False, misleading, and irrelevant statements in Ms Norland’s 3-2-22 email

| The Trails & Sidewalks Committee **agreed 4-1 not to spend additional township funds on specifically exploring 3’-5’ trails**. Those four votes included Abbie Kessler (as the TLC representative), myself, Tom and Rudy. | **FALSE** There was an informal motion - no formal motion was passed. Regardless, the committee would have been voting on a proposal that had been falsely characterized by Norland as increasing impervious coverage. |
| --- | --- |
| This TSC consensus was not based just on **accessibility standards**… | TSC could not have reached an informed “consensus” related to accessibility standards because TSC demonstrated repeatedly at meetings that they were misinformed of them. In October, not a single member recognized that a universal access path could be as little as 3’ wide. One member claimed that narrowing the path was “dangerous” to wheelchair users. At this week’s meeting, they were unaware about what passing spaces were or how often they were needed. Norland confidently asserted that they would increase impervious coverage and refused to allow me to share the actual standard. |
| the implementation of which is **complicated since we are dealing with varied topographical and environmental conditions along the creek for the length of the project.**  | **MISLEADING** The adjustments for accessibility are already built into the 6-8’ path… in most cases, the deviation required to narrow it to 3’ would stay within the corridor already mapped out. When it does not, the topography is unlikely to vary significantly enough to require additional calculations. And if it does, then the tree is cut down!  |
| To be fair to Mr. Doehring, he is not part of the consultant team, so he would not be privy to **these details and considerations.**  | **FALSE OR MISLEADING** These conversations did not take place during public meetings, as I attended them all. If they occurred privately, why was the public excluded? |
| The TSC consensus was based on a **full set of factors**  | **FALSE** TSC was misinformed about accessibility standards, and so could not have considered all factors. |
| ranging from the purpose of the Greenway,  | **FALSE** Nothing in the option to narrow the path to 3’ as needed interferes with the stated use by pedestrians |
| the consultants’ recommendations, user experience, **minimal relative cost savings**, | **FALSE** Without mapping this out, the cost saving cannot have been calculated. This is especially true where landowners will refuse to cede their land. TSC has never seen cost savings. And this ignores the environmental and related costs when a mature tree is cut down unnecessarily |
| **future expected use**,  | **FALSE** The designers here have never presented projections regarding future use, and cannot extrapolate from their other work which has almost exclusively centered on urban/suburban areas with markedly higher use. I have reviewed research that uses statistical modeling to project usage, and the results suggest that uncomfortable encounters drop exponentially as volume decreases. |
| the robust design process to date, **numerous opportunities to date to incorporate feedback,** | **FALSE** The fact that the TSC failed to discuss an option first presented 5 months ago illustrates how poorly the process of incorporating feedback has worked.  |
| and the extensive environmental work, stormwater management and restoration that are occurring as part of the trail implementation.  | **IRRELEVANT** The suggestion to narrow the path to 3’ in places while retaining a 2’ buffer has no impact on these other factors  |
| Township management and the consultants have been working individually with each landowner to ensure that their environmental, trail width, stormwater management and viewshed concerns are addressed in nuanced yet cost-effective ways.  | **FALSE** There is at least one of the five landowners with whom KT has had no meaningful conversations. At least one other has requested updates re final design but seen none |
| Mr. Doehring is not privy to those conversations, but members of the committee understand these considerations due to **executive session discussions**.  | **LIKELY FALSE** I would ask that minutes of executive sessions be reviewed. |
| Further, I have also spoken to Bike Kennett and the Chester County Planning Commission, and they also do not believe that 3-5 feet is the right approach for this trail. | **IRRELEVANT** They could not have judged a plan that was presented incorrectly to them.  |
| I appreciate Mr. Doehring’s feedback and his desire for transparency, which are important in all public processes. We have public input after every agenda item in our meeting.  | **IRRELEVANT** I had requested that the feasibility of narrowing the path be examined - KTA worked to prevent this from happening - there was no presentation to have public input on. |
| There will be at least one additional public session with the consultants prior to wrapping up this task order, which is included in the current scope and fee for this final engineering task order. **Extensive public input informed the final engineering task order itself.**  | **IRRELEVANT** There has never been a robust and informed public debate in this option, and clear attempts have been made to prevent this from occurring. No option to narrow the path to 3’ was ever included in the discussions about final design |
| For example, due to concerns raised by Peter and others relating to tree loss, the Township has paid for an arborist and landscape planner to evaluate on site *every single native tree over 24 inches* in diameter along the road side corridor which could be impacted  | This illustrates KTAs reluctance rather than their open-ness to consider input. I asked at October’s meeting whether the number of trees damaged would be assessed. Norland claimed this had been done. I asked for the standard to be used. Norland did not know. At the October Open House, I queried the designers, who admitted that they did not have a formal plan to evaluate potential damage. Only then was the assessment undertaken. |
| if the trail were **3-5** or 6-8 feet.  | How did this occur - if in fact it did? The option to narrow the path to 3 feet in width was not discussed at length until today. This would suggest that the designers know how many trees could be saved if the path was narrowed |
| These experts have developed mitigation measures to be put in place if the tree will be lost, the protection measures to save trees that will be implemented on site, and considered potential penalties for contractors if trees are damaged. | Excellent! Note that neither these additional impacts nor the costs associated with them have been presented to the Supervisors  |
| I understand **Mr. Doehring is against the Greenway** and that he is unhappy with the committee’s decision.  | **MISLEADING** I have raised concerns about the feasibility of the Greenway as proposed by KTA, but am a vigorous advocate for trails |
| However, the majority of the committee does not believe that the Township should spend additional funds pursuing Mr. Doehring’s questions below.  | **FALSE** TSC never voted to deny me the opportunity to allow me to meet with the designers |
| Mr. Doehring has requested the committee pursue alternatives before on this very project, such as edge lane roads. These alternatives were explored in an effort at collaboration (costing more than $14,000 for that project alone) only to be determined by both township and professional traffic engineers that they could not be implemented for this project.  | **MISLEADING/FALSE** The review undertaken ignored important research findings related to sight distance and volume. We were provided with 30 minutes to meet with the designers, after which we had 15 minutes to answer a half-dozen questions, most of which were clearly misinformed. We were provided no opportunities to respond to the recommendations, despite obvious errors. Note that the principals of the design firms each charge $250/hour because of their expertise, but they were allowed to charge KT to undertake their own professional development. I do not believe that they charged the full $14K for this work. |
| Further, **he has requested and had numerous consultations with the consultants in the past, at the Township’s expense**. He has also previously emailed the consultants multiple times -- without including the Township (and without Township approval), despite requests to the contrary -- costing time and effort.  | **FALSE** Outside of the ELR consultation described above, no additional meetings with the designers have been scheduled with me, nor have the consultants ever responded to emailed requests for information. All of my interactions have occurred in public meetings. Unless the designers are charging for emails which they ignore, there is no meaningful time/effort involved.  |
| We understand he has also reached out to individual residents along Chandler Mill Road who are engaged in negotiations with the Township relating to right-of-way acquisition, advocating against their agreement on the Township’s plans. This alone will increase cost to the Township in consultant and legal fees, and puts the project at risk. | **MISLEADING** I have spoken with three landowners to understand where they are at in the process, after KTA refused to share any information whatsoever. There is nothing restricting me from sharing my views with a landowner regarding options for the path. One landowner’s representative reached out to me, because they had heard nothing from KT about the plan moving ahead. Two of the landowners were grateful because I was able to update them on the progress on these and other trail initiatives.  |
| This is a complicated project, and the TSC’s consensus is to let the expert trails consultants finish what the Board unanimously approved **without further interference, delay or sidetracks**.  | Concerns about delays are disingenuous, given that KTA blocked all movement on the project for almost two years while they unilaterally pursued alternatives against the wishes of other committee members, landowners, easement holders, and members of the public |
| My understanding of committees is that you, the Board of Supervisors, look to the TSC to hear, discuss and resolve the kinds of details that go into these projects (and there are many!). The Board of Supervisors has previously conveyed to the committee that these issues are to be addressed at the committee and at other community feedback opportunities that have been designed into the Chandler Mill process.  | **FALSE** KTA is using its influence to prevent TSC from having a meaningful discussion with a clear understanding of the options |
| When an issue has been considered, is **against expert recommendations**,  | **FALSE** The previous designer, with the support of the current engineer, supported this recommendation. The current designers have yet to rule on it, which is why I am requesting a meeting. |
| and is rejected by a committee (who has the most information about a project, the history of the people involved and its complications), | **FALSE** No formal vote was taken on the need for further discussion (let alone my request to meet with the designers), and it is clear that members did not understand the option. .  |
| it strikes me as both disruptive and demoralizing to good process for the Board to bypass a committee’s 4-1 recommendation | **Questionable** The efforts to prevent discussion of reasonable alternatives is itself destructive. |