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## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Legislation Mandate

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 was enacted by the United States Congress and signed into law by President George H. W. Bush in 1990. The law was adopted with the purpose of providing a "clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities." The law went into effect in 1992 and imposed requirements for public accessibility and mandates employers provide reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities. The public accessibility standards have since provided the basis of design for public facilities including sidewalks, ramps, parking lots, buildings, amenities, and other forms of pedestrian transportation and access.

The ADA consists of five titles that outline protections in the following areas:
I. Employment
II. State and Local Government Agencies
III. Public Accommodations
IV. Telecommunications
V. Miscellaneous Provisions

Title II of ADA pertains to the programs, activities and services provided by public entities. The City of Lewisburg must comply with this section of the Act, as it specifically applies to public service agencies. Title II of ADA states that "no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity" (42 USC Sec. 12132; 28 CFR Sec. 35.130).

As a public entity, the City of Lewisburg must comply with the Department of Justice 28 CFR 35, which states under its general requirements, "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the fill and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, r accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any private entity who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation."

This regulation serves as the primary standard and reference as any questions arise during the implementation of the Transition Plan. The self-evaluation and transition plan presented here is meant to comply with the requirements set forth in Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act Technical Assistance Manual section II-8.3000 Transition Plan TITLE 28 CFR PART 35.150 (d), which states

## (d) Transition Plan

(1) In the event that structural changes to facilities will be undertaken to achieve program accessibility, a public entity that employs 50 or more persons shall develop, within six months of January 26, 1992, a transition plan setting forth the steps necessary to complete such changes. A public entity shall provide an opportunity to interested persons, including individuals with disabilities or organizations representing individuals with disabilities, to participate in the development of the transition plan by submitting comments. A copy of the transition plan shall be made available for public inspection.
(2) If a public entity has responsibility or authority over streets, roads, or walkways, its transition plan shall include a schedule for providing curb ramps or other sloped areas where pedestrian walks cross curbs, giving priority to walkways serving entities covered by the Act, including State and local government offices and facilities, transportation, places of public accommodation, and employers, followed by walkways serving other areas.
(3) The plan shall, at minimum -
(i) Identify physical obstacles in the public entity's facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities;
(ii) Describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;
(iii) Specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance with this section and, if the time period of the transition plan is longer than one year, identify steps that will be taken during each year of the transition period; and
(iv) Indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan
(4)If a public entity has already complied with the transition plan requirement of a Federal agency regulation implementing section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, then the requirements of this paragraph (d) shall apply only to those policies and practices that were not included in the previous transition plan.
In November 2016, the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) issued a mandate to each municipality within the State of Tennessee requiring the performance of a self-evaluation to ascertain compliance with minimum ADA accessibility standards. Transition Plans are required as a means of documenting non-compliant facilities and establishing an achievable strategy for bringing those facilities into compliance with ADA. Submission of each public entity's Transition Plan is required by December 2019.

### 1.2 Purpose

As stated by the ADA , public entities that employ 50 or more persons shall develop a transition plan setting forth the steps necessary to achieve program accessibility. This report is intended to meet the general requirements as stated by Title II of the ADA:
I. Designation of at least one (1) responsible employee to coordinate ADA Compliance
II. Provide Public Notice about ADA Requirements
III. Establishment of an ADA Grievance Policy and Procedure
IV. Completion of a Self-Evaluation of Programs and Services for Accessibility
V. Development of a Transition Plan to make structural modifications to non-compliant facilities uncovered by the Self-Evaluation process.

The City of Lewisburg hired a consultant firm, OHM Advisors, to execute the City's Self-Evaluation phase and develop the City's ADA Transition Plan. This document describes the process developed to evaluate Lewisburg's facilities and the plan to bring non-compliant issues into compliance with current standards.

### 2.1 Designation of an ADA Coordinator

Under the ADA Title II, public entities with 50 or more employees must designate at least one responsible employee to coordinate ADA compliance ( 28 CFR Sec. $35.107(\mathrm{a}$ )). This person is commonly referred to as the ADA Coordinator. The public entity must provide the ADA Coordinator's name, office address, and telephone number to all interested individuals ( 28 CFR Sec. 35.107(a)).

The City of Lewisburg has appointed Lueshell Taylor as the City's ADA Coordinator. The information required by 28 CFR Sec. 35.107(a) is posted on the City Website, https://www.lewisburgtn.gov/codes-stormwater-ada/ada:

Lueshell Taylor<br>ADA Coordinator<br>131 East Church Street<br>Lewisburg, TN 37091<br>Office: (931) 359-1544<br>Direct: (931) 359-4013<br>Lueshell.taylor@lewisburgtn.gov

### 2.2 Roles and Responsibilities of an ADA Coordinator

The ADA Coordinator is responsible for coordinating the efforts of the government entity to comply with Title II and investigating any complaints that the entity has violated Title II. The Department of Justice has defined the following qualifications that help make an effective ADA Coordinator:

- Familiarity with the state or local government's structure, activities, and employees
- Knowledge of the ADA and other laws addressing the rights of people with disabilities, such as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. $\$ 794$
- Experience with people with a broad range of disabilities
- Knowledge of various alternative formats and alternative technologies that enable people with disabilities to communicate, participate, and perform tasks
- Ability to work cooperatively with the local and people with disabilities
- Familiarity with any local disability advocacy groups or other disability groups
- Skills and training in negotiation and mediation
- Organizational and analytical skills

Public entities that employ 50 or more persons shall adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints alleging any action that would be prohibited by the ADA (28CFR 35.107 (b)).

The City of Lewisburg publishes its ADA Grievance Policy and Procedure on its website, found under links at https://www.lewisburgtn.gov/codes-stormwater-ada/ada.

Upon inspection, Lewisburg's ADA Grievance Policy and Procedure is consistent with the template provided by TDOT. The City has displayed both the Grievance Procedure and a printable Grievance Form on its ADA webpage. These forms can be found in Appendix A. A link to the ADA government website is also posted on the City website.
2.4 Facilities Review: Public Sidewalks

As part of the self-evaluation process, the City of Lewisburg conducted an inventory and evaluation of pedestrian facilities within its public rights-of-way, which includes approximately 17.5 miles of sidewalks and associated driveway ramps, curb ramps, and railroad crossings.

### 2.4.1 SIDEWALK EVALUATION

The following criteria were evaluated at approximately 100 foot intervals along the aforementioned 17.5 miles of public sidewalk located within the City of Lewisburg:

## Running Slope

Running slope of a sidewalk is defined as the slope parallel to the direction of travel. ADA requires a maximum running slope of $5 \%$ or 1:20. (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 402.2). PROWAG states that where pedestrian access routes are contained within a street or highway right-of-way, the running slope shall not exceed the general grade established for the adjacent street or highway (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R302.5).

## Cross Slope

Cross slope of a sidewalk is defined as the slope perpendicular to the direction of travel. ADA stipulates a maximum cross slope of $2 \%$ for pedestrian access routes (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 403.3).

## Continuous Width

For the purpose of this report, continuous width is defined as the total width of the sidewalk, measured perpendicular to the direction of travel and irrespective of any obstructions. Pedestrian access routes must maintain a minimum continuous width of 36 -inches according to ADA (2010 ADA Standards Sec. 403.5.1). PROWAG requires a minimum continuous width of 48 -inches, exclusive of curb,
except at medians and pedestrian refuge islands where 60-inches is required (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R302.3).

## Clear Width

Clear width is defined as the necessary width that must be maintained in the event an obstruction is present within the path of travel of pedestrian access routes. According to ADA, the clear width of a sidewalk shall be 36 -inches minimum. This matches the continuous width requirement as stated above. However, clear width shall be permitted to be reduced to 32 -inches minimum for a length of 24-inches maximum provided that reduced width segments are separated by segments that are 48inches long minimum and 36-inches wide minimum (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec. 403.5.1). This instance most commonly occurs in the event an obstruction is present. The image below more clearly shows this requirement:


Figure 1: Clear Width of an Accessible Route

## Vertical Discontinuity

A vertical discontinuity is defined as the vertical difference in level between two adjacent surfaces. ADA specifies that the vertical difference between two adjacent surfaces cannot exceed 0.25 -inches (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 303.2). Within public sidewalks, vertical discontinuities exceeding this limit are normally encountered when either settling or heaving occurs.

## Horizontal Openings

Horizontal openings, for the purpose of this report, is defined as any opening encountered along the ground surface within the pedestrian access route. The most common example are drainage inlets. ADA dictates that openings in ground surfaces shall not allow passage of a sphere more than $1 / 2$ inch in diameter (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 302.3).

Vertical Clearance

For the purpose of this report, vertical clearance is defined as the vertical distance measured from the ground surface to an object protruding within the pedestrian access route. Common examples of non-compliance found along public sidewalks involves guy wires that anchor outside of the sidewalk but whose wire protrudes into the pedestrian path. ADA regulations require a minimum of 80inches of vertical clearance along pedestrian access routes (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 307.4).

## Surface Condition

ADA regulations require pedestrian access routes to be comprised of slip resistant materials and be free from obstructions (Ref 2010 ADA Standards 302.1).

### 2.4.2 DRIVEWAY RAMP EVALUATION

Included in the self-evaluation of Lewisburg's public sidewalks were 543 driveway ramps located along pedestrian paths. The following criteria was evaluated at every driveway ramp encountered along the 17.5 miles of public sidewalk:

## Cross Slope

Cross slope of a sidewalk is defined as the slope perpendicular to the direction of travel. ADA stipulates a maximum cross slope of $2 \%$ for pedestrian access routes (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 403.3). Cross slope for Lewisburg driveway ramps was measured using a smart level placed perpendicular to the direction of travel.

## Continuous Width

For the purpose of this report, continuous width is defined as the total width of the sidewalk, measured perpendicular to the direction of travel and irrespective of any obstructions. Pedestrian access routes must maintain a minimum continuous width of 36 -inches according to ADA ( 2010 ADA Standards Sec. 403.5.1). PROWAG requires a minimum continuous width of 48 -inches, exclusive of curb, except at medians and pedestrian refuge islands where 60 -inches is required (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R302.3). The continuous width for Lewisburg driveway ramps was measured from the front edge to the rear edge of the pedestrian travel path.

## Running Slope

Running slope of a ramp is defined as the slope parallel to the direction of travel. ADA requires a maximum running slope of $8.33 \%$ or $1: 12$. (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 406.1 and 405.2; PROWAG 304.2.2). Running slope along straight driveway ramps was measured using a smart level placed perpendicular to the direction of travel.

Flare Slope

In some instances, driveways are constructed with flared ramps along the pedestrian path. Flare slope is simply defined as the slope of these concrete flares. The maximum flare slope allowed by ADA and PROWAG is 10\% (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 406.3; 2011 PROWAG Standards R304.2.3). Flare slope was measured using a smart level placed perpendicular to the flare.

### 2.4.3 STREET CROSSING EVALUATION

Additionally, the City of Lewisburg conducted an inventory and evaluation of 205 pedestrian street crossings, including curb ramps and crosswalks. The following criteria was evaluated at every pedestrian street crossing:

## Curb Ramp Presence

This item defines whether a curb ramp is physically present in a specific location. Curb ramps must be located wherever a pedestrian pathway crosses a curb, or when there occurs an alteration that affects the walkway and a curb ramp is not already present. Curb ramps are required to be placed in locations that ensure a person with limited mobility can safely travel from a sidewalk on one side of the street to the sidewalk on the other side of the street with no impedance.

## Length of a Curb Ramp

The length of a curb ramp is defined as the total length of the ramp along its axis of travel from the top of the ramp to the toe of the ramp where it interfaces with the concrete curb or asphalt pavement. According to PROWAG, the maximum length of a curb ramp is 15 -feet, and is set by a maximum $8.33 \%$ running slope to a maximum 30 -inch height of the ramp (2011 PROWAG Standards R304.2.2). A typical 6 " tall curb ramp shall not be steeper than $1: 12$ implying a 6 ' length (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 405.2).

## Width of a Curb Ramp

The width of a curb ramp is defined as the lateral width of the travel path along the ramp itself. The minimum width of a curb ramp is 36 -inches as required by ADA (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 405.5). PROWAG requires a minimum width of 48 -inches, exclusive of curb (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R304.5.1).


Figure 2: Ramp Width (Source: ADA Accessibility Survey Instructions Manual)

## Running Slope

Running slope is defined as the slope parallel to the direction of travel. ADA requires a maximum running slope of $8.33 \%$ or $1: 12$. (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 406.1 and 405.2; PROWAG 304.2.2).


Figure 3: Running Slope (Source: ADA Accessibility Survey Instructions Manual)

## Cross Slope

The cross slope of a curb ramp is defined as the slope perpendicular to the direction of travel along the ramp run. The maximum allowable cross slope of a curb ramp, or any accessible route, may not exceed 2\% (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 403.3; 2011 PROWAG Standards R304.5.3).


Figure 4: Cross Slope (Source: ADA Accessibility Survey Instructions Manual)

## Flare Slope

In some instances, curb ramps are installed with flared sides in order to meet grade in the vicinity of the ramp. It is important to note flared sides are not required to be installed at every curb ramp, and a majority of the curb ramps inventoried in the City of Lewisburg did not have flared sides to evaluate. Where provided, curb ramp flares shall not be steeper than 10\% or 1:10 (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 406.3; 2011 PROWAG Standards R304.2.3).


Figure 5: Flare Slope (Source: ADA Accessibility Survey Instructions Manual)

## Detectible Warning

Detectible warnings are designed to be felt underfoot or with a cane by people who are blind or have low vision, thereby alerting them of hazards. The most common hazard is the transition from a pedestrian route to an area allowing vehicular traffic. Detectible warnings at curb ramps must extend 2-feet minimum in the direction of pedestrian travel and extend the full width of the ramp run. Detectible warnings must also contrast visually with the adjacent gutter, street, or pedestrian access route surface (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R305).

## Surface Condition

ADA regulations require pedestrian access routes, including curb ramps, to be comprised of slip resistant materials and be free from obstructions (Ref 2010 ADA Standards 302.1).

## Landing

Landings are defined as the relatively flat areas provided at the top of ramp runs. At the top of curb ramps, ADA requires landings to have a minimum clear length of 36-inches (Ref 2010 ADA Standards 406.4).


Figure 6: Landing (Source: ADA Accessibility Survey Instructions Manual)

### 2.4.4 CROSSWALK EVALUATION

Crosswalks, when present, were also evaluated as part of the street crossing evaluation. The 2011 PROWAG Standards makes recommendations for crosswalk cross and running slope. It is important to note that the 2010 ADA Standards do not specify requirements for crosswalks themselves. Cross slope and running slope, as defined previously, is the slope perpendicular and parallel to the direction of travel, respectively. Cross slope requirements depend on the type of roadway intersection (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R302.6):

- Cross Slope
- $5 \%$ maximum if contained within an intersection without stop or yield control
- $2 \%$ maximum if contained within an intersection with yield or stop control
- May equal grade of the road if located midblock (outside of an intersection)
- Running Slope
- Where pedestrian access routes are contained within pedestrian street crossings, the grade of the pedestrian access route shall be 5\% maximum (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R302.5.1).

Field crews also evaluated the striping condition based on field judgment. Crosswalk striping condition, while not included in the ADA, is useful information for the local municipality.

### 2.4.5 RAILROAD CROSSINGS

As part of the pedestrian access route inventory and evaluation, railroad crossings where pedestrian travel paths led across railroad tracks were evaluated. A total of 4 railroad crossings exist in the City of Lewisburg. The following criteria was evaluated at all railroad crossings:

## Crossing Presence

This item defines whether a crossing is physically present. Walking surfaces must extend through the railroad crossing in order for a crossing to be considered present and must be placed in locations that ensure a person with limited mobility can safely travel from one side of the railroad to the other side with no impedance.

## Flangeway Gap

A flangeway gap is defined as the gap between railroad tracks and the walking surface. Flangeway gaps are necessary to allow the passage of train wheel flanges. Flangeway gaps pose a potential hazard to pedestrians who use wheelchairs because the gaps can entrap the wheelchair casters. Flangeway gaps are permitted to by 2.5 -inches maximum (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 810.10).


Figure 7: Flangeway Gaps (Source: ADA Accessibility Survey Instructions Manual)

## Cross Slope

As defined above, cross slope of a railroad crossing is the slope perpendicular to the direction of travel. ADA stipulates a maximum cross slope of 2\% for pedestrian access routes (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 403.3). Cross slope for Lewisburg railroad crossings (if present) was measured using a smart level placed perpendicular to the direction of travel.

## Running Slope

Running slope of a sidewalk is defined as the slope parallel to the direction of travel. ADA requires a maximum running slope of $5 \%$ or $1: 20$. (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Section 402.2). Running slope for Lewisburg sidewalk facilities was measured using a smart level placed perpendicular to the direction of travel.

## Detectible Warning

Detectible warnings are designed to be felt underfoot or with a cane by people who are blind or have low vision, thereby alerting them of hazards. Detectible warnings at curb ramps must extend 2-feet minimum in the direction of pedestrian travel and extend the full width of the ramp run. Detectible warnings must also contrast visually with the adjacent gutter, street, or pedestrian access route surface (Ref 2011 PROWAG Standards R305).

### 2.4.6 DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

All data listed in Section 2.4 .5 above was collected by OHM field evaluation crews. Distance measurements were taken with a standard tape measurer, and slope values were collected using a smart level. Data collection equipment also included a Samsung Galaxy tablet with ESRI ArcGIS Collector Application Software connected to an EOS GPS unit. Field crews recorded the GPS location of each point and input the data for each field parameter using the tablet.

All field parameters listed in Section 2.4.5 above were categorized into a range of values that corresponds with ADA and PROWAG regulations. Each data range was assigned a numeric value, on a scale of zero to two, to quantify the severity of non-compliance. A numeric value of zero represented an ADA compliant condition; a numeric value of one represented a moderately non-compliant condition; and a numeric value of two represented a severely non-compliant condition. The measurement for each field parameter was performed as described below.

## Sidewalk Data Collection

## Running Slope

Running slope for Lewisburg sidewalk facilities was measured using a smart level placed parallel to the direction of travel. Field crews then recorded the data according to the range shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Data Collection for Sidewalk Running Slope

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance <br> Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation $\nabla$ | 0 |
| Within ROW | 0 |
| Less than $5 \%$ | 1 |
| $5 \%-9 \%$ | 2 |
| Greater than $9 \%$ |  |

As shown above, running slopes less than $5 \%$ or consistent with adjacent roadway grade were given a non-compliance rating of zero. Slopes between $5 \%$ and $9 \%$ returned a non-compliance score of one, and slopes greater than $9 \%$ returned a value of two.

## Cross Slope

Cross slope for Lewisburg sidewalk facilities was measured using a smart level placed perpendicular to the direction of travel. Field crews then recorded the data according to the range shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Data Collection for Sidewalk Cross Slope

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation $\nabla$ |  |
| Less than $2 \%$ | 0 |
| $2 \%-3 \%$ | 1 |
| Greater than 3\% | 2 |

As shown above, cross slopes less than $2 \%$ returned a non-compliance value of zero. Slopes between $2 \%$ and $3 \%$ returned a non-compliance score of one, and slopes greater than $3 \%$ returned a value of two.

## Continuous Width

The continuous width for Lewisburg sidewalk facilities was measured from the front edge-ofconcrete to the rear edge-of-concrete. Field crews input findings, which generated a non-compliance score according to the range shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Data Collection for Sidewalk Continuous Width

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation $\nabla$ |  |
| Less than $36^{\prime \prime}$ | 2 |
| $36^{\prime \prime} \leq x \leq 48^{\prime \prime}$ | 1 |
| Greater than 48". | 0 |

As shown, sidewalks with a width less than 36 -inches returned a non-compliance score of two. Sidewalks with a width less than 48 -inches but greater than 36 -inches returned a value of one. Sidewalks greater than 48 -inches wide are ADA and PROWAG compliant and return a value of zero.

## Clear Width

Data collection for sidewalk clear width issues was based on Figure 1. When obstructions were encountered, field crews measured the available clear width and the length in which the clear width was obstructed. Field crews input findings, which generated a non-compliance score according to the range shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Data Collection for Sidewalk Clear Width

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation $\nabla$ |  |
| Less than $32^{\prime \prime}$ | 2 |
| $32^{\prime \prime} \leq x \leq 36^{\prime \prime}$ | 1 |
| $36^{\prime \prime} \leq x \leq 48^{\prime \prime}$ | 0 |

## Vertical Discontinuity

Data collection for vertical discontinuities was measured in the field using a standard tape measurer. Field crews input findings, which generated a non-compliance score according to the range shown in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Data Collection for Vertical Discontinuities

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation $\nabla$ |  |
| None Observed | 0 |
| $0.25^{\prime \prime} \leq x \leq 1$ " | 1 |
| $\geq 1$ inch | 2 |

As shown above, vertical discontinuities greater than 0.25 -inches but less than 1 -inch generated a non-compliance score of one. Vertical discontinuities greater than one inch in height generated a non-compliance score of two.

## Horizontal Openings

Data collection for horizontal openings was measured in the field using a tape measurer in the event an opening was encountered within the pedestrian travel path. Field crews input findings, which generated a non-compliance score according to the range shown in Table 6:

Table 6: Data Collection for Horizontal Openings

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation |  |
| None Observed | 0 |
| $<0.5^{\prime \prime}$ | 0 |
| $\geq 0.5^{\prime \prime}$ | 1 |

## Vertical Clearance

Data collection for vertical clearance issues was measured in the field using a tape measurer in the event the vertical clearance was compromised within the pedestrian travel path. Field crews input findings according the ranges shown in Table 7 below. Each range was pre-assigned a numeric value to quantify the severity of non-compliance.

Table 7: Data Collection for Vertical Clearance

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation |  |
| None Observed | 0 |
| $\leq 80^{\prime \prime}$ Vert. Clear | 1 |

## Surface Condition

As noted above, ADA regulations require a walking surface that is slip resistant and free from obstructions (Ref 2010 ADA Standards Sec 302.1). Field crews chose from three options concerning the surface condition based on field judgment: good, fair and poor. Each parameter returned a preassigned numeric value shown in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Data Collection for Surface Condition

| Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: |
| Observation |  |
| Good | 0 |
| Fair | 1 |
| Poor (See notes) | 2 |

## Total ADA Compliance Score

To quantify the level of severity of non-compliance, all sidewalk data parameters mentioned above were summed to equal the "Total ADA Compliance Score". This calculation was performed to quantify the level of severity of each point and to assist in the prioritization process. For sidewalk evaluation, each point's Total ADA Compliance Score could range from $0-14$. The following structure was established to categorize the level of severity:

Table 9: Sidewalk Severity Ranges

| Sidewalk: Total ADA Compliance Score |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Non-Compliance | Range |
| Compliant: | 0 |
| Low: | $1-4$ |
| Moderate: | $5-9$ |
| Severe: | $10-14$ |

## Driveway Ramp Data Collection

Field crews used the same methodology to collect the aforementioned driveway ramp parameters: Cross Slope, Continuous Width, Ramp Slope, and Flare Slope. Each parameter was divided into three or more value ranges, and each range was pre-assigned a numeric value to quantify the severity of non-compliance. Driveway ramp collection methodology is outlined in Table 10 below:

| Evaluation of Driveway Ramps | Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cross Slope | Observation $\bar{\nabla}$ |  |
|  | Less than 2\% | 0 |
|  | 2\%-3\% | 1 |
|  | Greater than 3\% | 2 |
|  |  |  |
| Continuous Width | Observation $\boldsymbol{\nabla}$ |  |
|  | Less than 36" | 2 |
|  | $36^{\prime \prime} \leq x \leq 48^{\prime \prime}$ | 1 |
|  | Greater than 48" | 0 |
|  |  |  |
| Ramp Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | None Observed, Needed | 2 |
|  | Less than 5\% | 1 |
|  | $5 \% \leq x \leq 8.33 \%$ | 0 |
|  | Greater than 8.33\% | 2 |
|  |  |  |
| Flare Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | None Observed, needed | 2 |
|  | Less than 10\% | 0 |
|  | 10\%-12\% | 1 |
|  | Greater than 12\% | 2 |

## Total ADA Compliance Score

To quantify the level of severity of non-compliance, all driveway data parameters mentioned above were summed to return the "Total ADA Compliance Score". This calculation was performed to quantify the level of severity of each point and to assist in the prioritization process. For driveway evaluation, each point's Total ADA Compliance Score could range from $0-8$. The following structure was established to categorize the level of severity:

Table 11: Driveway Ramp Severity Ranges

| Driveway: Total ADA Compliance Score |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Non-Compliance | Range |
| Compliant: | 0 |
| Low: | $1-2$ |
| Moderate: | $3-5$ |
| Severe: | $6-8$ |

## Street Crossing Data Collection

Field crews used the same methodology to collect the aforementioned street crossing parameters: Presence, Ramp Length, Ramp Width, Running Slope, Cross Slope, Flare Slope, Detectible Warning, Surface Condition, and Landing. Street crossing evaluation also included the evaluation of crosswalks if present. Each parameter was divided into three or more value ranges, and each range was pre-assigned a numeric value to quantify the severity of non-compliance. Street Crossing collection methodology is outlined in Table 10 below. Crosswalk collection methodology is outlined in Table 11 below.

Table 12: Data Collection for Street Crossings

| Evaluation of Street Crossings | Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presence/Need | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Ramp does not exist and is needed | 13 |
| Length of Curb Ramp | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Less than 15 ft | 0 |
|  | Greater than 15 ft | 1 |
| Width of Curb Ramp | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Less than 4 ft | 1 |
|  | Greater than 4 | 0 |
| Running Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Less than 5\% |  |
|  | 5\% $\leq x \leq 8.33 \%$ | 0 |
|  | Greater than 8.33\% | 2 |
| Cross Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Less than 2\% | 0 |
|  | 2\%-3\% | 1 |
|  | Greater than 3\% | 2 |
| Flare Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | None observed, needed | 2 |
|  | Less than 10\% | 0 |
|  | 10\%-12\% | 1 |
|  | Greater than 12\% | 2 |
| Detectible Warning | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Not Present | 1 |
|  | Present: Compliant | 0 |
|  | Present: Non-Compliant | 1 |
| Surface Condition | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Good | 0 |
|  | Fair | 1 |
|  | Poor (See notes) | 2 |
| Landing | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | Does Not Exist, needed | 2 |
|  | Non-Compliant: Dimensions | 1 |
|  | Non-Compliant: Slope | 1 |
|  | Compliant | 0 |

## Crosswalk Data Collection

Crosswalk data was also collected as part of the street crossing evaluation. Data parameters, as listed in section 2.4.4 above, were collected according to Table 11 below:

Table 13: Data Collection for Crosswalks

| Evaluation of Crosswalks | Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score | Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Type | Observation $\nabla$ |  |  |  |
|  | Stop Control: Signalized | $\longrightarrow$ | Push Buttons Present? |  |
|  | Stop Control: Unsignalized |  | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | No Stop Control |  | Yes | 0 |
|  | Midblock |  | No | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Striping Condition | Observation $\nabla$ |  |  |  |
|  | None Observed |  |  |  |
|  | Worn |  |  |  |
|  | Good |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  | Observation $\nabla$ |  |
|  | With Stop Control |  | Without Stop Control $\overline{\mathbf{V}}$ |  |
|  | $\leq 2 \%$ | 0 | Less than 5\% | 0 |
|  | 2\%-5\% | 1 | Greater than 5\% | 1 |
|  | Greater than 5\% | 2 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Running Slope | Observation $\nabla$ |  |  |  |
|  | Less than 5\% | 0 |  |  |
|  | Greater than 5\% | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Total ADA Compliance Score

To quantify the level of severity of non-compliance, all street crossing data parameters mentioned above were summed to return the "Total ADA Compliance Score". This calculation was performed to quantify the level of severity of each point and to assist in the prioritization process. For street crossing evaluation, each point's Total ADA Compliance Score could range from $0-18$. The following structure was established to categorize the level of severity:

Table 14: Street Crossing Severity Ranges

| Street Crossing Total ADA Compliance Score |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Non-Compliance | Range |
| Compliant: | 0 |
| Low: | $1--6$ |
| Moderate: | $7--12$ |
| Severe: | $13--18$ |

## Railroad Crossing Data Collection

Field crews used the same methodology to collect the aforementioned railroad crossing parameters: crossing presence, flangeway gap, cross slope, running slope, and detectible warning. Each parameter was divided into three or more value ranges, and each range was pre-assigned a numeric value to quantify the severity of non-compliance. Railroad crossing collection methodology is outlined in Table 12 below:

Table 15: Data Collection for Railroad Crossings

| Evaluation of Railroad Crossing | Field Data Input | ADA Compliance Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crossing Presence | Observation $\bar{\nabla}$ |  |
|  | ADA crossing not present, present, needed | 5 |
|  |  |  |
| Flangeway Gap | Observation $\overline{\text { V }}$ |  |
|  | None Observed | 1 |
|  | Less than 2.5" | 1 |
|  | Greater than 2.5 " | 0 |
|  |  |  |
| Cross Slope | Observation $\overline{\text { V }}$ |  |
|  | W/ Stop Control |  |
|  | $\leq 2 \%$ | 0 |
|  | 2\%-5\% | 1 |
|  | Greater than 5\% | 2 |
|  |  |  |
| Running Slope | Observation $\bar{\nabla}$ |  |
|  | Less than 5\% | 0 |
|  | Greater than 5\% | 1 |
|  |  |  |
| Detectible Warning | Observation $\overline{\text { V }}$ |  |
|  | Not Present | 1 |
|  | Present: Compliant | 0 |
|  | Present: Non-Compliant | 1 |

## Total ADA Compliance Score

To quantify the level of severity of non-compliance, all railroad crossing data parameters mentioned above were summed to return the "Total ADA Compliance Score". This calculation was performed to quantify the level of severity of each point and to assist in the prioritization process. For railroad crossing evaluation, each point's Total ADA Compliance Score could range from $0-5$. The following structure was established to categorize the level of severity:

Table 16: Railroad Crossing Severity Ranges

| Railroad Crossing Total ADA Compliance Score |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Non-Compliance | Range |
| Compliant: | 0 |
| Low: | $1-2$ |
| Moderate: | $3--4$ |
| High: | 5 |

## Geographic Information System (GIS) Database

Prior to the commencement of the onsite evaluation, a Geographic Information System (GIS) database was created with ESRI software to facilitate field data collection and storage. GIS database was considered ideal due to its ability to create and tailor specific fields to the various pedestrian access route attributes that were encountered. In addition, GIS proved beneficial for mapping and providing visual references and displays of the entire pedestrian access route inventory. The information collected utilizing the GIS database, combined with other publicly available GIS information, enables the City of Lewisburg and its agents to efficiently: a) ascertain sidewalk, driveway ramp, and street crossing compliance with adopted ADA standards, b) document specific and unique characteristics of existing conditions, c) identify areas that are in need of replacement or modification, d) quantify the extent and value of rehabilitation work required, and e) prioritize modifications.

### 2.5 Facilities Review: Public Buildings

The field evaluation of existing public buildings and their compliance with the 2010 Americans Disabilities Act and the 2011 Proposed Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public-Right-of-Way was conducted in a two-step process. The first step consisted of measuring and documenting the existing structure. The OHM team member was responsible for getting accurate measurements of all existing structures and then creating a basic floor plan for documentation. The second step consisted of the actual evaluation. The evaluation was conducted by an OHM team member familiar with ADA and PROWAG. The team member followed a checklist, included in Appendix B, created by OHM that outlines the priority levels of compliance within a building. The priorities for rehabilitation in order of descending value are:

- Approach and Entrance
- Access to Goods and Services
- Toilet Rooms
- Additional Access.

This checklist ensures that the entire building is evaluated for compliance.

Eight buildings within the City of Lewisburg were evaluated. All buildings included in the evaluation are listed in Table 9 and shown on the map in Appendix E.

Table 17: Summary of Buildings Evaluated

| Buildings |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Historic First Avenue Building | 205 North First Avenue |
| 2. West-Side Fire Hall | 1897 Mooresville Highway |
| 3. Lewisburg Police Department Building | 101 Water Street |
| 4. Lewisburg City Hall | 131 East Church Street |
| 5. Lewisburg Parks, Recreation and Fitness Center | 1551 Mooresville Highway |
| 6. Lewisburg Public Works Building | 927 5th Avenue North |
| 7. Ellington Airport Terminal Building | 1877 Franklin Pike |
| 8. Tennessee College of Applied Technology Building | 505 North Ellington Parkway |

### 2.6 Facilities Review: Public Parks

The field evaluation of existing public park structures and their compliance with the 2010 Americans Disabilities Act and the 2011 Proposed Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public-Right-of-Way was conducted in a two-step process. The first step consisted of measuring and documenting the existing structure. The OHM team member was responsible for getting accurate measurements of all existing structures and then creating a basic floor plan for documentation. The second step consisted of the actual evaluation. The evaluation was conducted by an OHM team member familiar with ADA and PROWAG. The team member follows a checklist created by OHM that outlines the priority levels of compliance within a building. The priorities for rehabilitation in order of descending value are:

- Approach and Entrance
- Access to Goods and Services
- Toilet Rooms
- Additional Access.

This checklist ensures that the entire building is evaluated for compliance.
In the case of a public park having a playground or recreational faculties', further evaluation was conducted. These facilities were evaluated by an OHM team member familiar with ADA and PROWAG. The team member followed a checklist created by OHM that outlines the required compliance for play areas, sports activities, team/player seating, and exercise machines and equipment. This checklist is included in Appendix B.

Thirteen public parks within the City of Lewisburg were evaluated. All public parks included in the evaluation are listed in Table 14 and shown on the map in Appendix E.

Table 18: Public Parks Evaluated

| Parks |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Davis Park |  |
| 2. Harmon Park |  |
| 3. Jonathan D. Hollinsworth Memorial Babe Ruth Park | 18 Manor Drive |
| 4. Jones Park/Jones Field | Unaddressed |
| 5. New Lake Park |  |
| 6. Public Square Park |  |
| 7. Marshall County Youth Football Field | Springplace Road |
| 8. Marshall County Little League Complex |  |
| 9. Rock Creek Park | 101 Old Farmington Road |
| 10. Southside Soccer Fields | Airport Drive |
| 11. Southside Adult Softball Park |  |
| 12. Lewisburg Recreation Center | 1551 Mooresville Highway |
| 13. Lewisburg Community Garden |  |

A complete list of issues is provided in the public park facility reports (see Appendix B). Common issues included:

## 3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### 3.1 Public Sidewalks

The City of Lewisburg evaluated an approximate total of 17.5 miles of public sidewalk facilities during the self-evaluation process. Data was collected at 100 -foot intervals and where obvious cases of noncompliance were encountered in the field. In all, a total of 916 data points were collected exclusive of driveway ramps and street crossings. Using the severity ranges from Table 9, an estimate of the percentage of non-compliant sidewalk has been developed as shown in the table below:

Table 19: Sidewalk Non-Compliance Estimates

|  | Estimate of Sidewalk Severity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Compliant <br> $\mathbf{( 0 )}$ | Low <br> $\mathbf{( 1 - 4 )}$ | Moderate <br> $\mathbf{( 5 - 9 )}$ | Severe <br> $(\mathbf{1 0 - 1 4 )}$ |
| Percentage | $27.6 \%$ | $59.3 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Distance (miles) | 4.83 | 10.37 | 2.26 | 0.04 |

A more detailed summary of evaluated sidewalks and non-compliant issues discovered can be found in Appendix C.

As part of the sidewalk evaluation process, an additional total of five hundred and forty two (542) driveway ramps, where pedestrian access routes crossed a vehicular driveway, were evaluated to determine compliance with ADA standards. As shown in Table 15 below, $62 \%$ of all evaluated driveways presented at least one element that is non-compliant. A more detailed summary of evaluated driveways and non-compliant issues discovered can be found in Appendix C.

Table 20: Summary of Findings for Driveway Ramps

| Driveway Evaluation Parameter | Number <br> Evaluated | Total <br> Non-Compliant | Percent <br> Non-Compliant |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Driveway Ramp cross slope greater than 2\% | 542 | 291 | $54 \%$ |
| Driveway Ramp width less than 36 inches | 542 | 5 | $1 \%$ |
| Driveway Ramp width less than 48 inches | 542 | 8 | $1 \%$ |
| Driveway approach ramps not present; needed | 542 | 38 | $7 \%$ |
| Driveway approach ramp slope greater than $8.33 \%$ | 542 | 146 | $27 \%$ |
| Flare slopes not present; needed | 542 | 116 | $21 \%$ |
| TOTAL DRIVEWAY EVALUATION | 542 | 339 | $63 \%$ |

### 3.2 Street Crossings

The City of Lewisburg evaluated a total of 204 street crossings during the self-evaluation process. As shown in Table 16 below, $80 \%$ of all evaluated street crossings presented at least one element of
non-compliance. A more detailed summary of evaluated street crossings and non-compliant issues discovered can be found in Appendix C.

Table 21: Summary of Findings for Street Crossings

| Street Crossing Parameter | Total Number <br> Evaluated | Total <br> Non-Compliant | Percent <br> Non-Compliant |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curb Ramp not present; needed | 204 | 48 | $24 \%$ |
| Curb Ramp length greater than 15 feet | 204 | 2 | $1 \%$ |
| Curb Ramp width less than 48 inches | 204 | 17 | $8 \%$ |
| Curb Ramp running slope greater than 8.33\% | 204 | 26 | $13 \%$ |
| Curb Ramp cross slope greater than 2\% | 204 | 70 | $34 \%$ |
| Flare slopes not present; needed | 204 | 35 | $17 \%$ |
| Flare slopes are greater than 10\% | 204 | 8 | $4 \%$ |
| Detectible Warning not present; needed | 204 | 44 | $22 \%$ |
| Detectible Warning present, but non-compliant | 204 | 24 | $12 \%$ |
| Poor surface condition | 204 | 5 | $2 \%$ |
| Landing does not exist; needed | 204 | 36 | $18 \%$ |
| Landing exists; non-compliant | 204 | 28 | $14 \%$ |
| TOTAL STREET CROSSING EVALUATION | 204 | 164 | $80 \%$ |

As part of the street crossing evaluation process, a total of twenty-six (26) crosswalks were evaluated to determine compliance with the 2011 PROWAG Standards.

### 3.3 Railroad Crossings

In conjunction with the public sidewalk evaluation, the City of Lewisburg evaluated a total of four (4) railroad crossings as part of the self-evaluation process. Railroad crossings were considered for evaluation where sidewalk paths intersected a railroad. As shown in Table 17 below, $100 \%$ of all evaluated railroad crossings were non-compliant with ADA. A more detailed summary of evaluated railroad crossings and non-compliant issues discovered can be found in Appendix C.

Table 22: Summary of Findings for Railroad Crossings

| Railroad Crossing Parameter | Number <br> Evaluated | Total <br> Non-Compliant | Percent <br> Non-Compliant |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Railroad Crossing not present; needed | 4 | 4 | $100 \%$ |
| Flangeway Gap is non-compliant | 4 | N/A | N/A |
| Railroad Crossing cross slope greater than 2\% | 4 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | N/A |
| Railroad Crossing running slope greater than 5\% | 4 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Detectible Warning not present; needed | 4 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | N/A |
| Detectible Warning present; non-compliant | 4 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | N/A |
| TOTAL RAILROAD CROSSING EVALUATION | 4 | 4 | $100 \%$ |

### 3.4 Public Buildings

Table 18 below summarizes non-compliant issues discovered in the self-evaluation process for Lewisburg's public buildings. Areas that were evaluated for each building included approach and entrance, access to goods and services, toilet rooms and additional access (i.e. water fountains, etc.). A complete list of issues and recommended improvements is provided in the building facility reports (see Appendix B).

Table 23: Summary of Findings for Public Buildings

| Building Name | Number of Non-Compliant Issues Found |  |  |  | Total per Building |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Priority 1: | Priority 2: | Priority 3: | Priority 4: |  |
|  | Approach and Entrance | Access to Goods and Services | Toilet Rooms | Additional Access |  |
| 1. Historic First Avenue Building | 14 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 27 |
| 2. West-Side Fire Hall | 6 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 19 |
| 3. Lewisburg Police Department Building | 8 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 21 |
| 4. Lewisburg City Hall | 7 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 21 |
| 5. Lewisburg Parks, Recreation and Fitness Center | 16 | 7 | 20 | 12 | 55 |
| 6. Lewisburg Public Works Building | 5 | 3 | 22 | 2 | 32 |
| 7. Ellington Airport Terminal Building | 6 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 24 |
| 8. Tennessee College of Applied Technology Building | 11 | 13 | 17 | 2 | 43 |
| TOTAL BUILDING EVALUATION | 73 | 47 | 100 | 22 | 242 |

### 3.5 Public Parks

Table 19 below summarizes non-compliant issues discovered in the self-evaluation process for Lewisburg's public parks. Areas that were evaluated for each public park space included approach and entrance, access to goods and services, toilet rooms, additional access for public buildings and play areas where applicable. A complete list of issues and recommended improvements is provided in the park facility reports (see Appendix B).

Table 24: Summary of Findings for Public Parks

| Public Park | Number of Non-Compliant Issues Found |  |  |  | Total per Park |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Priority 1: | Priority 2: | Priority 3: | Priority 4: |  |
|  | Approach and Entrance | Access to Goods and Services | Toilet Rooms | Additional Access |  |
| 1. Davis Park | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Harmon Park | 2 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 13 |
| 3. Jonathan D. Hollinsworth Memorial Babe Ruth Park | 11 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 32 |
| 4. Jones Park/Jones Field | 1 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 11 |
| 5. New Lake Park | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Public Square Park | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Marshall County Youth Football Field | 10 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 27 |
| 8. Marshall County Little League Complex | 12 | 3 | 22 | 2 | 39 |
| 9. Rock Creek Park | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 18 |
| 10. Southside Soccer Fields | 5 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 16 |
| 11. Southside Adult Softball Park | 6 | 1 | 19 | 1 | 27 |
| 12. Lewisburg Recreation Center | *Covered in Table 18 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 13. Lewisburg Community Garden | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL PUBLIC PARK EVALUATION | 53 | 16 | 103 | 11 | 183 |

The City of Lewisburg also evaluated a total of 3 miles of pedestrian pathways located within public parks. As shown in Table \# below, an estimated 2.47 miles of park pedestrian paths are noncompliant with ADA standards.

Table 25: Summary of Findings for Public Park Sidewalks

|  | Estimate of Park Sidewalk Severity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Compliant <br> $\mathbf{( 0 )}$ | Low <br> $\mathbf{( 1 - 4 )}$ | Moderate <br> $\mathbf{( 5 - 9 )}$ | Severe <br> $(\mathbf{1 0}-\mathbf{1 4 )}$ |
|  | $44.4 \%$ | $51.1 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Distance (miles) | 1.33 | 1.53 | 0.13 | 0.00 |

4. ADA TRANSITION PLAN

### 4.1 Prioritization

### 4.1.1. Pedestrian Access Facilities

The City of Lewisburg has identified specific locations as priority areas for planned accessibility improvement projects. These areas have been selected due to their proximity to specific land uses such as government offices and public areas of interest. The priority areas as identified in the selfevaluation are shown can be generally described as follows:
$\square$ High Priority - Public Square; Public Right-of-Way in vicinity of public buildings
$\square$ Medium Priority - Areas Immediately Surrounding the Public Square
$\square$ Low Priority - All other Areas

A more effective visualization of these areas can be seen in Figures 8 below and the map located in Appendix E:


Figure 8: Priority Zones in vicinity of Public Square
To assist in the project prioritization process, each zone was assigned a pre-determined value known as the "Criticality Score." A breakdown of the values assigned to each zone is shown in Table 14 below:

Table 26: Criticality Score Values

| Zone | Priority Level | Assigned Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone 1 | High | 5 |
| Zone 2 | Medium | 3 |
| Zone 3 | Low | 1 |

The Criticality Score was then added to the aforementioned "ADA Compliance Score" at each point to produce the "Total Prioritization Score". This process assisted in prioritizing future projects for Lewisburg's transition plan.

### 4.1.2 Public Buildings and Public Parks

The Department of Justice ADA Title III regulations specify four priority areas for public building accessibility. These priorities, equally applicable to state and local government facilities, are listed below in order of descending value:

Priority 1 - Accessible approach and entrance
Priority 2 - Access to goods and services
Priority 3 - Access to public toilet rooms
Priority 4 - Access to other items such as water fountains and public telephones
When evaluating public parks, play and recreation areas were considered Priority 4 level according to ADA guidelines.

### 4.2 Annual Budget for Improvements

The City of Lewisburg is committed to making the ADA improvements a priority. The City has allocated $\$ 60,000$ as the base annual ADA improvement budget. Additionally. the City is dedicated to pursuing numerous other potential funding sources including state and federal grants and piggybacking ADA improvements with other department's funds. The City also expects future funding for TDOT routes to include funds for ADA improvements as the state continues to make it a priority.

State and Federal grants that the City of Lewisburg plans to pursue to contribute to the ADA improvement plan include Safe Routes to School (SRTS), TDOT's Multimodal Access Grant, City Park Improvement grants, USDA community grants, and additional Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. The City has a very high record of accomplishment receiving the grants they pursue and will make it a priority to continue pursuing additional funding to aid the ADA improvement plan.

Additionally, the City will examine the possibility of piggybacking ADA improvements with other department's funds. These may include allocating some of their $\$ 137,000$ annual STP funds. The City has a $\$ 200,000$ roadway-resurfacing budget that could see a portion of it used for sidewalk ramps and street crossings in conjunction with the resurfacing. Furthermore, the City plans to continue using Department of Public Works funds for immediate ADA concerns as high priority needs arise.

Furthermore, several of the main thoroughfares through the City of Lewisburg are state routes. The City will push for future state funded projects to include ADA improvements within the TDOT right-of-way.

### 4.3 Implementation Schedule

The ADA evaluation plan highlights a high percentage of City pedestrian facilities out of compliance and therefore requiring a substantial amount of ADA improvements with an estimated cost of $\$ 6,300,000$. However, through the funding sources outlines in section 4.2 , the City of Lewisburg plans to aggressively address the ADA deficiencies. The City is proposing a three-phase priority zone implementation plan to first address the critical deficiencies of high pedestrian traffic areas. Although resources are limited, the City of Lewisburg is proposing a transition plan goal to have all pedestrian facilities ADA compliant within a 30 to 50 -year timeline.

The City of Lewisburg has developed a priority schedule outlining the sidewalk deficiencies block by block and what priority zone they fall under and estimated cost to fix as shown in APPENDIX F. High trafficked business and public facility areas will receive the highest priority. Through the base annual budget and the pursuit of numerous State and Federal grants, the City believes their goal of 30 to 50 years is attainable.

### 4.4 Public Outreach

As a part of the ADA transition plan initiative The City of Lewisburg will conduct public outreach to ensure that the citizens of the City are aware of and have access to the ADA resources available to them. At the time of this report the City has already added an ADA webpage to the official City website that provides the information on the ADA Coordinator, the ADA grievance procedure and grievance form, and a link to the national ADA website for further information and assistance. The City ADA webpage can be found at https://www.lewisburgtn.gov/codes-stormwater-ada/ada.

Furthermore, in order to increase public awareness about the new initiative and provide information on the ADA resources available, the City of Lewisburg will place the information and the link to the ADA page on their website under the "PUBLIC NOTICES" and "MEDIA RELEASES" tabs. Additionally the City will hold a public meeting to discuss the initiative, increase public awareness, and receive public feedback toward the plan moving forward.

Additionally, as part of the public outreach, a copy of the Transition Plan was sent to Empower Tennessee, which is Middle Tennessee's Center for Independent Living in order to receive any comments or feedback. The intention is to ensure the Transition Plan has been reviewed and reflects the feedback of members of the disability community and those who directly work with them.

## APPENDIX

Appendix A: Grievance Policy and Procedure
Grievance Procedure
Grievance Form
Lewisburg Ordinance \#: Adoption of Grievance Policy and Procedure Appendix B: Facility Reports - Public Buildings

ADA Compliance Checklist
Public Buildings
Appendix C: Facility Reports - Public Parks
Public Parks
Park Sidewalk
Appendix D: Facility Reports - Pedestrian Access Routes
Public Sidewalk
Driveway Ramps
Street Crossings
Crosswalks
Railroad Crossings
Appendix E: Maps
Evaluated Building Locations
Evaluated Park Locations
Evaluated Pedestrian Access Routes
Prioritization Zones
Appendix F: Transition Plan Estimated 30-50 Year Priority List
Block by Block Breakdown of Priority List and Estimated Cost

Note: Copies of all Appendices can be viewed Lewisburg City Hall located at 131 E. Church St. Lewisburg, TN 37091.

| APPENDIX F: ESTIMATED 30-50 YEAR PRIORITY LIST (SIDEWALKS, STREET CROSSINGS, DRIVEWAYS, \& RAILROAD CROSSINGS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STREET NAME | PHASE | LIMITS |  | ORIENTATION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISTANCE } \\ & \text { (LF) } \end{aligned}$ | NUMBER OF DRIVEWAYS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUMBER OF } \\ & \text { STREET } \\ & \text { CROSSINGS } \end{aligned}$ | NUMBER OF CROSSWALKS | NUMBER OF RAILROAD CROSSINGS | TOTAL ESTIMATED COST (FY 2019 DOLLARS) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRIORITY } \\ & \text { ZONE } \end{aligned}$ |
| W. Commerce Street |  | Southwest City Square Improvements |  | SW Corner | N/A | - | 1 | 1 | - | \$60,000.00 | 1 |
| W. Church Street |  | Northwest City Square Improvements |  | NW Corner | N/A | - | 1 | 1 | - | \$60,000.00 | 1 |
| E. Church Street |  | Northeast City Square Improvements |  | NE Corner | N/A | - | 1 | 1 | - | \$60,000.00 | 1 |
| East Church Street |  | 1st Avenue N. | Rock Creek | South | 225 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | \$40,700.00 | 1 |
| East Church Street |  | 1st Avenue N . | Rock Creek | North | 275 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 1 |
| 1st Avenue North |  | E. Church St. | Water Street | West | 320 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$44,000.00 | 1 |
| 1st Avenue North |  | E. Church St. | Water Street | East | 285 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 1 |
| 1st Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | West | 275 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$55,500.00 | 1 |
| 1st Avenue South |  | W. Commerce Street | E. Ewing Street | East | 250 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$41,000.00 | 2 |
| 1st Avenue South |  | W. Commerce Street | E. Ewing Street | East/West | 100 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$21,000.00 | 2 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | E. Church St. | Water Street | East | 285 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | \$46,700.00 | 2 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | E. Church St. | Water Street | West | 285 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | \$57,700.00 | 2 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | West | 290 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$57,000.00 | 2 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | East | 135 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$18,500.00 | 2 |
| 2nd Avenue South |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Ewing Street | East | 270 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$50,000.00 | 2 |
| 2nd Avenue South |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Ewing Street | West | 270 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$50,000.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | East | 150 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$26,000.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | West | 300 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | W. Church Street | Water Street | East | 300 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$46,000.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | W. Church Street | Water Street | West | 215 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$31,500.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Church Street | East | 285 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Church Street | West | 285 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$44,500.00 | 2 |
| 3rd Avenue South |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Ewing Street | East | 125 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | \$18,700.00 | 2 |
| 4th Avenue North |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Church Street | West | 300 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | \$54,200.00 | 2 |
| 4th Avenue North |  | W. Church Street | Water Street | West | 325 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$49,500.00 | 2 |
| 4th Avenue North |  | W. Church Street | Water Street | East | 100 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$21,000.00 | 2 |
| 4th Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | East | 300 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 2 |
| 4th Avenue North |  | Water Street | Haynes Street | West | 300 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$47,000.00 | 2 |
| E. Commerce Street |  | 1st Avenue N . | Rock Creek | North | 275 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$51,500.00 | 2 |
| E. Commerce Street |  | 1st Avenue N . | Rock Creek | South | 300 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$36,000.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3rd Avenue N . | North | 275 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | \$50,700.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3rd Avenue N . | South | 275 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | \$45,900.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street |  | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N. | North | 400 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | \$57,200.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street | I | 3rd Avenue N . | Railroad Tracks | South | 300 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$53,000.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street | 11 | 3rd Avenue N. | Railroad Tracks | South | 300 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$54,000.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street |  | Railroad Crossing at 5th Avenue North |  | North | N/A | - | - | - | 1 | \$50,000.00 | 2 |
| W. Commerce Street |  | Railroad Crossing at 5th Avenue North |  | South | N/A | - | - | - | 1 | \$50,000.00 | 2 |
| W. Church Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3 rd Avenue N . | North | 285 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | \$45,700.00 | 2 |
| W. Church Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3rd Avenue N . | South | 285 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$44,500.00 | 2 |
| W. Church Street |  | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N. | North | 310 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$48,000.00 | 2 |
| W. Church Street |  | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N . | South | 400 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | \$51,200.00 | 2 |
| W. Church Street |  | 4th Avenue N. | 5th Avenue N. | South | 300 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 2 |

APPENDIX F: ESTIMATED 30-50 YEAR PRIORITY LIST (SIDEWALKS, STREET CROSSINGS, DRIVEWAYS, \& RAILROAD CROSSINGS)

| STREET NAME | PHASE | LIMITS |  | ORIENTATION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISTANCE } \\ & \text { (LF) } \end{aligned}$ | NUMBER OF DRIVEWAYS | NUMBER OF STREET CROSSINGS | NUMBER OF CROSSWALKS | NUMBER OF RAILROAD CROSSINGS | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { TOTAL ESTIMATED } \\ \text { COST (FY } 2019 \\ \text { DOLLARS) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { PRIORITY } \\ \text { ZONE } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water Street |  | 1st Avenue N. | 2nd Avenue N . | South | 310 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$53,000.00 | 2 |
| Water Street |  | 1st Avenue N . | 2nd Avenue N . | North | 310 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 2 |
| Water Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3 rd Avenue N . | North | 200 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$25,000.00 | 2 |
| Water Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3rd Avenue N . | South | 275 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$49,500.00 | 2 |
| Water Street |  | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N . | North | 400 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$62,000.00 | 2 |
| Water Street | 1 | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N . | South | 200 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$37,000.00 | 2 |
| Water Street | 11 | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N. | South | 200 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$43,000.00 | 2 |
| Haynes Street |  | 1st Avenue N . | 2nd Avenue N . | North/South | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | \$20,000.00 | 2 |
| Haynes Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 3rd Avenue N . | South | 285 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 2 |
| Haynes Street |  | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N. | South | 400 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$62,000.00 | 2 |
| Haynes Street |  | 3rd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N . | North | 125 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$29,500.00 | 2 |
| Haynes Street | 1 | 4th Avenue N. | 5th Avenue N. | South | 275 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 2 |
| Haynes Street | 11 | 4th Avenue N. | 5th Avenue N . | South | 200 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$31,000.00 | 2 |
| 1st Avenue North | I | Haynes Street | North to Address | West | 300 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| 1st Avenue North | 11 | Haynes Street | College Street | West | 340 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$45,000.00 | 3 |
| 1st Avenue North |  | College Street | Bates Street | West | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$15,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | Haynes Street | College Street | East | 345 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$56,500.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | 1 | Haynes Street | College Street | West | 300 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$47,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | 11 | Haynes Street | College Street | West | 250 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$36,000.00 | 3 |
| 3rd Avenue North |  | Haynes Street | College Street | East | 325 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$49,500.00 | 3 |
| 3rd Avenue North | 1 | Haynes Street | College Street | West | 250 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$54,000.00 | 3 |
| 3rd Avenue North | 11 | Haynes Street | College Street | West | 250 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$42,000.00 | 3 |
| College Street |  | 1st Avenue N. | 2nd Avenue N . | North | 325 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 3 |
| College Street |  | 2nd Avenue N . | 4th Avenue N . | North | 150 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$32,000.00 | 3 |
| College Street |  | 4th Avenue N. | Limestone Avenue | North | 285 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$44,500.00 | 3 |
| College Street |  | Limestone Avenue | 5th Avenue N. | North | 290 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$45,000.00 | 3 |
| College Street |  | Limestone Avenue | 6th Avenue N. | North | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$41,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | I | College Street | Bates Street | East | 350 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$52,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | 11 | College Street | Bates Street | East | 175 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$22,500.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | 1 | College Street | McClure Street | West | 350 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | II | College Street | McClure Street | West | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | III | College Street | McClure Street | West | 265 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$37,500.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | McClure Street | Adams Street | West | 250 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$41,000.00 | 3 |
| Limestone Avenue |  | Address | Address | East | 325 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$44,500.00 | 3 |
| Limestone Avenue | I | Address | Address | West | 350 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$53,000.00 | 3 |
| Limestone Avenue | 11 | Address | Address | West | 300 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$36,000.00 | 3 |
| Silver Street |  | 5th Avenue N. | McDowell Lane | North | 240 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | \$39,000.00 | 3 |
| Silver Street |  | McDowell Lane | 6th Avenue N. | North | 335 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$56,500.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue South |  | Maple Street | Forrest Street | West | 400 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$50,000.00 | 3 |
| Forrest Street | I | 2nd Avenue S. | 5th Avenue S. | North | 350 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$47,000.00 | 3 |
| Forrest Street | 11 | 2nd Avenue S. | 5th Avenue S. | North | 225 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$34,500.00 | 3 |
| Forrest Street | 1 | 2nd Avenue S. | 5th Avenue S. | South | 450 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$57,000.00 | 3 |

APPENDIX F: ESTIMATED 30-50 YEAR PRIORITY LIST (SIDEWALKS, STREET CROSSINGS, DRIVEWAYS, \& RAILROAD CROSSINGS)

| STREET NAME | PHASE | LIMITS |  | ORIENTATION | DISTANCE <br> (LF) | NUMBER OF DRIVEWAYS | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { NUMBER OF } \\ \text { STREET } \\ \text { CROSSINGS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | NUMBER OF CROSSWALKS | NUMBER OF RAILROAD CROSSINGS | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { TOTAL ESTIMATED } \\ \text { COST (FY } 2019 \\ \text { DOLLARS) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | PRIORITY ZONE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forrest Street | 11 | 2nd Avenue S. | 5th Avenue S. | South | 385 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$60,500.00 | 3 |
| Highland Avenue | I | Belfast Street | Hillsdale Street | East | 325 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$44,500.00 | 3 |
| Highland Avenue | 11 | Belfast Street | Hillsdale Street | East | 300 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$41,000.00 | 3 |
| Highland Avenue | 1 | Belfast Street | Hillsdale Street | West | 310 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$49,000.00 | 3 |
| Highland Avenue | 11 | Belfast Street | Hillsdale Street | West | 310 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$49,000.00 | 3 |
| Highland Avenue | III | Belfast Street | Hillsdale Street | West | 400 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 3 |
| Park Avenue | 1 | Davis Street | Verona Avenue | East | 350 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$52,000.00 | 3 |
| Park Avenue | 11 | Davis Street | Verona Avenue | East | 175 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$29,500.00 | 3 |
| Park Avenue | 1 | Cannon Street | Davis Street | West | 175 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$40,500.00 | 3 |
| Park Avenue | II | Davis Street | Verona Avenue | West | 325 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$61,500.00 | 3 |
| Davis Street |  | Park Avenue | 2nd Avenue N . | North | 250 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$37,000.00 | 3 |
| Davis Street |  | Park Avenue | 2nd Avenue N . | South | 250 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$31,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | Davis Street | Dead End (north) | East | 260 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$49,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North |  | Davis Street | Dead End (north) | West | 260 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$38,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | I | Davis Street | Greenwood Street | East | 325 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$55,500.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | 11 | Davis Street | Greenwood Street | East | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| 2nd Avenue North | 1 | Davis Street | Greenwood Street | West | 325 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$50,500.00 | 3 |
| 3rd Avenue North | II | Davis Street | Greenwood Street | West | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| Greenwood Street |  | Verona Road | 2nd Avenue N. | North | 335 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$61,500.00 | 3 |
| Verona Road |  | Address | Greenwood Street | West | 230 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$40,000.00 | 3 |
| Cummings Circle | 1 | Silver Street | Turn-Around | East | 315 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$55,500.00 | 3 |
| Cummings Circle | II | Silver Street | Turn-Around | East | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| Cummings Circle | III | Silver Street | Turn-Around | East | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| Cummings Circle | IV | Silver Street | Turn-Around | West | 400 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 3 |
| Cummings Circle | V | Silver Street | Turn-Around | West | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$40,000.00 | 3 |
| 7th Avenue North | I | Silver Street | To Cul-de-Sac | East | 300 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$53,000.00 | 3 |
| 7th Avenue North | II | Cul-de-Sac | Cul-de-Sac | East | 200 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$56,000.00 | 3 |
| 7th Avenue North | III | Cul-de-Sac | Silver Street | West | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| Silver Street | I | 7th Avenue North | 9th Avenue North | North | 370 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$61,000.00 | 3 |
| Silver Street | 11 | 7th Avenue North | 9th Avenue North | North | 400 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$58,000.00 | 3 |
| Silver Street | 1 | 7th Avenue North | 9th Avenue North | South | 350 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$57,000.00 | 3 |
| Silver Street | 11 | 7th Avenue North | 9th Avenue North | South | 350 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$57,000.00 | 3 |
| 7th Avenue North |  | Silver Street | Bark Street | West | 260 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$48,000.00 | 3 |
| 7th Avenue North | I | Bark Street | Hill Street | West | 225 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$39,500.00 | 3 |
| 7th Avenue North | II | Bark Street | Hill Street | West | 225 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$44,500.00 | 3 |
| Bark Street |  | 7th Avenue North | Endsley Avenue | North | 265 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$43,500.00 | 3 |
| Bark Street |  | Endsley Evenue | Hill Street | North | 250 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$53,000.00 | 3 |
| Bark Street |  | Hill Street | 9th Avenue North | North | 230 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$45,000.00 | 3 |
| Bark Street | I | 7th Avenue North | 9th Avenue North | South | 385 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$56,500.00 | 3 |
| Bark Street | 11 | 7th Avenue North | 9th Avenue North | South | 420 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$60,000.00 | 3 |
| 9th Avenue North |  | Silver Street | Bark Street | East | 265 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | \$42,500.00 | 3 |
| 9th Avenue North |  | Bark Street | Dead End (north) | East | 340 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$57,000.00 | 3 |


| APPENDIX F: ESTIMATED 30-50 YEAR PRIORITY LIST (SIDEWALKS, STREET CROSSINGS, DRIVEWAYS, \& RAILROAD CROSSINGS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STREET NAME | PHASE | LIMITS |  | ORIENTATION | DISTANCE <br> (LF) | NUMBER OF DRIVEWAYS | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { NUMBER OF } \\ \text { STREET } \\ \text { CROSSINGS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | NUMBER OF CROSSWALKS | NUMBER OF RAILROAD CROSSINGS | ```TOTAL ESTIMATED COST (FY 2019 DOLLARS)``` | PRIORITY ZONE |
| Endsley Avenue | I | Bark Street | Hill Street | East | 220 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$34,000.00 | 3 |
| Endsley Avenue | 11 | Bark Street | Hill Street | East | 220 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$39,000.00 | 3 |
| Endsley Avenue | I | Bark Street | Hill Street | West | 220 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$34,000.00 | 3 |
| Endsley Avenue | 11 | Bark Street | Hill Street | West | 220 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$39,000.00 | 3 |
| Hill Street |  | 7th Avenue North | Endsley Avenue | South | 260 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | \$43,000.00 | 3 |
| Hill Street | 1 | 7th Avenue North | Bark Street | North | 260 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$44,000.00 | 3 |
| Hill Street | II | 7th Avenue North | Bark Street | North | 350 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$59,000.00 | 3 |
| Hill Street | III | 7th Avenue North | Bark Street | West | 300 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$48,000.00 | 3 |
| Creekside Drive |  | US-431 | Dead End (north) | East/West | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$42,000.00 | 3 |
| Old Columbia Road |  | Silver Creek Drive | Address | West | 400 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | \$52,200.00 | 3 |
| Mooresville Highway |  | W. Ellington Parkway | Crestview Drive | North | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$18,000.00 | 3 |
| SW End Avenue |  | W. Commerce Street | W. Cedar Street | West | 315 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$43,500.00 | 3 |
| West Cedar Street |  | Woods Avenue South | SW End Avenue | North | 300 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$36,000.00 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  | TOTALS: | 37465 | 299 | 136 | 15 | 2 | \$6,319,900.00 |  |

