND COMMERCIAL SPOT

In anticipation of February's landmark AGZA Green Zone dedication, we grabbed our video gear to shoot some promo footage of TruGreen's AGZA Certified operation at Garfield Park. What we didn't expect is that while we were running around manually shooting with our 'better' cameras, our tripod-mounted iPhone was generating some of the most compelling footage in time-lapse.

Back at the AGZA Lab we threw some titles, transitions, and a playful soundtrack over the footage and suddenly found ourselves with a great little promo spot worth sharing with our colleagues, strategic partners, and future allies.

TRIVIA TIME

Q: If a picture's worth a thousand words, and we captured one picture every half-second for 2 hours ... what's that worth?  A: Apparently 14.4 million words! For comparison, War and Peace, one of the longest novels ever written, contained only 587,287 words. To be fair to Tolstoy, I don't think it's likely our art will go as viral as his did! But to be fair to us, I guess we won't know for another 150 years. Tolstoy didn't try to take on the entire oil and gas economy, now did he? Stay tuned ... AGZA might just come out ahead : )
MEAN GREEN MACHINE'S INCREDIBLE 60-INCH MOWER

Powerful. Quiet. Emission-free. And all-day battery life. We've got only one question: Why isn't this machine servicing every park in the country? We're here to make that happen.

LEARN MORE ABOUT MEAN GREEN'S PRODUCTS
TEAM

DAN MABE
CEO
& PRESIDENT

PH 1 (310) 779-9785
EM DJMabe@AGZA.net

LUKE MASSMAN-JOHNSON
CFO & COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR

PH 1 (323) 445-1613
EM Luke@AGZA.net

HOURS

7 days a week 8am — 8pm
Very good! Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone
Sam Gaston

On Jun 4, 2019, at 4:17 PM, Bailey, Alicia <abailey@sain.com> wrote:

Sam,
See below. Hopefully this helps.

From: Brown, Jennifer
Sent: Tuesday, June 04, 2019 4:15 PM
To: Bailey, Alicia
Subject: RE: Pine Ridge Road

Our prioritization procedure evaluated 6 criteria including cost, feasibility, public support, severity of problem, probable use (demand-proximity to schools, parks, transit, and other generators), and effectiveness of solution (connectivity). Yes, Pine Ridge scored high from public support but it also scored high in the probable use (20/20) and effectiveness of solution categories (10/10). Pine Ridge Road connects Overbrook Road to Old Leeds Road which essentially connects residents to Jemison Park as well as other locations.

Jennifer G. Brown, P.E., RSP
Project Manager
Sain Associates, Inc.
205.263.2159
jbrown@sain.com

From: Bailey, Alicia
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 9:55 AM
To: Brown, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Pine Ridge Road

Help me answer this please.

From: Sam Gaston [mailto:gastons@mtnbrook.org]
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 9:53 AM
To: Bailey, Alicia
Subject: Pine Ridge Road

Got another “hot” call about sidewalks on Pine Ridge although it was from the lower side and a few houses east of where Jim Harris lives.
Didn’t want it, loss of privacy, not needed, have the Jemison Trail just below it, too costly for the “few” people who would use it and the $ should be given to education instead were her arguments.
Help me remember some of the reasons we selected Pine Ridge besides the large number of requests we received for it.

Sam S. Gaston
City Manager
City of Mountain Brook, AL.
56 Church Street
P.O. Box 130009
Mountain Brook AL. 35213
(205) 802-3803 Phone
(205) 870-3577 Fax
EXISTING CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

Existing Intersection Turning Movement Traffic Counts

Intersection turning movement traffic counts were performed at the three existing study intersections on Thursday, December 8, 2011 by Traffic Data, LLC on behalf of Skipper Consulting, Inc. The counts were conducted from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. The intersection turning movement traffic count data is included in Appendix A. The intersection turning movement traffic count data was analyzed to determine the a.m. and p.m. peak hours of traffic flow. The peak hour intersection turning movement traffic count data is depicted in Figure 2.

Existing Machine Traffic Count

A machine traffic count, including speed and classification, was performed on Pine Ridge Road immediately south of Pine Ridge Trail for 48 continuous hours beginning at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 and ending at 9:00 on Friday, December 9, 2010. The machine traffic count data is included in Appendix B. The data is summarized in Tables 1, 2 and 3.

The existing daily traffic volume on Pine Ridge Road is approximately 4,000 vehicles per day. The morning peak hour is generally 7:15 a.m. to 8:15 a.m., with a total traffic volume of approximately 500 vehicles per hour. The afternoon peak hours are 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., with a total traffic volume of approximately 425 vehicles per hour during each of these periods.

The posted speed limit on Pine Ridge Road is 30 miles per hour; however, the traffic count shows that the average speed of vehicles is approximately 36-37 miles per hour and the 85th percentile speed is 40-41 miles per hour. The 85th percentile speed is the speed at which 85% of all vehicles are traveling at or under and is used for design purposes.

Approximately 3% of the vehicles on Pine Ridge Road are classified as trucks. This is typical for collector roadways in the Birmingham area. Of these trucks, approximately 10% are heavy trucks (such as tractor-trailers).
Figure 2 - Existing Peak Hour Traffic Counts
Pine Ridge Road - Mountain Brook, Alabama
December 2011
### Table 1

**Existing Machine Traffic Count**

**Pine Ridge Road south of Pine Ridge Trail**

**Wednesday-Friday, December 7-9, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th><strong>Wednesday-Thursday</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Thursday-Friday</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1 AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 AM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 AM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 AM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 AM</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 AM</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 AM</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 AM</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 AM</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 PM</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1 PM</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 PM</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 PM</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 PM</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 PM</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 PM</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 PM</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 PM</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 PM</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 PM</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 PM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12 AM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,251</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,568</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,819</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,517</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AM Peak**

- 7:15-8:15 AM: 142
- 7:15-8:15 AM: 358
- 7:15-8:15 AM: 500
- 10:15-11:15 AM: 215
- 7:15-8:15 AM: 342
- 7:15-8:15 AM: 489

**PM Peak**

- 5:00-6:00 PM: 342
- 2:45-3:45 PM: 155
- 5:00-6:00 PM: 424
- 5:15-6:15 PM: 336
- 2:45-3:45 PM: 183
- 3:00-4:00 PM: 419
Table 2
Existing Speed Survey
Pine Ridge Road south of Pine Ridge Trail
Wednesday-Friday, December 7-9, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Range</th>
<th>Wednesday-Thursday</th>
<th>Thursday-Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14 mph</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 mph</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 mph</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 mph</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 mph</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 mph</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 mph</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 mph</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 mph</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 mph</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 mph</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69 mph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+ mph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85th %tile</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>32-42 mph</td>
<td>32-42 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% in Pace</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>36 mph</td>
<td>36 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Wednesday-Thursday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Axle Long</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unit Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 axle)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unit Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 axle)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Unit Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 axle)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Unit Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less than 5 axles)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Unit Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 axle)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Unit Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(greater than 5 axles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Percentage</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Medium Trucks</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Heavy Trucks</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing Intersection Capacity Analysis**

Existing intersection capacity analyses were performed for the peak hours of traffic flow according to the methodology outlined in the 2010 *Highway Capacity Manual*, published by the Transportation Research Board. Capacities are expressed as levels of service, and range from a level of service “A” (highest quality of service) to a level of service “F” (jammed conditions). As a general rule, operation at a level of service “C” or better is desirable, with a level of service “D” considered acceptable during peak hours of traffic flow. The existing intersection capacity analysis worksheets are included in Appendix C and are summarized in Table 4. As shown in Table 4, all movements at each of the study intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine Ridge Road at Old Leeds Road (signalized)</td>
<td>Old Leeds Road Eastbound</td>
<td>Through/Right</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Road Westbound</td>
<td>Left/Through</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road Northbound</td>
<td>Left/Right</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall intersection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road at Pine Ridge Trail (unsignalized)</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Trail Eastbound</td>
<td>Left/Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Trail Northbound</td>
<td>Left/Through</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road at Mountain Park Drive (unsignalized)</td>
<td>Mountain Park Drive Eastbound</td>
<td>Left/Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road Northbound</td>
<td>Left/Through</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4**  
**Existing Intersection Capacity Analysis**
Good afternoon Sam. It’s patsy. You know I am a big proponent of the sidewalk on Pine Ridge Road. And I did get a letter about the survey crew being on pine ridge. My concerns though are great in the thought that the sidewalk being proposed will be 6 feet wide and understand that for safety. But. The sidewalk being on the high side of Pine Ridge will completely destroy and undermine the beauty of the old trees, shrubs and walls that have been there for as long as pine ridge has been a road. The opposing side of the street is steeper but has far less established beauty. When the Thompson property was being developed it was, I thought, understood that the future sidewalk would be on that side. The cost may be greater on the low side but I seriously believe we will lose the beauty of One of the oldest streets in Mountain Brook if the sidewalk is built on the high side. I received some information for the people who live on Pine Ridge to let their thoughts be known to you. Is there a meeting we should be present at next week? I believe the residents of Pine Ridge need a more thorough briefing of the actuality of what to expect. You know I appreciate your listening and thoughts. Patsy

Patsy Dreher
936-2788
Pddreher@aol.com
Mr. Gaston, Caroline and I live on the corner of Pine Ridge Lane and Pine Ridge road. We are very much in favor of the sidewalks on Pine Ridge Road. Please let us know what we can do to help. Thank you.

Ry Bailey
Brawco, Inc.
O 205-426-5557
C 205-937-6598

www.brawco.com
Dear Mr. Gaston - I understand that the MB City Council will be undertaking plans to provide a sidewalk on Pine Ridge Road. I am thrilled to hear this as this has been needed for quite sometime. As you know, this is a very busy street with little to no shoulder. The City has done a spectacular job with the sidewalks - in the Pine Ridge Rd neighborhood, there is a well built and well connected sidewalk on Old Leeds/Montrose at one end of Pine Ridge Rd and on the other end is the Jemison Trail and the Overbrook Rd sidewalk. Pine Ridge Rd is a natural connector to these 2 sidewalks/trails and gets a good bit of foot traffic. I walk on Pine Ridge Rd often and there are many times that there is no shoulder to step on to and a car will simply not slow down or edge over into the other lane. I assure you it is frightening. I also witness the gentleman from Waste Management who walks Pine Ridge to compile the garbage try to maneuver this road and Jr High students who are often looking for a quicker route maneuver this road as well. I fear that it is a matter of time before someone is hit.

Again, I am thrilled to know this plan for a sidewalk is in process. This will not only enhance and improve the walkability of this city, but will also provide a more safe environment for its citizens.

Many thanks for what you do for the City of Mountain Brook - Emily Curran

Emily Curran
emilycurran@me.com
Cell - 205.542.1101
Dear Sam,
By now I am sure that you have been inundated by emails from people who live on Pine Ridge Road. There should be no question that the majority of people on this street want a sidewalk. People try to walk and jog on this street fairly often and it is so dangerous. We have heard that the City Council will be discussing this issue next week. Should we come? Turner and I are both for a sidewalk and would attend if necessary. I was hoping that it would be on my side of the street but have heard it is on the right side coming from Old Leeds Road. Thank you for the conversation about mom’s property and let me know if Public Works had anything different to say about the storm drain. Thanks.
Libba

Sent from my iPhone
Sam,
I live at 3240 Pine Ridge Road. I have talked with you a few times over the past years about our desire for a sidewalk and wanted to email you to restate that. As a resident of the street, a sidewalk would allow us to walk from our home safely. For the community, it would do the same and link all three villages.
Thanks
Susan Thomas
Ph. 205 601 9628
We are so excited to have a sidewalk connecting Glencoe to the junior high and to mountain brook village. So many times we walk the trails and walk pine ridge- taking our life in our hands!!!! So scary! Also we love walking to friends and family and this opens a whole new world to us! Please please please get this sidewalk done!!!!!!

Celeste Henderson
205-441-1669
Good Evening, Sam

I am writing to let you know that my husband and I are in favor of having sidewalks added on Pine Ridge Road. We live on Pine Ridge Lane and would love for children to be able to walk to Mountain Brook Junior High from our house. Mountain Brook is an amazing community that is so walkable. We would love the ability to walk to Crestline Village from our home or to be able to step out for a jog or a walk and be able to go from our home instead of having to get in the car to drive somewhere to begin. Please take this into consideration as you make decisions about this subject.

Thank you,
Amy and Jay Rainer
6 Pine Ridge Lane
Sam, as you know since we inquired about the cost of sidewalks a couple years ago, we are very, very supportive of this. One time, soon after we moved to Pine Ridge, we were walking to a neighbor’s house and a car passed us so close I had to hold my son in the air over the culvert on the side of the road (since there is no shoulder). That was the last time we attempted the 100 yard walk down the road to their house!

Unfortunately I cannot be at the City Council next week but if I was in town I would definitely attend to show support.

Jamie

Begin forwarded message:

From: Catherine Gregory <catgreg4@gmail.com>
Date: June 18, 2019 at 2:53:57 PM EDT
To: Jamie Gregory <ajgregoryjr@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Pine Ridge Road Sidewalks

sent from catherine's phone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Patrick Carlton <pcarlton@nationalbankofcommerce.com>
Date: June 18, 2019 at 2:44:22 PM EDT
To: "j Crommelin@raypoynor.com" <jcrommelin@raypoynor.com>,
"pdreher@aol.com" <pdreher@aol.com>, "steve.rowe@arlaw.com" <steve.rowe@arlaw.com>, "catgreg4@gmail.com" <catgreg4@gmail.com>, Bronwynne Chapman <bronwynne76@gmail.com>, Joel Mcmahon <joelmcmahon@javindustrial.com>, "wcwood@gmail.com" <wcwood@gmail.com>,
"kristinnmcpherson40@me.com" <kristinnmcpherson40@me.com>, "libba57@gmail.com" <libba57@gmail.com>,
"twilliams@burr.com" <twilliams@burr.com>,
"ashley@honeybeecollection.com" <ashley@honeybeecollection.com>,
"jchilds@maynardcooper.com" <jchilds@maynardcooper.com>,
"druemiller@icloud.com" <druemiller@icloud.com>
Cc: "geraldagarner@gmail.com" <geraldagarner@gmail.com>, Mary Glen Carlton <mgCarlton@yahoo.com>
Subject: Pine Ridge Road Sidewalks

You all likely received something from the City about plans to put a sidewalk in on Pine Ridge Road. I am told there are a couple of residents that are against them and plan to voice those next week at the City Council meeting. Would you please take a minute to email Sam Gaston with the City if you are in support of the sidewalk plan. Discussion is
on the agenda for next week’s City Council meeting so please try to do so by then. Feel free to share with anyone on the street that you think may help or your spouse 😊.

gastons@mtnbrook.org

Thanks

Patrick Carlton

www.nationalbankofcommerce.com

Patrick S. Carlton
President - Birmingham
600 Luckie Drive, Suite 200
Birmingham, AL 35223
P O Box 381748
Birmingham AL 35238
pearlton@nationalbankofcommerce.com
205-313-8120 Phone
205-313-8111 Fax
NMLS #740818

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is intended solely for the addressee and may contain private, confidential and/or legally privileged material. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted is prohibited by law.
I understand that there may be discussion at the next council meeting about the planned sidewalk for Pine Ridge Road.

My family lives at 3511, we are strongly in favor of the sidewalk regardless of the specifics of its construction.

-William and Tina Wood
3511 Pine Ridge Road

Mobile 205-937-3337
--
Sent from Gmail Mobile
Dear Sam-

We are writing in tremendous support of the sidewalks being installed on Pine Ridge Road. As a main thoroughfare in Crestline, it is very dangerous for all of the pedestrian traffic that tries to exercise on it or using it as a connecting path to the Jemison Trail. This is monumental for our property values in that it would complete our street and make it more polished looking. The city has done such a beautiful job in the areas affected so far that we hope you all will continue your successful progress on our street.

Thank you for helping in our progress!

Jane Huston and Claiborne Crommelin

Jane Huston Crommelin, ABR, SRES, MRP, GRI, e-Pro, CRS, SRS
Ray & Poynor Properties
C: 205.527.4251 O: 205.879.3036
jcrummelin@raypoynor.com
Sam:

Please put me down as a strong supporter of sidewalks for Pine Ridge Road.

My family has lived at 3500 Pine Ridge Road for 30 plus years. I love to walk, but it’s dangerous to walk on Pine Ridge because there is often no shoulder. My neighbor Patrick is nice to let me cross his property to get closer to the sidewalk at Old Leeds Road. A sidewalk would be a better way to get to the wonderful network of sidewalks that exists in our city.

I often see joggers or walkers on Pine Ridge and I am certain there will be many more when sidewalks are built.

Thanks,

Steve
Sam Gaston

From: The Gerald Garner
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 11:43 AM
To: Sam Gaston
Subject: Support for Pine Ridge Sidewalk

Sam, please share this email with our City Council and Mayor for the upcoming council meeting. Thank you.

I am beyond excited to hear that a sidewalk on Pine Ridge Road might be a real possibility. I can’t imagine a more deserved or more appropriate street for a sidewalk. When we consider the streets with sidewalks surrounding Pine Ridge Road, it is easy to see that Pine Ridge Road is the missing connector. On day one, a Pine Ridge sidewalk will be a game changer. It alone will improve the way our citizens will be able to take advantage of what our fair city has to offer. Consider the possibilities. Park usage increases where sidewalks offer easier access. Vendors see an increase in traffic when shoppers or diners can access locations without driving. More parents can walk their children to school. Couples jog. Friends hangout. All thanks to well designed and well placed sidewalks. Our city offers many great things. And being more interconnected will only add to the uniqueness and value of our fair city. A Pine Ridge sidewalk will offer greater access for a greater number of citizens to places like Jemison Park, the Junior High School, MB Village, Crestline Village and even the Irondale Furnace.

I apologize for the length of my letter, but I am passionate about making this city better. I served on MB’s Parks and Recreation Board for 11 years. I currently serve on our BZA. I have witnessed how the right decisions increase the ultimate value of Mountain Brook not just through the aesthetics, but also the functions. Please consider making the right decision to continue striving to improve Mountain Brook.

Respectfully,
Gerald Garner
3401 Pine Ridge Road
--
Sent from GMail Mobile