

**KENNETT TOWNSHIP**  
**TRAILS & SIDEWALKS COMMITTEE**

January 4, 2022 Minutes

Held in the Township Meeting Room with zoom attendance as an option. Agenda posted 12/28/21.

**Present:**

Committee Members:

Christina Norland, Chair (via Zoom)  
Diane McGovern (via Zoom)  
Abbie Kessler  
Rudy Karkosak (via Zoom)  
Tom Janton (via Zoom)

Guests:

Peter Doehring (via Zoom)  
John Wilkens (via Zoom)  
Peter McLaughlin, MDT (via Zoom)  
Michael Guttman (via Zoom)

Township Representatives:

Eden Ratliff (via Zoom)  
Gretchen Flack

Ms. Norland called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm with introductions.

**Administration:**

- Ms. Norland called for approval of October minutes. Mr. Karkosak motioned for approval with Ms. Norland seconding. All in favor.
- Committee appointments: Mr. Karkosak nominated Ms. Norland for Chair with a second from Mr. Janton. All in favor.
- Ms. Norland nominated Ms. Kessler for Secretary with a second from Mr. Karkosak with all in favor.

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

**Mason-Dixon Trail**

- Peter McLaughlin, Eastern Coordinator for the Mason-Dixon Trail, presented on the Trail and the segment through Kennett.
- Request a way to move the MDT off of Burnt Mill and use the trails on Spar Hill and Lord Howe to provide a safer and more scenic route for this segment.
- Discussion ensued regarding proposed locations and whether the Committee should recommend the Township approve the segment as suggested. All committee members agreed it is a good site for a MDT segment.
- Mr. Doehring questioned how hikers know they are allowed to hike without asking permission and Mr. McLaughlin confirmed that they ensure no permissions have been revoked.
- Ms. Norland moved to make the recommendation to the Supervisors with all members in favor.
- Mr. McLaughlin then asked if anyone knows anyone along Nine Gates that would allow the MDT to go through their properties to help remove another section from the roadways. Mr. Doehring spoke up as they have looked at such a connection previously with one landowner not in agreement quite yet.

**Trail Segment Updates:**

- *Chandler Mill Final Engineering:*
  - Final engineering in progress with potential archaeological mitigation needed along the former dam site.
  - Existing bog turtle habitat exists along the western side of the Creek with proposed mitigation already given to the Fish and Game Commission. Waiting for feedback.

- Change order for additional traffic analysis has resulted in the data with the pilot study now removed. Analysis is not complete, but once it is, they will meet with the fire companies to determine final design for traffic calming.
- October open house resulted in general questions related to overlooks, plantings, etc. Most of the users who responded said they would be in smaller groups and only want small areas to rest. This has resulted in a change to the design to create smaller overlooks and such. All plants chosen were quite colorful by most respondents.
- *Connecting the Flats to Anson B. Nixon:*
  - No budget item included so still no resolution as to how to connect these locations. Ms. Norland found the rededication of the ROW to Hazel Ave residents, which means there is no extra ROW for a trail.

**Funding Updates:**

- *Vision Partnership Program Application:*
  - The grant was awarded and contract to be executed by February.
- *CFA MTF Grant Award:*
  - Contract being executed prior to the holidays.

**Regional Trails Committee:**

- *Baltimore Pike Bikeway Concept:*
  - Major priority of the Southern Chester County Circuit Trail Feasibility Study.
  - Looking to gather the municipalities that relate to this and the County is recommending they all work together and apply for a TCDI grant application for a master plan. This grant program is through DVRPC and would open in February.
  - All committee members believe it is an important connector and Kennett should be involved.

**Land Development Updates:** No update.

**Public Comment:**

- Mr. Wilkens commented as to why there is not an agenda item regarding the debate proposed by the Supervisors in December regarding a combination of the TSC and LCAC Committee.
- Mr. Doehring spoke about his questions emailed to the Committee just before the meeting. He stated he expected more information about timelines and construction and was disappointed there was not more information. His questions that he supplied are attached as an addendum to these minutes.

**Land Acquisition Updates:** Executive session.

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm.

NOTE: Next meeting to be held February 7<sup>th</sup> at 1 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Abbie Kessler, Secretary

Comments/questions submitted by Peter Doehring in advance of the meeting.

Questions I have asked at previous Trails and Sidewalks Committee (TSC) meetings that remain unanswered

- May 2021: I developed an alternative proposal intended to make Chandler Mill Road (CMR) safer for most cyclists. And submitted this to TSC and to the Board of Supervisors *Yet to be reviewed by either committee*
- September/October 2021:
  - Ultimate ROW: A response in a question indicated that the discussions re ultimate right of way were ongoing. *Has the township completed discussions and has the Ultimate ROW been acquired from all landowners in order to move ahead with the proposed design?*
  - Based on a review of existing guidelines, I concluded that the proposed design cannot be considered a shared use path, unless it is 10' wide. The exception claimed by McMahon for sections 8' wide does not apply because the sections on CMR are too long. *Will the consultants continue to claim that the path is suitable for cyclists?*
  - Based on a review of existing guidelines, I also proposed that the trail might be narrowed to 3-4' as long as other requirements re passing spaces are met. This could significantly reduce the cost and environmental impact without impacting the function since cyclists cannot use the path. Evidence for the counter-claim that this would not be supported has not been presented. *How much money and how many trees might be saved with a narrower path?*
  - Based on a discussion with the consultants and a review of other guidelines, I argued that the current projections of the environmental impact is a significant underestimate, because the criteria only results in a count of the trees which must be removed (based on 30% destruction to the critical root zone). Trees that have 15-29% destruction of the CRT are not counted, and the costs of protecting them are not calculated. *How many other trees will be damaged, how significant is the damage, and what is the cost of protecting them?*

Questions that I was unable to ask at the November/December meetings because these were canceled

- *What are the results of the new traffic study? What speed reductions do they demonstrate as motorists are entering the one-way sections? Do these offer alternatives for controlling speed in sections with limited sight distance, and potentially make CMR safer for some cyclists (and also rendering a LTS 2 rating more appropriate)?*
- *How was the decision reached to put off construction for a year? Why was this not discussed and voted on by the committee?*
- *Does the cost of the proposed design for CMR include re-paving the entire road?*

Questions that I am asking at the January 4, 2022 meeting

- As stated at the 1/3/22 BOS meeting, my review of committee appointments suggests that Tom Janton's and Tim Peterson's appointments are not currently valid, given how the bylaws are written, how their positions are described, and what appointments have been approved by the BOS. *What solutions are proposed that are appropriate, given the precedent set with LCAC whereby LCAC committee members were stripped of their committee assignments under similar circumstances?*
- *Can these meetings be recorded to ensure that questions like these and the answers (or lack thereof) are duly noted?*