



Peter Doebling <pjdoehring@gmail.com>

Comments tonight

3 messages

Peter Doebling <pjdoehring@gmail.com>

Wed, Jul 20, 2022 at 10:11 PM

To: Richard Leff <richard.leff@kennett.pa.us>

Cc: Geoffrey Gamble <geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us>, "scudder.stevens" <scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us>

Dear Rich,

I want to respond to two comments that could potentially mislead members of the public in attendance tonight

1) "Sometimes Peter thought the trail was too wide, and other times too narrow"... This refers to two sets of conditions, not any apparent confusion on my part.

- More recently (like tonight) I have commented that a 6-8' wide path is unnecessarily wide. I have cited federal guidelines in support of my claim that a 5' wide trail meets standards for a universally accessible trail, and that it can be narrowed to 3' (technically even 32") as needed, as long as other conditions were met. In fact, this was built into the Penntrails design approved by McMahon that was part of the original grant proposal. Claims by your consultants that the trail must be at least 5-6' wide have no basis in federal standards, given the likely volume of traffic. Convene a meeting between the designers and myself, and they are unlikely to maintain their position.

- I repeated at multiple times last summer and fall that the proposed 8' wide path was too narrow to be characterized as a shared use path, as the designers (and KTA) had repeatedly insisted. They wanted to characterize CMR as safe for all riders by shuffling them off of the road onto an 8' wide section of the path wherever the road narrowed into a one lane choker, arguing that federal guidelines allowed shared use paths to be narrowed to 8' as needed. The designers appeared only to back down after I had a face to face with McMahon at the public event in October, when I specified that there are no examples of shared use paths being narrowed to 8' for 100+' as this plan intended...

- I have documented these concerns at public meetings and on OpenKennett... please let me know if there are other examples that you believe might indicate apparent confusion re recommended width

2) "There have been ample opportunities for public comment., and we have considered Peter's ideas" As I noted in the meeting, public comment is irrelevant if important information about the proposal is withheld - I can cite multiple examples. More to the point, I attempted to advance a counter proposal before you approved the "Final design" last June. The minutes of that meeting show that you not only blocked consideration of this counter-proposal, but prevented it from being included in the public record. I will note that one element of my design - to continue to add traffic calming until the desired speed was reached - was dismissed by McMahon as unlikely to succeed. 4 months later, they reversed course, and came back to you with additional studies of traffic calming that achieved (in part) the effect I expected. Nonetheless, KTA has continued to refuse to consider the rest of the plan, a plan which has the potential to make CMR safe for most riders. So I have advanced counter proposals, with independent expert input, which you refused to consider. If given the chance, I will be happy to elaborate on the alternatives I alluded to tonight.

Please note that I will post this email, and any response, on OpenKennett. Feel free to invite your design team to comment.

Peter Doebling

--

Regards,

Peter

 Peter Doebling (pjdoehring@gmail.com)
 5 Nine Gates Rd.
 Chadds Ford, PA 19317

Richard Leff <richard.leff@kennett.pa.us>

Fri, Jul 22, 2022 at 10:34 AM

To: Peter Doebling <pjdoehring@gmail.com>

Cc: Geoffrey Gamble <geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us>, Scudder Stevens <scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us>, Eden Ratliff <Eden.Ratliff@kennett.pa.us>

Peter,

Thank you for your email.

You left out of my initial statement on Chandler Mill Road trail that “paralysis by analysis” in considering too many options, too many times is not a desired path forward (for any project).

Already, Kennett Township has spent weeks and thousands of dollars to analyze your idea of using edge lane roads (aka – advisory bike lanes); which upon further examination are exploratory in the US (and the Federal Highway Administration in 2021 denied any new requests for experiments), there are none in PA (per the website <https://www.advisorybikelanes.com/>) and are not recommended in roads with curves, limited line of site and vertical changes, all of which are on Chandler Mill Road. Thus, in the end it was a waste, not only of money, but more importantly of time for Chandler Mill Road Trail project. And this is just one of the many suggests offered by you that we have spent time, energy and money in consideration. I did however suggest that you might explore other roads in Kennett Township where edge lane roads might be useful, but have never heard back from you.

Your continued attempts to derail progress on the Chandler Mill Road Trail under the guise of suggesting endless alternatives and your threatening last night to undermine Kennett Township’s grant application to support this project with PA funds (and reduce the cost to Kennett Township) are choices you have made. You are free to continue doing so and I will listen to you, but I will continue to do what I think is best for Kennett Township. The Board has considered your proposals, dedicated time and money and decided that they were not in best interest of Kennett Township. Your threat to undermine a grant to benefit Kennett Township demonstrates your willingness to further stall the project and incur yet more costs to Kennett Township, none of which seems to be in the best interest of Kennett Township.

If you do decide to post my comments, I would request that you post ALL of my comments and don’t ignore the context at the start of my comments regarding “paralysis by analysis” nor a summary of your threat to try to undermine a grant to benefit Kennett Township.

Rich

Richard Leff

Chair, Board of Supervisors, Kennett Township

[Quoted text hidden]

Peter Doebling <pjdoehring@gmail.com>

Fri, Jul 29, 2022 at 7:21 AM

To: Richard Leff <richard.leff@kennett.pa.us>

Cc: Geoffrey Gamble <geoffrey.gamble@kennett.pa.us>, Scudder Stevens <scudder.stevens@kennett.pa.us>, Eden Ratliff <Eden.Ratliff@kennett.pa.us>

Thanks Rich, I will include this in the email chain I post to OpenKennett. I will also prepare a separate response to your claims re Edge Lane Roads - not only do these fall apart pretty quickly but the facts offer interesting insights into how quickly ELRs are evolving and make it clear that this is a missed opportunity that could likely have saved us at least a million dollars.

Peter

[Quoted text hidden]