

SOUTH PEACHTREE CREEK NATURE PRESERVES, INC.  
P.O. BOX 33247  
DECATUR, GA 30033  
(404) 728-1411

355-6438

December 6, 1995

Mr. Edward McBrayer  
The PATH Foundation  
P.O. Box 14327  
Atlanta, GA 30324

Dear Ed:

It was a pleasure to see you at the last meeting of the South Peachtree Creek Nature Preserves, Inc. You are doing excellent work and the Board appreciated your thoughtful presentation.

I believe the prospect of working together is exciting for everyone in our organization. So much so, a smaller liaison group from our board was formed to discuss and deal with the practical details of how we might structure such an association.

As you mentioned, though PATH has explored working with land trusts before, I understand that this would be the first time that PATH has actually participated directly with a community land trust on a project. It would seem that the SPCNP project presents a good place to start. Similarly, it would present a unique opportunity for us also.

Like all good working relationships, I have always found it helpful to try to define everyone's role as clearly as possible on the front end. With the possibility of jointly pursuing the project under the Olympic umbrella I thought it would be appropriate to raise several matters for your consideration and comment. These have been summarized in the attached. I think they represent the central considerations which the board has asked me to relate. I am sure there are issues from PATH's perspective we need to discuss so please let me know.

Again, on behalf of everyone with SPCNP, we appreciate you opening the door to working on this project together. Overall, I hope we can take advantage of each other's strengths and shared vision to make the multi-use trail a reality. Please call at 728-1411 or 240-1545 so we can discuss these items further.

Sincerely,



Thomas E. Gould, President

## SPCNP/PATH MULTITUSE TRAIL CONSIDERATIONS

### 1. Scope of Participation.

I am attaching a copy of the vision statement from SPCNP. As you will note, in addition to "1. [ ] preserv[ing] and protect[ing] natural spaces along South Peachtree Creek" and "2. [ ] offer[ing] educational and recreational opportunities appropriate to these areas," the objectives of the SPCNP include "3. [ ] provid[ing] suitable access to these spaces" and "4. [ ] alternative transportation routes." The latter two objectives would seem to fit with PATH's objectives, so our efforts look substantially the same.

PATH's proven success and recognized expertise in the planning and construction of the alternative transportation routes would help accomplish these goals and, in our view, be mutually advantageous to take advantage of such expertise. But, due to the sensitivity of the area and our goal to protect the natural spaces along South Peachtree, it would be important for us to help with decisions regarding "greenway" issues. So, some understanding of how such decisions are made is helpful. Do you have guidelines and criteria that guide such decisions?

### 2. Communication.

At present the SPCNP's Board of Directors meets monthly on the second Tuesday of each month, though it has not been unusual for us to meet several times a month. I would think it would be appropriate for you or a representative of PATH to serve on the board. For matters that arise and require an update between board meetings, I would think these could be dealt with informally between you and I as the respective heads of our organizations.

### 3. Criteria for Selecting Route of Path.

We have recently undertaken a "survey" of the potential trail route and reviewed several alternatives with DeKalb County. Could you provide SPCNP with a general priority list for the criteria that PATH utilizes when it selects the route of a path? That would help us in our initial efforts.

### 4. Criteria for Construction of Path.

With regard to the design and construction specifications for the route, I realize some of these may be dictated by DOT standards. Additionally, I would think PATH may

also have certain preferences within the range of options allowed by the DOT for ISTEA projects. Your comments and any related materials on these would be greatly appreciated. If there is anything specific as to flood plain areas (boardwalk criteria, for instance) that would be very much appreciated.

5. Selection and Supervision of Subcontractors.

Certainly, when it comes to the selection and supervision of subcontractors for the project, I would expect great deference would be given to PATH based upon its expertise. SPCNP has worked successfully with several professionals in our initial efforts and would like to know how they could become potential subcontractors on this project and possibly get preferential treatment in the bidding process.

6. Environmental Considerations.

As we discussed at our last meeting, the SPCNP has multiple objectives, but all with an environmental focus. SPCNP recognizes that alternative transportation can be an end in and of itself, but can also be a means of allowing the public to enjoy an area of green space which may not otherwise generate sufficient public support for preservation. Consequently, the SPCNP views the prospect of environmental preservation and inter modal transportation as being at least complementary objectives.

I raise the above issue because you candidly noted that running a route through a flood plain may become, at points, problematic. I think it is reasonable to foresee there being some point or several points along the route where two alternative courses present themselves, both being feasible, but the one leads away from the South Peachtree Creek's green space. It would be our bias to choose the one staying in the green space even if it presents more problems. Could we work together in the planning stage, drawing on your experience, to arrange the trail route with this in mind?

7. Other Path Projects.

Due to time constraints, we did not have much of an opportunity to discuss the possibility of whether the SPCNP route could link up with any of PATH's current projects or potential future projects. If so, in the context of these, do you foresee this as affecting PATH's participation with SPCNP?

**The South Peachtree Creek Nature Preserves, Inc.**

**Vision Statement**

*and protect*  
To preserve natural spaces along South Peachtree Creek, including adjacent floodplains and wetlands and their native fauna and flora.

To offer to the public educational and recreational opportunities appropriate to these areas.

To provide suitable access to these spaces with special consideration for the physically challenged.

To explore the possibility of alternative transportation routes for bicycle and pedestrian traffic, linking commercial, educational and residential centers to these natural spaces.