

**Rader, Jeff**

From: Ed McBrayer [[edwin@pathfoundation.org](mailto:edwin@pathfoundation.org)]  
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2008 11 :25 AM  
To: Rader, Jeff  
Cc: 'Rader, Jeff'  
Subject: South Peachtree Creek Trail

Good morning *Jeff*:

Sorry I couldn't make the meeting yesterday. Pete and I have to divide and conquer some days.

After hearing the reports from Pete and Matt, I have concerns about the path we are taking at this point. I know you and I both have years of experience with NIMBY situations so my comments may not be new material. Please accept them as constructive ideas regarding our implementation strategy for the project.

1. The opposition is throwing everything imaginable against the wall to see if anything sticks. Keep in mind **THEY DO NOT WANT THESE CONCERNS SOLVED**. This would mean the project moves forward. If we satisfy one "concern" they will . simply cross that one off and move to something else.
2. They ask the same questions ten different ways to keep us doing busy work and hopefully not constructing anything.
3. The questions are presented such that each answer automatically creates ten new questions. Here's an example:

"What are you doing about the runoff?" If we present the technical data & plans, it leads to scrutiny of the data and plans which in turn leads to scrutiny of the criteria from which the technical data was derived. This approach does not conclude with implementation.

The answerable question is "Are you complying with all federal, state, and County regulations regarding erosion, sedimentation and runoff control?" Answer YES.

By the way, We are paving a total of 11,400 sq. ft in the 22 acre park that the opposition is so concerned about.

**Any two of their homes has more impervious surface than this.** So the question could be, what are they doing about runoff from their homes?

4. It is my contention that the only people wanting more data are the ones looking for a kink in the armor, not someone seeking information. They have tried EPD, Army Corps of Engineers, County Development Dept., Fish & Wildlife, Historic Preservation Office, CSX, the Board of Commissioners, The CEO, the Media, our

PLAINTIFF'S  
EXHIBIT

2

donors, and now the Little League saying we are destroying one of the last ballfields in the County. So far they have not found a kink but providing them with a website full of plans, details etc gives them infinitely more chances to manufacture something.

5. We have responded to every reasonable, logical idea presented by the neighbors, dramatically increasing the cost and complexity of the project:

We moved the alignment from ending at Willivee Circle to following the Creek (This was the major contention 7 years ago)

We replaced over 50% of the trail with boardwalk through the forest  
We extended the trail to Medlock Park (parking area) to remove the parking issue from their concern list. (Looking back, this was likely only a "concern" if it stopped the trail from being built)

We moved the Willivee Crossing which was originally at the Creek.  
We are facilitating plant rescue along the alignment  
We are re-evaluating the route within Medlock Park to see if we can keep from clipping the corner of the ball field.

In summary, you indicated to us 6-8 months ago that we would have a couple of steering committee meetings before construction and one during. We've met, addressed questions, made changes, had a community meeting, spent another \$10-20K making posters and drawing concepts, and obtained permits that we didn't technically have to obtain. It's time to build this.

We are prepared to tour the alignment with the steering committee members before we start construction, and we welcome their input during the implementation phase. Please tell me we have satisfied the public outreach phase of the project.

Thanks for your support.

Ed

Another example

The opposition has put out the word that we are ruining the ball field in Medlock Park by putting a trail through it.