



Peter Doehring &lt;pjdoehring@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Re: TSC Recommendation not to move forward w/ additional consultant expenses**

---

Christina Norland &lt;cnorland@ksqroots.com&gt;

Wed, Mar 2, 2022 at 5:10 PM

To: Eden Ratliff &lt;eden.ratliff@kennett.pa.us&gt;, Peter Doehring &lt;pjdoehring@gmail.com&gt;, Abbie Kessler &lt;preservation@tlcforscc.org&gt;, RudyK &lt;rudyk@kennett.net&gt;, Diane McGovern &lt;dmccmcg@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: Scudder Stevens &lt;scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us&gt;, Geoffrey Gamble &lt;geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us&gt;, Richard Leff &lt;richard.leff@kennett.pa.us&gt;, Tom &lt;proftmj@juno.com&gt;, Tim Peterson &lt;timp.pla@gmail.com&gt;, Tim Plemmons &lt;mntnoseatrek@gmail.com&gt;

Hi all –

Peter - if you could kindly correct your address book to include my correct email, that would be helpful, since this is a reoccurring issue of which you are aware. I've now included Tom, Tim and Tim on this email string to include the full committee.

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.

This TSC consensus was not based just on accessibility standards, 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. 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. The TSC consensus was based on a full set of factors ranging from the purpose of the Greenway, the consultants' recommendations, user experience, minimal relative cost savings, future expected use, the robust design process to date, numerous opportunities to date to incorporate feedback, and the extensive environmental work, stormwater management and restoration that are occurring as part of the trail implementation. 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. Mr. Doehring is not privy to those conversations, but members of the committee understand these considerations due to executive session discussions. 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.

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. 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. 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 if the trail were 3-5 or 6-8 feet. 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.

I understand Mr. Doehring is against the Greenway and that he is unhappy with the committee's decision. However, the majority of the committee does not believe that the Township should spend additional funds pursuing Mr. Doehring's questions below. 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. 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. 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.

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. 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. When an issue has been considered, is against expert recommendations, and is rejected by a committee (who has the most information about a project, the history of the people involved and its complications), it strikes me as both disruptive and demoralizing to good process for the Board to bypass a committee's 4-1 recommendation.

Kind regards,

Christina

---

**From:** Eden Ratliff <[Eden.Ratliff@kennett.pa.us](mailto:Eden.Ratliff@kennett.pa.us)>  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 2, 2022 at 3:13 PM  
**To:** Peter Doehring <[pjdoehring@gmail.com](mailto:pjdoehring@gmail.com)>, Abbie Kessler <[preservation@tlcforscc.org](mailto:preservation@tlcforscc.org)>, RudyK <[rudyk@kennett.net](mailto:rudyk@kennett.net)>, Diane McGovern <[dmccmccg@gmail.com](mailto:dmccmccg@gmail.com)>  
**Cc:** Scudder Stevens <[scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us](mailto:scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us)>, Geoffrey Gamble <[geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us](mailto:geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us)>, Christina Norland <[cnorland@ksqroots.com](mailto:cnorland@ksqroots.com)>, Richard Leff <[richard.leff@kennett.pa.us](mailto:richard.leff@kennett.pa.us)>  
**Subject:** RE: Universal access trails 3' wide trails are appropriate and passing spaces do not increase impervious coverage

[EXTERNAL]

Hi Peter.

Thank you so much for the email. I am copying Rich Leff and Christina Norland ([cnorland@ksqroots.com](mailto:cnorland@ksqroots.com)) into this chain.

Thanks!  
Eden

---

**From:** Peter Doehring <[pjdoehring@gmail.com](mailto:pjdoehring@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 1, 2022 5:11 PM  
**To:** [christine@ksqroots.com](mailto:christine@ksqroots.com); Abbie Kessler <[preservation@tlcforscc.org](mailto:preservation@tlcforscc.org)>; RudyK <[rudyk@kennett.net](mailto:rudyk@kennett.net)>; Diane McGovern <[dmccmccg@gmail.com](mailto:dmccmccg@gmail.com)>  
**Cc:** Scudder Stevens <[scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us](mailto:scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us)>; Geoffrey Gamble <[geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us](mailto:geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us)>; Eden Ratliff <[Eden.Ratliff@kennett.pa.us](mailto:Eden.Ratliff@kennett.pa.us)>  
**Subject:** Re: Universal access trails 3' wide trails are appropriate and passing spaces do not increase impervious coverage

Upon reflection, I would like to add three other points and make a request. First, I want to make sure you heard the question I asked today correctly; Does the committee have a plan to review the proposal I presented 5 months ago in October... for a 5' wide path that could be narrowed to as little as 3' to avoid trees, sensitive areas, and going beyond the right of way. That is, the path would typically be 5 (or even 6') wide wherever there are no issues, but would narrow to as little as 3' (and always with a 2' buffer). This is the same question I asked the committee in October, with the same standards in mind that I emailed you earlier. In fact, the minutes from that meeting read "Discussion continued as to the need for a 6-8' trail and the potential for narrower sections for short distances to save a tree would be feasible as the bulk would still be wide enough for easy passing." I would also note that Eden claimed at the last BoS meeting that "we should look into this".

Second, we need to record these meetings, because it is important to keep everyone accountable for what they claim. While the October minutes certainly captured a portion, they did not reflect that I cited specific standards, and did not include absurd claims by others that confused the discussion; (e.g., that wheelchair users would find a 3' wide trail "dangerous").

Third, we now have multiple examples of committee members refusing to make any reasonable effort to confirm my claims (even when I am ready to offer sources), then making their own claims with no basis in fact, and following this up with other reasons why we cannot discuss these options. When my claims were disputed, in October, I went back to check the standards... apparently no one else did! And I have done it again today... The privilege of advising KT re how to spend millions of dollars comes with the responsibility to get the facts right.

And my request... I request an opportunity to speak directly with the designers to confirm whether this option is viable. If it is, it at least offers us a choice. We cannot afford to waste more time...even if we take this up again in April, we will have already lost 6 months.

For your interest, the reason I have made myself so familiar with these standards is because I am working with others to test a trail rating system that treats accessibility as a continuum. This system builds off of these standards (slope, width, obstacles, resting places, etc) - that is why I know them well. You can see elements of this system [in action with Margot](#), showing how we used this continuum to build her capacity for more difficult trails. I have presented these ideas at different state/national conferences, and gotten a lot of interest.

And this fits in with my own "vision" for the Kennett Greenways. This includes (among other things) categorizing the available paths/trails along this continuum, matching these to the needs of different kinds of users, and then making strategic choices about the kinds of paths we need to build to close gaps. A universal access path from Pennock Park to TLC would close a key gap in our regional network, which is why I am interested in this option... I just want to make sure we make choices that are fiscally and environmentally responsible....

I am happy to chat more.

Peter

On Tue, Mar 1, 2022 at 2:14 PM Peter Doehring <[pjdoehring@gmail.com](mailto:pjdoehring@gmail.com)> wrote:

Please see [this link](#)... go to p.37. These are drawn directly from federal and state regs, and co-authored by the head of WeConservePA. I will also note that the proposal to narrow the path to 3 feet as needed was part of the 2015 grant, for which McMahon did the concept design. In other words, the engineers already approved it, the trail designers at the time approved it. The decision to stick to a 5' wide path throughout is therefore a choice, and I argue an unnecessary one that will increase cost and environmental impact.

5'x5' Passing spaces are required every 1000' of trail that is narrower than 5' (though of course you can put them in more often). There is no basis for Christina's claim that passing spaces combined with a 3' wide rail would increase

impervious coverage, relative to a 5' wide trail.

Please share with Tom Janton - I want to make sure that the committee works with accurate information. Let me know if there is anything I missed!!

Regards,

Peter

-----  
*Peter Doehring* ([pjdoehring@gmail.com](mailto:pjdoehring@gmail.com))  
[5 Nine Gates Rd.](#)  
Chadds Ford, PA 19317

--

Regards,

Peter

-----  
*Peter Doehring* ([pjdoehring@gmail.com](mailto:pjdoehring@gmail.com))  
[5 Nine Gates Rd.](#)  
Chadds Ford, PA 19317