Executive Summary

Study Initiation
The study was initiated by the City of Mountain Brook through the Advanced Planning, Programming, and Logical Engineering (APPLE) program developed by the Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham (RPCGB). The City requested professional planning assistance to evaluate the feasibility of installing sidewalks along roadways located in the city limits of Mountain Brook.

Purpose for the Study
The study area includes all roadways located in the City of Mountain Brook. Prior to this study, the City of Mountain Brook developed a walkway master plan. Since that plan’s development, many sidewalks have been installed and there are currently two sidewalk projects under construction. However, there are still areas that lack sidewalk where it is desired. The overall goal of this study is to determine the feasibility of constructing the sidewalks identified in the walkway master plan, as well as other logical sidewalk locations. The strategy to achieve this goal includes several steps:

- Identify where sidewalks are needed and/or desired
- Evaluate their constructability
- Determine an opinion of probable cost
- Prioritize the installation of potential sidewalk segments
- Identify construction phasing
- Identify available funding for sidewalk installation

Potential Sidewalk Locations
Most of the potential sidewalk locations were identified in the City’s previously prepared Walkway Master Plan. In addition to these locations, many residents, via face-to-face discussions, e-mail, or through a city-wide survey, have supplied suggestions for new sidewalks. All of these requested routes were included in the feasibility evaluation. Also, as part of a windshield review, several additional potential sidewalk locations were identified based on the relative ease of construction and based on their ability to provide connectivity to destinations. The total lengths of the considered routes are listed below in linear feet (LF) and miles:

- Existing walkways: 243,334 LF (46.09 miles)
- Previously identified phases: 53,685 LF (10.17 miles)
- Newly identified phases: 16,472 LF (3.12 miles)
- User requested phases: 37,885 LF (7.18 miles)
- Previously studied and eliminated walkways: 12,915 LF (2.45 miles)
Constructability Review

An in-field constructability review was performed for each potential sidewalk segment. This review identified the existing travel lane widths, the roadway shoulder type and condition, the presence of utilities, potential grading difficulties, and property impacts. From the in-field review, sidewalk segments were placed in four installation categories: easy, medium, difficult, and infeasible.

Prioritization Procedure

For this study, criteria for prioritizing potential projects were selected from the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System and from FHWA’s How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan according to the main needs of the Mountain Brook community. Establishing priorities for potential sidewalk segments included three steps:

1. Development of a prioritized list of criteria
2. Development of a methodology for using the criteria to evaluate potential sites
3. Creation of a prioritized list of sites for sidewalk improvements

The following criteria were applied for establishing priorities:

- Cost
- Feasibility
- Public Support
- Severity of Problem
- Probable Use
- Effectiveness of Solution

Points were assigned to each criterion. Segments were then awarded points accordingly, with the maximum number of available points totaling 100. After assigning points to each segment, three priority groups were determined. The high-priority group had an average score of 63 points; the medium-priority group had an average score of 51 points; the low-priority group had an average score of 37 points.

Project Phasing

Following the sidewalk segment prioritization, sidewalk installation phases were identified. When identifying project phases, available funding and user requests were the main considerations. The first step in the phasing process was to identify locations where the City could use their own forces to complete the work. Potential sidewalks providing connectivity between existing facilities and with construction costs around the $100,000 mark were defined as City-funded projects.

Next, project phases were created by identifying the most requested segments and selecting adjacent or relatively close segments, geographically speaking, to create projects with costs ranging between $1M and $2.5M. Projects with costs of this magnitude are good candidates for Federal funding match programs (i.e. Congestion
Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding). An estimated timeframe for completion of projects using Federal funding is estimated at five to eight years.

**Next Steps**

If the City chooses to move forward with implementing any of the proposed sidewalks and would like to pursue Federal funding, the next step would be to request inclusion of a project in RPCGB’s Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). In 2019, RPCGB will solicit new projects to be included in the next TIP planning cycle. However, projects that utilize the APPLE program provide local governments the opportunity to request funding between TIP cycles. The preparation of this feasibility study can be used in the application for funds from the RPCGB for future improvements.

Once Federal funds are in place for the project, an environmental document will need to be prepared. The environmental document must include technical studies and public involvement outreach necessary to comply with procedures of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once the environmental study has been completed, the design would be undertaken, and construction would follow. If it is determined that additional right-of-way is required, acquisition would be conducted prior to construction.

Should the City elect to use local funds, the timing, scheduling, and implementation of the installation would be at their discretion.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Feasibility Study

The study was initiated by the City of Mountain Brook through the Advanced Planning, Programming, and Logical Engineering (APPLE) program developed by the Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham (RPCGB). The City requested professional planning assistance to evaluate the feasibility of installing sidewalks along roadways located in the city limits of Mountain Brook.

Prior to this study the City of Mountain Brook developed a walkway master plan. Since that plan’s development, many sidewalks have been installed and there are currently two sidewalk projects under construction. However, there are still areas that lack sidewalk where it is desired. The overall goal of this study is to determine the feasibility of constructing the potential sidewalks identified in the walkway master plan, as well as other logical sidewalk locations. The strategy to achieve this goal includes several steps:

- Identify where sidewalks are needed and/or desired
- Evaluate their constructability
- Determine an opinion of probable cost
- Prioritize the installation of potential sidewalk segments
- Identify construction phasing
- Identify available funding for sidewalk installation

1.2 Study Approach

The study was performed using a two-stage process. Stage one included an evaluation of the existing conditions and an evaluation of potential sidewalk locations. Stage 2 included prioritizing potential sidewalk segments and recommending project phasing for future sidewalk projects.

For stage one, a base map was prepared using aerial images and available GIS data. The previously prepared City of Mountain Brook Walkway Master Plan was reviewed and a field review was also performed as part of stage one. This field review consisted of confirming the presence of existing sidewalks and performing a constructability review of potential sidewalk locations. The constructability review consisted of walking the study area, taking measurements and inventory, and investigating what impacts sidewalk installation would have to the adjacent areas.

For stage two, potential sidewalk segments were prioritized and placed into project phases. Mapping showing results of the constructability review, prioritization, and phasing was presented at a public involvement meeting before being finalized.
2 Existing Conditions

The City of Mountain Brook Walkaway Master Plan was first developed in 1992. Since that time adjustments have been made to meet the City’s needs and many sidewalks have been installed. There are currently two sidewalk projects under construction. Although much has been accomplished relating to sidewalk installation in the City of Mountain Brook, there are still areas that lack sidewalk where it is desired. This section provides an overview of the existing sidewalk network and summarizes the constructability review. The study area includes all roadways located in the City of Mountain Brook. Figure 1 provides a location map that shows Mountain Brook City Limits in red. Appendix A provides an inventory of existing sidewalks and potential sidewalk segments.
2.1 Constructability Review

Field reviews of the area were performed on January 27, 2017, March 13, 2017, and July 12, 2017. During the field visits, a constructability review was performed for each potential sidewalk segment. This review identified the existing travel lane widths, the roadway shoulder type and condition, the presence of utilities, potential grading difficulties, and property impacts. From the in-field review, sidewalk segments were placed in four installation categories: easy, medium, difficult, and infeasible. A map showing the ease of installation is provided in Appendix B.

2.3.1 Easy Installation

Easy installation segments are defined as portions of roadway that would require minor grading, minor challenges with mailboxes, and few impacts to properties, driveways, and/or utilities. Perhaps the segments with the easiest installation are those where the existing pavement is wide (twenty-four feet or greater) which allows for pavement removal as a way to achieve enough room for sidewalk installation. This type of construction is referred to as a road diet. The segment on Locksley Drive from Wheatherton Drive to Dunbarton Drive is an example of easy sidewalk constructability (see Figure 2). Although this segment presents some challenges associated with utilities, it is considered an easy installation since the adjacent area is relatively flat and the pavement width is 24 feet, making it a road diet candidate.

Figure 2: Easy Sidewalk Installation – Locksley Drive from Wheatherton Drive to Dunbarton Drive
2.3.2 Medium Installation

Medium installation segments are defined as portions of roadway that would experience moderate challenges during installation. These include: moderate grading, substantial mailboxes, moderate property impacts, steeper driveways, and/or the presence of utilities. The segment on Westbury Road from Bethune Drive to Crosshill Road is an example of medium sidewalk constructability (see Figure 3) considering its numerous brick mailboxes, driveway entrance treatments, and storm drainage structures that would require modification.

![Figure 3: Medium Sidewalk Installation – Westbury Road from Bethune Drive to Crosshill Road](image)

2.3.3 Difficult Installation

Difficult installation segments are defined as portions of roadway that would experience major challenges during construction. These challenges include: major grading and/or retaining walls, increased property impacts associated with tie slopes and driveways, and/or utilities. The segment of Old Leeds Road from Crosshill Road to Cherokee Road is an example of difficult sidewalk constructability (see Figure 4). The roadway is approximately 21 feet wide, so a road diet is not viable. There is a narrow ditch with a steep back slope on the south side, which will likely result in the need for a retaining wall. There are also some aerial utility poles that may be affected.
### 2.3.4 Infeasible Installation

Infeasible installation segments are defined as portions of roadway with extensive challenges requiring very high costs, right-of-way acquisition, and considerable grading operations. The segment of Old Leeds Lane from Old Leeds Road to Hillock Drive is an example of infeasible sidewalk constructability (see Figure 5). On the south end of the road there is what appears to be a US Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional stream, and on the north side of the road there is a steep rock cut section. The roadway is only 22’ wide; therefore, a road diet is not viable. Although this particular section is deemed infeasible, the City could still install sidewalk with the knowledge that costs and timeframe are much greater than other locations. Segments labeled as infeasible were not eliminated from the study and are included in prioritization and project phasing.
3 Environmental Features

3.1 Threatened and Endangered Species

A letter was sent to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on February 20, 2017 to obtain background information on potential items of concern. USFWS responded with a letter dated March 8, 2017 noting that there are twelve (12) endangered or threatened species that may occur in the project area. The project area is within the habitat range of listed bat species; therefore, it is suggested that USFWS be contacted in case trees need to be cleared to complete the project. Also, USFWS recommends that project plans should include protections for water quality, the Cahaba River and its tributaries. See Appendix C for the USFWS response letter.

The presence of any of these species does not prevent the City from moving forward with a sidewalk project but it may have an impact. Should the City elect to use Federal funding for the design or construction of the sidewalks, additional coordination with USFWS will be required and the presence of certain species could impact construction scheduling.
3.2 Prime and Unique Farmlands
The National Environmental Policy Act requires that a project area be evaluated to determine the presence of prime and unique farmlands. On February 20, 2017 a letter was sent to the United States Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Mapping produced via USDA’s Web Soil Survey was also included with the letter. This mapping shows the study area as well as areas of prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance. The intent of the letter was to obtain concurrence from NRCS that these farmlands would not be impacted by the proposed sidewalks.

Per correspondence from NRCS dated March 28, 2017, the area of consideration for the sidewalk study does contain “Prime Farmlands”; however, the area does not meet the criteria set forth by the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) and Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA) of June 22, 1982. It is recommended by NRCS that erosion and sediment control measures should be implemented and maintained during the construction phase to protect land, water, and related resources. Also, NRCS suggests that plans for construction should include sediment basins or traps and other erosion control practices. Appendix D provides the package submitted to NRCS and their concurrence.

3.3 Historic and Archaeological Properties
Per the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) database, there are two (2) historic properties located in the study area:

- Mountain Brook Estates Building: this building was significant to the community during the period from 1925 to 1949. It was registered at the NRHP in April, 2003. The building is located at the intersection between Cahaba Road and Montevallo Road, where existing sidewalks are present.
- Redmont Gardens Apartments: the period of significance of this area included the years from 1925 to 1949. Redmont Gardens Apartments are classified as a historical district, registered as eligible for the NRHP since August, 1993. The apartments are located on Fairway Drive, where existing sidewalks are present.

There are existing sidewalks where both historic resources are located within the study area; therefore, the current project will not affect these sites.

There are no National Historic Landmarks (NHL) or Alabama Register of Landmarks and Heritage (ARLH) properties recorded within the study area.

Should the City move forward with obtaining Federal monies for the installation of the sidewalks, it is recommended that a Phase 1 cultural resources study be performed. This study would be able to identify and document any historic properties, as well as identify any known or unknown archaeological sites. The Alabama Historic Commission would
also have to concur with the findings in the cultural resources study. If local funds are used, a phase 1 cultural resources study is not required.

3.4 Wetlands and Floodplains
Per correspondence from NRCS dated March 28, 2017, the area of consideration for the sidewalk study does not contain hydric soils (blue) that meet the definition for wetland criteria. Mapping showing wetlands and flood zones is provided in Appendix E.

3.5 Environmental Justice
Environmental Justice is a component of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that seeks to ensure that all socio-economic groups share in the benefits and burdens of Federal transportation projects. Two areas of environmental justice that frequently become a concern are areas with a high minority population or areas where the majority of the inhabitants are members of low income households.

Table 1 provides a very brief overview of the socioeconomic demographics of the study area as shown in 2015 American Community Survey (ACS), a statistical survey by the U.S. Census Bureau. The minority populations and the percentage of families living below the poverty level in the study area are below those seen for the entire County. Therefore, it can be concluded that installation of any of the sidewalks proposed in this study would not cause any adverse impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Overview</th>
<th>City of Mountain Brook</th>
<th>Jefferson County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Total</td>
<td>20,518</td>
<td>659,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Families Living Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Potential Sidewalk Locations
4.1 New Sidewalk Locations
Most of the potential sidewalk locations were identified in the City’s walkway master plan. In addition to these locations, many residents, via face-to-face discussions, e-mail, or a city-wide survey, have supplied the suggestions on where the City should install new sidewalks. All of these requested routes were included in the feasibility evaluation.
Also, as part of a windshield review, several additional potential sidewalk locations were identified based on the relative ease of construction and based on their ability to provide connectivity to destinations. Mapping of these locations is shown in Appendix A. The total lengths of the considered routes are:

- Existing walkways: 243,334 LF (46.09 miles)
- Previously identified phases: 53,685 LF (10.17 miles)
- Newly identified phases: 16,472 LF (3.12 miles)
- User requested phases: 37,885 LF (7.18 miles)
- Previously studied and eliminated: 12,915 LF (2.45 miles)

### 4.2 Prioritization Procedure

For this study, criteria for prioritizing potential projects were selected from the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) *Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System* and from FHWA’s *How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan* according to the main needs of the Mountain Brook community. Establishing priorities for potential sidewalk segments included three steps:

1. Develop a prioritized list of criteria
2. Develop a methodology for using the criteria to evaluate potential sites
3. Create a prioritized list of sites for sidewalk improvements

#### 4.2.1 Prioritized List of Criteria

The following criteria were applied for establishing priorities:

**Cost**

The total cost of each project is the sum of the estimated cost to install the sidewalk and the estimated cost of utility relocation.

**Feasibility**

Feasibility of construction is primarily based on roadway profile condition, approximate cut/fill slope and height, and characteristics of drainage and utilities.

**Public Support**

Through various avenues, the public provided feedback to the City stating where they felt sidewalk is needed.

**Severity of Problem**

This criterion is usually defined according to the crash history of the site or based on the likelihood of crash frequency and severity. After an analysis of pedestrian-related crash data, no crash trends were observed. In this analysis, severity of the problem was estimated based on the speed limit of the road. There is a direct relationship between speed and the severity of pedestrian-related crashes, thus resulting in a greater need to separate pedestrians from motor vehicles on high-speed facilities.
**Probable Use**
Travel demand was estimated based on the proximity to pedestrian trip generators. Priority was given for sidewalks within 0.25 miles from:
1. Schools: children are especially vulnerable
2. Parks: high pedestrian activity for leisure or fitness activities
3. Transit: transit riders need sidewalks to access transit stops
4. Other generators: places of worship and community centers

**Effectiveness of Solution**
The effectiveness of the solution was based on the relevance of the connectivity provided by the sidewalk segment. It is important to install sidewalks to connect pedestrian areas to each other and create continuous walking systems.

**4.2.2 Methodology for Using the Criteria**
The FHWA's *Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System* recommends the *Points Method* as one of the methodologies for selecting locations for improvements. A weighted points system was used: all of the criteria were assigned a range of numbers. The weights were adapted from the FHWA's *How to Develop a Pedestrian Safety Action Plan* according to the main needs of the Mountain Brook community. Priority is higher for projects with higher scores. Table 2 shows the points assigned to each criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Public Support</th>
<th>Severity of Problem</th>
<th>Probable Use</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Solution</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost**
Cost points for a segment were calculated in relation to the highest project cost. Lower cost projects have higher priority. The segment on Caldwell Mill Road from Pump House Road to Dolly Ridge Road has the highest cost ($1,260,216.60) while the segment on Cherokee Court from Smyer Road to the cul-de-sac has the lowest cost ($22,011.98). If the segment cost represents approximately:
1. 1 time the highest project cost: assign 2 points
2. 1/2 times the highest project cost: assign 4 points
3. 1/3 times the highest project cost: assign 6 points
4. 1/4 times the highest project cost: assign 8 points
5. 1/5 times the highest project cost: assign 10 points
6. 1/6 times the highest project cost: assign 12 points
7. 1/7 times the highest project cost: assign 14 points
8. 1/8 times the highest project cost: assign 16 points
9. 1/9 times the highest project cost: assign 18 points
10. 1/10 or less times the highest project cost: assign 20 points
**Feasibility**
Points for ease of installation were attributed for each segment as follows:
1. Easy installation: assign 20 points
2. Medium installation: assign 15 points
3. Difficult installation: assign 10 points
4. Infeasible installation: assign 0 points

**Public Support**
User requested sidewalks were assigned points based on input received by the City:
1. User requested segments: assign 10 points
2. Segments not requested by users: assign 0 points

**Severity of Problem**
Speed limit points were defined for each project. If the speed limit of the road segment where the sidewalk is located is:
1. 20 to 25 MPH: assign 5 points
2. 30 to 35 MPH: assign 10 points
3. 40 to 45 MPH: assign 15 points
4. 50 to 55 MPH: assign 20 points

**Probable Use**
Travel demand points were determined as the sum of the points assigned for each trip generator. If the segment was located within 0.25 miles from:
1. Schools: assign 8 points
2. Parks: assign 6 points
3. Transit: assign 4 points
4. Other generators: assign 2 points

The Probable Use criterion has a minimum of zero and a maximum of 20 points. When the segment is within 0.25 miles from school, park, transit, and another generator, points assigned are $8 + 6 + 4 + 2 = 20$. If the segment is not within 0.25 miles of pedestrian trip generators, zero points are assigned.

**Effectiveness of Solution**
Effectiveness points were assigned based on the importance of the connectivity provided by the sidewalk:
1. Important connectivity: assign 10 points
2. Connectivity less relevant: assign 0 points

**4.2.3 Prioritized List of Sites for Sidewalk Improvements**
After assigning points to each segment, three priority groups were determined. The high-priority group had an average score of 62 points; the medium-priority group had an average score of 48 points; the low-priority group had an average score of 36
points. Priority groups can be seen in Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5. Appendix F provides mapping of the project prioritization.

### Table 3: High-Priority Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority I (High)</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From Road</th>
<th>To Road</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overhill Rd</td>
<td>Balmoral Rd</td>
<td>Hastings Rd S</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Overbrook Rd</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Oaks Rd</td>
<td>Briar Oaks Dr</td>
<td>Overton Rd</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Lane</td>
<td>Mountain Park Dr</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montclair Rd</td>
<td>Memory Ln</td>
<td>Mountain Park Dr</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oakdale Rd</td>
<td>Oakdale Dr</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinth Dr</td>
<td>Kennesaw Dr</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Park Rd</td>
<td>Garden Pl</td>
<td>Country Club Cir</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Mountain Park Dr</td>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corinth Dr</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherokee Rd</td>
<td>Overbrook Rd</td>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northcote Dr</td>
<td>Warrington Rd</td>
<td>Colchester Rd</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Hill Rd</td>
<td>Sedley Dr</td>
<td>S Brookwood Rd</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Club Rd</td>
<td>Montclair Rd</td>
<td>Sidewalk Terminus</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedley Dr</td>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Spring Hill Rd</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briar Oak Dr</td>
<td>Overton Rd</td>
<td>River Oaks Rd</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingshill Rd</td>
<td>Bethune Dr</td>
<td>S Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crosshill Rd</td>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>Brookwood Rd</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balmoral Rd</td>
<td>Overhill Rd</td>
<td>Pine Crest Rd</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherokee Ct</td>
<td>Smyer Rd</td>
<td>Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE POINTS FOR GROUP I**

63
# Table 4: Medium-Priority Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From Road</th>
<th>To Road</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locksley Dr</td>
<td>Dunbarton Rd</td>
<td>Warrington Rd</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw Drive</td>
<td>Stone River Rd</td>
<td>Wilderness Rd</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Rd</td>
<td>Salisbury Rd</td>
<td>Rockdell Rd</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Leeds Road</td>
<td>Near Highlands School</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>Crosshill Rd</td>
<td>Brook Leeds Rd</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locksley Dr</td>
<td>Warrington Rd</td>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Leeds Road</td>
<td>Brook Leeds Rd</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montevallo Ln</td>
<td>Montevallo Rd</td>
<td>Richmar Dr</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Westbury Pl</td>
<td>S Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmar Drive</td>
<td>Montevallo Ln</td>
<td>Mountain Park Dr</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Park Rd</td>
<td>Somerset Cir</td>
<td>Country Club Rd</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Park Dr</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Rd</td>
<td>Michael Ln</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbarton Dr</td>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Locksley Dr</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Crest Rd</td>
<td>Montevallo Rd</td>
<td>Overbrook Rd</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Brookwood Rd</td>
<td>Brookwood Forest School</td>
<td>Bottom of hill</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair Rd</td>
<td>Country Club Rd</td>
<td>Memory Ln</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Robin Dr</td>
<td>Sedley Dr</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagood St</td>
<td>Euclid Ave</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter Ave</td>
<td>Existing Sidewalk</td>
<td>Vine St</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington Rd</td>
<td>Locksley Dr</td>
<td>Northcote Dr</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 5: Low-Priority Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority III (Low)</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From Road</th>
<th>To Road</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>S Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Croshill Rd</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colchester Rd</td>
<td>Northcote Dr</td>
<td>Overton Rd</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Kingshill Rd</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 280 W</td>
<td>Pump House Rd</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Ln</td>
<td>Antietam Dr</td>
<td>Stone River Rd</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>Cherokee Rd</td>
<td>Crosshill Rd</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caldwell Mill Rd</td>
<td>Pump House Rd</td>
<td>Dolly Ridge Rd</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 280 W</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Cahaba Village</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookwood Rd</td>
<td>Crosshill Rd</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Briarcliff Rd</td>
<td>Brookwood Rd</td>
<td>Overcrest Rd</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyer Rd</td>
<td>Brookwood Mall</td>
<td>Valley Christian Church</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pump House Rd</td>
<td>Rocky Ridge Rd</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Ln</td>
<td>Hillock Dr</td>
<td>Antietam Dr</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>Shady Ln</td>
<td>Old Leeds Ln</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbury Rd</td>
<td>Bethune Dr</td>
<td>Crosshill Rd</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Valley Ct</td>
<td>N Woodridge Rd</td>
<td>Kingshill Rd</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Ln</td>
<td>Old Leeds Rd</td>
<td>Hillock Dr</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain Park Dr</td>
<td>Michael Ln</td>
<td>Montrose Rd</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingshill Rd</td>
<td>Spring Valley Ct</td>
<td>Bethune Dr</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE POINTS FOR GROUP III**

37

### 4.3 Project Phasing

Following the sidewalk segment prioritization, sidewalk installation phases were identified. When identifying project phases, available funding and user requests were the main considerations. The first step in the phasing process was to identify locations where the City could use their own forces to complete the work. Potential sidewalks providing connectivity between existing facilities and with construction costs around the $100,000 mark were defined as City-funded projects.

Next, project phases were created by identifying the most requested segments and selecting adjacent or relatively close segments, geographically speaking, to create projects with costs ranging between $1M and $2.5M. Projects with costs of this magnitude are good candidates for Federal funding match programs (i.e. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding). An estimated timeframe for completion of projects using Federal funding is estimated at five to eight years.
After City funded projects, there are essentially 9 phases. The hierarchy of these identified project phases was based upon input from users and the degree of connectivity the project segments provided for the City. Segments with a higher number of requests from Mountain Brook citizens and those which offered the most connectivity to places of interest were placed in higher phases. Appendix G provides mapping of the project phasing. Tables 6 and 7 provide a summary of the phases and the segments included in those phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Overhill Road (Balmoral Road to Hastings Road South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Lane Park Road (Garden Place to Country Club Circle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Corinth Drive (Existing Sidewalk to Cul-de-sac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Cherokee Court (to Smyer Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Country Club Road (Montclair Road to Sidewalk Terminus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Dexter Avenue (Existing Sidewalk to Vine Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funded</td>
<td>Hagood Street (Euclid Avenue to Greeenbriar Circle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road (Overbrook Road to Pine Ridge Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road (Pine Ridge Lane to Mountain Park Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Pine Ridge Road (Mountain Park Drive to Old Leeds Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Montevallo Lane (Montevallo Road to Richmar Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Richmar Drive (Montevallo Lane to Mountain Park Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Mountain Park Drive (Pine Ridge Road to Michael Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Mountain Park Drive (Michael Lane to Montrose Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Montclair Road (Memory Lane to Mountain Park Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Country Club Road Salisbury Road to Rockdell Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Lane Park Road (Somerset Circle to Country Club Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Montclair Road (Country Club Drive to Memory Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Pine Crest Road (Balmoral Road to Overbrook Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Balmoral Road (Overhill Road to Pine Crest Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Corinth Drive (Kennesaw Drive to Existing Sidewalk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Kennesaw Drive (Stone River Road to Wilderness Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Old Leeds Lane (Antietam Drive to Stone River Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Old Leeds Lane (Hillock Drive to Antietam Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Old Leeds Lane (Old Leeds Road to Hillock Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Old Leeds Road (Shady Lane to Old Leeds Lane)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Project Phases Continued (Phase 4 through Phase 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Estimated Cost of Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4*</td>
<td>River Oaks Road (Briar Oaks Drive to Overton Road)</td>
<td>$3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northcote Drive (Warrington Road to Colchester Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Hill Road (Sedley Drive to S Brookwood Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedley Drive (N Woodridge Road to Spring Hill Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briar Oak Drive (Overton Road to River Oaks Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locksley Drive (Dunbarton Drive to Warrington Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locksley Drive (Warrington Road to N Woodridge Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunbarton Drive (N Woodridge Road to Locksley Drive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Brookwood Road (Brookwood Forest School to Bottom of hill)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Woodridge Road (Robin Drive to Sedley Drive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warrington Road (Locksley Drive to Northcote Drive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colchester Road (Northcote Drive to Overton Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E Briarcliff Road (Brookwood Road to Overcrest Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Kingshill Road (Bethune Drive to S Woodridge Road)</td>
<td>$2.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Woodridge Road (Westbury Place to S Woodridge Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Woodridge Road (S Woodridge Road to Crosshill Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S Woodridge Road (N Woodridge Road to Kingshill Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westbury Road (Bethune Drive to Crosshill Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Valley Court (N Woodridge Road to Kingshill Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingshill Road (Spring Valley Court to Bethune Drive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Crosshill Road (Old Leeds Road to Brookwood Road)</td>
<td>$2.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherokee Road (Overbrook Road to Old Leeds Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Road (Brook Leeds Road to City Limits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Road (Crosshill Road to Brook Leeds Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Road (near Highlands School)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookwood Road (Crosshill Road to City Limits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Leeds Road (Cherokee Road to Crosshill Road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>Highway 280 W (Pump House Road to City Limits)</td>
<td>$1.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 280 W (City Limits to Cahaba Village)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyer Road (Brookwood Mall to Valley Christian Church)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>Caldwell Mill Road (Pump House Road to Dolly Ridge Road)</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 9</td>
<td>Pump House Road (Rocky Ridge Road to City Limits)</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Phase 4 includes improving the existing pedestrian accommodations on S Brookwood Road (near Brookwood Forest School). If this segment were removed from Phase 4, the estimated cost would be reduced approximately $236,000.
5 Accessibility

Per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), facilities located within the public right-of-way must provide accessibility for all users including those with disabilities. The United States Access Board has developed proposed guidelines for pedestrian facilities in public rights-of-way. These guidelines are more commonly referred to as Public Rights-Of-Way Accessibility Guidelines or PROWAG. Per PROWAG, design, construction, and any alteration of pedestrian facilities within public rights-of-way, including local rights-of-way, must be made accessible for pedestrians with disabilities. Although PROWAG has not yet been officially adopted by the United States Department of Justice, it is the standard recognized by ALDOT. Once PROWAG is officially adopted it will be mandatory that the guidelines set forth by the United States Access Board be implemented into projects located within public rights-of-way.

Recently, the City completed a Transition Plan for ADA Compliance (June 28, 2017). As a part of the preparation of the transition plan, forty-five miles of existing sidewalk was evaluated. The purpose of this plan is to “ensure that these existing pedestrian facilities are accessible to all Mountain Brook citizens in as timely and complete manner as is reasonably possible.” The plan states that the City will strive to complete improvements to existing sidewalk conditions over the course of ten years, beginning with the 2017-2018 fiscal year and with a $150,000 per year budget. This timeline and budget is based upon the City’s current revenue and is subject to change.

6 Funding Sources

Costs associated with the design and construction of the proposed sidewalks could exceed the City’s current available resources. This section discusses federal and private funding sources that are available to aid in design and construction. Federal programs are administered by the Alabama Department of Transportation. Table 8 details funding sources, the category of the source and type of project for which the funding can be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Relevant Project Type</th>
<th>Match Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Mountain Brook</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Provides connectivity with an estimated cost of $100,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>80% Federal/ 20% City (Design and Construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>80% Federal/ 20% City (Construction Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Projects with the goal of reducing traffic crashes</td>
<td>90% Federal/ 10% City (Construction Only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Funding

Below is a brief description of available federal funding programs.

- CMAQ and TAP funding programs have been continued through the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) receives approximately $10 Million of CMAQ funds and $1.2 Million of TAP funds annually. These funds are then distributed amongst various municipalities and ALDOT. The members of the MPO vote to determine which projects receive funding. The CMAQ and TAP funding programs are further discussed below.

  o The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program’s goal is to improve air quality. The installation of pedestrian facilities is one way CMAQ achieves this goal. Pedestrian facilities have the potential to reduce vehicle emissions since they encourage walking instead of motor vehicle transportation. CMAQ funding can be used for both design and construction of a project. With CMAQ funding, an 80/20 match is required meaning the Federal government provides 80% of the funding and the City would be responsible for the remaining 20% of funding. Since this report was prepared as part of the APPLE program, it can be used in conjunction with the application and will streamline the City's request for CMAQ funding. The downside to CMAQ funding is the time it adds to the overall project. Additional time is required in order to account for ALDOT and FHWA involvement including additional plan reviews and more stringent design and construction standards. For these reasons, a timeframe for completing a CMAQ pedestrian facility project is estimated at three to five years.

  o Projects defined as transportation alternatives are eligible for Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding. More specifically, applicable projects include: construction of facilities for pedestrians; construction of safe routes for non-drivers; community improvement activities; and environmental mitigation activities. TAP applicable projects are funded through a competitive process. Project design is not covered by TAP funds, meaning the City would have to use other funding for engineering services. Like CMAQ funding, an 80/20 match is required with TAP funding. TAP funds cover 80% of the construction cost and the City would be responsible for 20% of the construction cost plus all engineering services for the project. In theory the timeframe for completing a TAP project should be shorter than a CMAQ project since the design is separate from the construction funding; however, three to five years should be assumed since design plans and construction specifications are required to meet ALDOT standards. The application deadline for 2018
funding is Friday, December 15, 2017 at 5:00PM. The total amount a project sponsor can apply for has been increased this year from $500,000 to $800,000 ($640,000 Federal and $160,000 local match). Municipalities wanting to pursue TAP funds should apply with RPCGB and ALDOT. 
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/transportation_alternatives/
https://www.rpcgb.org/transportation-alternatives-program/

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a 90/10 match Federal program that funds projects with the goal of reducing traffic crashes. ALDOT’s Traffic and Safety Operations Section manages HSIP funds. Applications for HSIP funds must demonstrate a project’s ability to reduce crashes in order to be approved for funding.

7 Stakeholder and Public Input

Several stakeholder meetings were conducted during the life of the study. In addition, a public involvement meeting was conducted and discussion was included at several City Council meetings. This section summarizes those meetings.

7.1 Stakeholder Input

A scoping stakeholder meeting was held on October 17, 2016 at the Mountain Brook City Hall. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the goals of the study and review the needs for next steps. Representatives from the City of Mountain Brook and RPCGB were present. During this meeting, an overview of the APPLE program and the project were provided. Participants expressed a strong desire to determine if there are areas where sidewalks are needed but have not yet been considered by the City Walkway Master Plan.

Following the development of potential sidewalk locations, crash data analysis, and field observations, a stakeholder progress meeting was held on January 5, 2017 at Mountain Brook City Hall. Again, representatives from the City of Mountain Brook and RPCGB were present. A second progress meeting was held on March 22, 2017 at Mountain Brook City Hall, with representatives from the City of Mountain Brook and RPCGB. The tasks accomplished before these meetings included: in-field constructability review, cost estimates, and prioritization procedure.

City Council meetings were attended on April 24, 2017, May 8, 2017, July 10, 2017 and July 24, 2017 to obtain feedback from the Council Members and provide updates associated with the study.

7.2 Public Involvement

Over the course of the study, the City received numerous e-mails requesting sidewalks in various areas. The City also conducted a city-wide survey separate from this study.
Input received via e-mail and through the survey was incorporated into the study. An official public involvement meeting was held at City Hall on June 27, 2017.

At the Public Involvement meeting, attendees were guided through four stations. The first station included a map displaying inventory of existing sidewalks and potential sidewalk locations. Station two included an ease of installation map which provided an overview of the potential sidewalk segments and their associated construction level of difficulty. The third station provided a map with the same sidewalk segments but instead of construction feasibility, prioritization was displayed. Lastly, station four exhibited a project phasing map. A ten day comment period was provided to allow the public time to provide input. Appendix H includes a list of comments received as a result of the public meeting and how they were addressed in the study.

8 Next Steps

If the City chooses to move forward with implementing any of the proposed sidewalks and would like to pursue Federal CMAQ or TAP funding, the next step would be to request inclusion of a project in RPCGB’s Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). In 2019, RPCGB will solicit new projects to be included in the next TIP planning cycle. However, projects that utilize the APPLE program provide local governments the opportunity to request funding between TIP cycles. The preparation of this feasibility study can be used in the application for funds from the RPCGB for future improvements.

Once Federal funds are in place for the project, an environmental document will need to be prepared. The environmental document must include technical studies and public involvement outreach necessary to comply with procedures of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Once the environmental study has been completed, the design would be undertaken, and construction would follow. If it is determined that additional right-of-way is required, acquisition would be conducted prior to construction.

Should the City elect to use local funds, the timing, scheduling, and implementation of the installation would be at their discretion.
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USFWS Correspondence
February 20, 2017

Mr. William J. Pearson  
Field Supervisor  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1208-B Main Street  
Daphne, AL 36526

Subject:  
USFWS Species Request  
Mountain Brook Sidewalks Study  
Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham  
Mountain Brook, Alabama

Dear Mr. Pearson:

The City of Mountain Brook in conjunction with the Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham is evaluating the feasibility of installing sidewalk along various roadways within the city limits. The intent of this letter is to request your assistance in identifying threatened and endangered species that may occur in the vicinity of the study area. The study area is shown on the enclosed map.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Jennifer G. Brown, PE  
Project Manager  
Alabama Reg. #32726

Attachment
Dear Ms. Brown:

Thank you for your letter dated February 20, 2017, requesting a species list to assist in preparing an environmental feasibility study for a proposed project that involves sidewalks along various roadways within city limits in Jefferson County, Alabama. Following is the Service’s list of species concerning this project as it relates to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 Cr.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661-667e).

**Federally Listed Species**
The following species may occur within or near your project area:
- Indiana bat *Myotis sodalis* - Endangered
- Northern long-eared bat *Myotis septentrionalis* - Threatened with 4d Rule
- Gray Bat *Myotis grisescens* - Endangered
- Alabama moccasinshell *Medionidus acutissimus* - Threatened
- Fineline Pocketbook *Hamiaota altilis* - Threatened
- Orange-nacre mucket *Hamiaota perovalis* - Threatened
- Ovate clubshell *Pleurobema perovatum* - Endangered
- Southern acronshell *Epioblasma othcaloogensis* - Endangered
- Triangular kidneyshell *Ptychobranchus greenii* - Endangered
- Southern clubshell *Pleurobema decisium* - Endangered
- Upland combshell *Epioblasma metastraita* - Endangered
- Cahaba Shiner *Notropis cahabae* - Endangered

Critical habitat Unit 13 for Alabama moccasinshell, fineline pocketbook, orangenacre mucket, ovate clubshell, southern acronshell, southern clubshell, triangular kidneyshell, and upland combshell. Cahaba River and Little Cahaba River, Jefferson, Shelby, Bibb Counties, Alabama. This unit includes the Cahaba River from U. S. Highway 82, Centerville, Bibb County, upstream to Jefferson County Road 143, Jefferson County, Alabama, and the Little Cahaba River from its confluence with the Cahaba River, upstream to the confluence of Mahan and Shoal Creeks, Bibb County, Alabama (69 FR 40084 40171).
Site-specific concerns:
The project area is within listed bat range. If trees will be cleared to complete the project please contact this office for further guidance. Critical habitat Unit 13 is within the project boundary. Therefore, project plans should include protections for water quality, the Cahaba River and its tributaries.

Under regulations that implement section 7 of the Endangered Species Act the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Ms. Jennifer Grunewald at (251) 441-6633. Please refer to the reference number located at the top of this letter in future phone calls or written correspondence.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William J. Pearson
Field Supervisor
Alabama Ecological Services Field Office
Appendix D
NRCS Correspondence
February 20, 2017

Mr. Milton Tuck  
Resource Soil Scientist  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Milton.tuck@al.usda.gov  
420 Hackberry Lane  
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35486

Subject:  
Primary and Unique Farmland Concurrence Request  
Mountain Brook Sidewalks Study  
Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham  
Mountain Brook, Alabama

Dear Mr. Tuck:

The City of Mountain Brook in conjunction with the Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham is evaluating the feasibility of installing sidewalk along various roadways within the city limits. Mapping is included for your use in determining the prime farmland status for the subject project.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Jennifer G. Brown, PE  
Project Manager  
Alabama Reg. #32726  
D: (205) 263-2159  
jbrown@sain.com

Attachment
Farmland Classification—Jefferson County, Alabama

**MAP LEGEND**

- Prime farmland if subsoiled, completely removing the root inhibiting soil layer
- Prime farmland if protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season
- Prime farmland if irrigated
- Prime farmland if irrigated and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season
- Prime farmland if irrigated and the product of \( I \times C \) (climate factor) does not exceed 60
- Prime farmland if irrigated and reclaimed of excess salts and sodium
- Farmland of statewide importance
- Farmland of local importance
- Farmland of unique importance
- Not rated or not available

**Soil Rating Points**

- Not prime farmland
- All areas are prime farmland
- Prime farmland if irrigated
- Prime farmland if irrigated and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season
- Prime farmland if irrigated and the product of \( I \times C \) (climate factor) does not exceed 60
- Prime farmland if irrigated and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season
- Prime farmland if irrigated and reclaimed of excess salts and sodium
- Not rated or not available

**Soil Rating Lines**

- Not prime farmland
- All areas are prime farmland
- Prime farmland if irrigated
- Prime farmland if irrigated and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season
- Prime farmland if irrigated and the product of \( I \times C \) (climate factor) does not exceed 60

**Water Features**

Prime farmland if irrigated and drained
The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL: Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Jefferson County, Alabama
Survey Area Data: Version 9, Sep 23, 2016

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Feb 13, 2011—May 20, 2014

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.
## Farmland Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map unit symbol</th>
<th>Map unit name</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Allen-Urban land complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>397.3</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bodine-Birmingham association, steep</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>144.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Docena complex, 0 to 4 percent slopes</td>
<td>Farmland of statewide</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gorgas-Rock outcrop complex, steep</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>703.9</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gorgas-Rock outcrop-Urban land complex, 8 to 15 percent</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>1,492.6</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Holston-Urban land complex, 2 to 8 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>610.7</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Leesburg-Rock outcrop complex, steep</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>1,817.1</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Montevallo-Nauvoo-Urban land complex, 10 to 40 percent</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>1,709.0</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nauvoo fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>370.8</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Nauvoo-Urban land complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>1,055.8</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nauvoo-Montevallo association, 10 to 40 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>498.9</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sullivan-State complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes</td>
<td>All areas are prime farmland</td>
<td>252.4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Townley-Nauvoo complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Townley-Urban land complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>571.4</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Urban land</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>222.4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Not prime farmland</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals for Area of Interest**

| Sum             | 9,888.5          | 100.0%          |
Description

Farmland classification identifies map units as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, or unique farmland. It identifies the location and extent of the soils that are best suited to food, feed, fiber, forage, and oilseed crops. NRCS policy and procedures on prime and unique farmlands are published in the "Federal Register," Vol. 43, No. 21, January 31, 1978.

Rating Options

Aggregation Method: No Aggregation Necessary

Tie-break Rule: Lower
March 28, 2017

ATTN: Jennifer Brown  
Sain Associates  
Two Perimeter Park S.  
Suite 500 East  
Birmingham, AL 35243

REF: Primary and Unique Farmland Concurrence Request  
Mountain Brook Sidewalks Study  
Regional Planning Commission of Greater Birmingham  
Mountain Brook, Alabama

Dear Jennifer Brown:

The area of consideration for the sidewalk study **does** contain “Prime Farmlands” as defined in Appendix A of Department Regulation No. DR 9500-3 dated March 22, 1983; however, **does not** meet the criteria set forth by the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) and Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA) of June 22, 1982.

The area of consideration for not subject to Farmland Protection Policy Act.

```
‘Farmland’ does not include land already in or committed to urban development or water storage. Farmland ‘already in’ urban development or water storage includes all such land with a density of 30 structures per 40-acre area. Farmland already in urban development also includes lands identified as ‘urbanized area’ (UA) on the Census Bureau Map, or as urban area mapped with a ‘tint overprint’ on the USGS topographical maps, or as ‘urban-built-up’ on the USDA Important Farmland Maps. Areas shown as white on the USDA Important Farmland Maps are not ‘farmland’ and, therefore, are not subject to the Act.
```

In addition, area of consideration **does not** contain hydric soils (blue) that meet the definition for wetland criteria, as required by 180-V-NFSAM Third Edition, Amend 2, November 1996 part 513.11.a.

Erosion and sediment control measures should be implemented and maintained during the construction phase to protect land, water, and related resources. Plans for construction should include sediment basins or traps and other erosion control practices, including coverage of bare soil as soon as possible by temporary and permanent vegetation and structures.

If you need further assistance, please contact your local NRCS office, or feel free to call myself, Christopher Ford, Acting Resource Soil Scientist, at (256) 372-5949.

Sincerely,

Christopher Ford  
Acting Resource Soil Scientist
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Appendix H
Public Involvement Summary
### Mountain Brook Sidewalks APPLE Study
#### Public Involvement Meeting Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Suggested Roadway</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Direction needed from the City</th>
<th>Sain Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hagood Street</td>
<td>As you know, Hagood Street was suggested by 13 citizens. The portion of Hagood Street located within Mountain Brook city limits is already included as a City funded project. The projects shown as City funded are not prioritized; however, the City may want to take this into consideration when selecting their next sidewalk project.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Based on GIS information from the City, the portion of Hagood Street within the City limits extends to Greenbriar Circle. Construction will be difficult due to storm drainage. Many of the comments referenced Saw's which is located outside the City limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balmoral Road</td>
<td>This segment was already included in the plan; however, we took a closer look at its constructability and proximity to MBH. We're not convinced that construction would not be difficult, as it is currently labeled. This is primarily due to the parking areas adjacent to the roadway, embankments, and steep driveways. We do feel that the prioritization of Balmoral and Pine Crest could be shifted higher up the list.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Due to the response from citizens, this segment is being moved to Phase 2 and will include surrounding roadways (Phase 3 is now Phase 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Crest Road</td>
<td>A portion of Pine Crest Road was already included in the plan. We reviewed the constructability of installing sidewalk for the portion of Pine Ridge Road between Balmoral Road and Montevallo Road since it was included in several suggestions from citizens. This addition will provide connectivity in the area with varying levels of difficulty.</td>
<td>Is the City in agreement to add all of Pine Crest Road to the Plan?</td>
<td>Connect Pine Crest Road from Overbrook Road to Montevallo Road. This connection will provide connectivity for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Road</td>
<td>Constructability for Virginia Road would be difficult due to narrow pavement width (18') which doesn't allow for any pavement removal for sidewalk installation. Also, the roadway has steep side slopes, some retaining walls, and large trees. Virginia Road is a low speed roadway and does not appear to be a cut through street and if sidewalks were installed on Pine Crest Road and Balmoral, residents could access those for connection to schools, etc. Does the City want Virginia Road included on the plan?</td>
<td>Do not include. Construction would be difficult and those living on this roadway can access the sidewalks proposed for Pine Crest and Balmoral Road. This does not appear to be a cut through roadway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Haven Road</td>
<td>We found the majority of Pine Haven Road to have a medium constructability rating; however, the portion of Pine Haven Road between Balmoral and Virginia would be difficult. Like Virginia Road, Pine Haven Road is low speed and does not appear to be a cut through for non-local traffic. Does the City want Pine Haven Road Included on the plan?</td>
<td>Do not include. Construction would be difficult and those living on this roadway can access the sidewalks proposed for Pine Crest and Balmoral Road. This does not appear to be a cut through roadway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Road</td>
<td>The network of Southwood Road to Guilford Road to Overhill Road was suggested by a citizen as a way to connect to Jemison Park. During our field review we noted primarily difficult installation for this network. Even though there are relatively flat areas they are not consistent and would cause some &quot;zig-zagging&quot; of the sidewalk meaning mid-block crossings which are not ideal. In previous discussions the City chose not to include this area in the plan. Is that still the case?</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan. Do not include based on previous discussions with the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwood Road</td>
<td>The network of Southwood Road to Guilford Road to Overhill Road was suggested by a citizen as a way to connect to Jemison Park. During our field review we noted primarily difficult installation for this network. Even though there are relatively flat areas they are not consistent and would cause some &quot;zig-zagging&quot; of the sidewalk meaning mid-block crossings which are not ideal. In previous discussions the City chose not to include this area in the plan. Is that still the case?</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan. Do not include based on previous discussions with the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpsburg Road 25 MPH</td>
<td>All three of these roadways have 25 feet of pavement and 2.5' valley gutter on both sides of the roadway. This width makes them ideal for sidewalks which are easily installed. Installation of sidewalk on these roadways would allow for connectivity to the Irondale Furnace Park as well as connect homes, via sidewalk, to Cherokee Bend Elementary School. Would the City like to include these roadways or a portion of these roadways in the plan?</td>
<td>Installation of sidewalk on these roadways would allow for connectivity to the Irondale Furnace Park as well as connect more homes, via sidewalk, to Cherokee Bend Elementary School. Would the City like to include these roadways or a portion of these roadways in the plan?</td>
<td>Do not include. The pavement widths for these roadways is 25 feet excluding the valley gutter width which can be accommodated for pedestrian activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpers Ferry Road 25 MPH</td>
<td>All three of these roadways have 25 feet of pavement and 2.5' valley gutter on both sides of the roadway. This width makes them ideal for sidewalks which are easily installed. Installation of sidewalk on these roadways would allow for connectivity to the Irondale Furnace Park as well as connect homes, via sidewalk, to Cherokee Bend Elementary School. Would the City like to include these roadways or a portion of these roadways in the plan?</td>
<td>Installation of sidewalk on these roadways would allow for connectivity to the Irondale Furnace Park as well as connect more homes, via sidewalk, to Cherokee Bend Elementary School. Would the City like to include these roadways or a portion of these roadways in the plan?</td>
<td>Do not include. The pavement widths for these roadways is 25 feet excluding the valley gutter width which allows for more room for pedestrian activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little River Road 20 MPH</td>
<td>No further review; already included in the plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee Road</td>
<td>No further review; already included in the plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Road</td>
<td>No further review; already included in the plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid Avenue</td>
<td>The request was for sidewalks on the south side of the roadway. Based on previous guidance from the City, no additional sidewalk is planned for Euclid with this plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Leeds Lane</td>
<td>No further review; already included in the plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Leeds Road</td>
<td>No further review; already included in the plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Ridge Road</td>
<td>No further review; already included in the plan.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Keep in plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>