

I. ROLE OF ELECTED RCC CHAIRPERSONS

The new voting structure of the Regional Citizens Committee (RCC) is not consistent with the Public Participation Plan (PPP). The officers of the RCC were elected under rules spelled out in the PPP, which do NOT give these officers the authority to assign all other votes.

The PPP (attachment 07047.pdf) allows the RCC to elect a chairperson and a vice-chairperson. The chair and vice-chair may appoint committee chairs. However, according to the PPP, the voting rights of the committee members are earned by certain patterns of attendance, not by appointment.

While the chair and vice-chair were nominated and elected unanimously, they were not elected for the role of assigning all other votes, assigning membership to subcommittees, or making alterations to the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) PPP. This is a significant deviation from the process detailed in the PPP.

Questions:

- a. Please explain the current status of the PPP. Does DVRPC consider the PPP to still be in force, in clear contradiction to the current facts on the ground?
- b. Are there plans to update the PPP to reflect the actual structure of the RCC subcommittees?
- c. Please provide the policy that under your interpretation allows the DVRPC to alter the structure of the RCC without updating the PPP.

II. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

In January, Aissia Richardson stated that she would be leading a task force to recommend changes to the RCC. The minutes report that these recommendations would be reported to the RCC. In the February meeting, the changes were made with no further input from the RCC.

It is deeply unsettling that the chair of the RCC, nominated by a committee that she appoints, elected unanimously without written ballots as required by the previously distributed nominating procedures (see page 14), offers to make recommendations to the RCC and then returns with new and sudden authority to appoint all subcommittee votes. A previous PA-RTKL request has revealed that there were no minutes taken at the "executive committee" meeting (see page 35).

Questions:

- a. What were the original recommendations, if any?
- b. Who made the decision to bypass the RCC, as originally stated, and make the recommendations policy without ratification by the RCC membership?
- c. Why wasn't the RCC given the opportunity to review the recommendations?
- d. Which DVRPC staff aside from Candace Synder were involved in the policy changes of DVRPC's PPP at the RCC, in addition to the elected chair and vice chairs of the RCC?

III. RCC CHANGE IMPLEMENTATION

The reasons given for implementing the new voting structure are inconsistent.

Several reasons have been given (by Ms. Snyder and RCC officials) to support the re-distribution of voting rights:

- To improve geographic, cultural, or other unspecified measure of diversity
- To improve attendance
- To eliminate "limited focus" voting

In addition, similar criteria have been mentioned in qualifying a member for voting rights:

- The individual's "diversity."
- The length of service of the individual
- The "exhibited knowledge of a particular subject area."

These are hardly measurable outcomes, nor are the criteria objective. However, I assume some level of research has been performed to reach these conclusions, which I would like explained.

Questions:

- a. Who determined that the individuals currently serving on the Action Task Force, with voting rights, met the qualifications you've laid out?
- b. What geographic, ethnic, and cultural interests did the DVRPC seek to represent when it made these changes?
- c. The 12/2010 meeting minutes (see page 27 of this document) state that "*Staff will provide a breakdown of membership by location, as well as by other demographic information.*" While Staff has provided the RCC membership and public with a list of voting subcommittee members by geographic location, other demographic information has not been produced. Please provide a list of the other demographic information of the subcommittee membership.
- d. How has attendance been improved through the new voting structure and subcommittee membership criteria?

IV. RCC DIVERSITY

The new voting structure results in less diversity, not more.

The city of Philadelphia encompasses a more diverse population in all of the following metrics: race, ethnicity, language, disabilities, available modes of transportation, preferred modes of transportation, etc. Prior to the voting change, the RCC could contain an unlimited number of voters from Philadelphia. Under the new program, only 2 are allowed voting rights. Attendance issues aside, it is unfathomable that limiting subcommittees to 2 members from such a diverse area, where previously there were no limits, can lead to more diversity rather than less.

Despite this obvious flaw, in your email you state: *"Our efforts, along with those of the RCC officers and various members, have brought a more diverse audience to meetings."*

Questions:

- a. When you write "audience", is the implication that this diversity is NOT present in the voting members?
- b. Aside from suspending the LRPTF, can you detail these efforts?
- c. Which members participated in these efforts?
- d. Please provide a reference to any of the RCC minutes that document these efforts.
- b. How was this "more diverse audience" determined?
- c. Which LEP populations were present in this "more diverse audience?"
- d. Describe any outreach that was performed to residents speaking the following languages: Spanish, Chinese, Polish, Russian, Korean, Vietnamese, Arabic and French.

V. FOCUS OF LRPTF DISCUSSIONS

The "limited focus" of the LRPTF is a symptom of the structural problems of the RCC meetings, not the cause of these problems. Nevertheless, the discussions that took place in the LRPTF still constitute public input, which has now been eliminated.

Despite being given only approximately 30 minutes a month to discuss long range issues (see page 35), the LRPTF was quite productive. In your email, you state the following:

"No initiatives were brought to the RCC except for those related to SEPTA, Newtown, Jenkintown, and trails in very specific locations within Montgomery and Bucks counties. There was no one attending from New Jersey; there was no diversity whatsoever; and the focus of the group had become very limited. The goal of the LRP Task Force is to work with DVRPC staff and provide input to the regional plan; this was not being achieved in the task force's former iteration."

I'd like to point out that over the course of the last year, there were at least THREE other major discussions on trails, none of which was initiated by the LRPTF:

- July 2010 - A presentation by the Schuylkill River Development Corporation, with extensive time spent discussing trails.
- September 2010 - Jim Richardson made an announcement about a trail opening in Chester County.
- January 2011 - DVRPC Senior Environmental Planner Chris Linn gave a presentation on trails.

Finally, the perceived ineffectiveness of the LRPTF was in part due to the frequent overlapping of time by the Action Task Force, chaired by Aissia Richardson, into scheduled LRPTF meeting time.

Questions:

- a. Why are "initiatives brought to the RCC... related to SEPTA, Newtown, Jenkintown, and trails" being discouraged?
- b. Do the above subject discussions not constitute public input, after all?
- c. How was it determined that "there was no diversity whatsoever?"
- d. If the goal of the LRPTF is to provide input to the regional plan, and the LRPTF was bringing initiatives concerning SEPTA, a regional agency, how exactly is this not consistent with the goal?
- e. In any case, how is the goal above being furthered in the absence of the LRPTF?
- f. Since you mentioned Newtown (although it is only sparsely covered in ANY meeting minutes, if at all), exactly why is this subject so unwelcome as "input", recognizing that Newtown is currently one of the largest and nearest (to job centers) towns in the region without meaningful access to public transportation?

g. Despite extensive time being devoted to discussion of trails, only the discussion at the LRPTF was deemed objectionable by the RCC officials. What is the difference?

h. Please define "working with DVRPC staff." Please also note regarding the rails-with-trails initiative as developed by the LRPTF, several requests were made for the subcommittee to meet with DVRPC staff for further input, development and refinement of this concept. Despite ongoing request for this meeting, most recently made by me in April 2011, this meeting has not taken place, nor have I received a response from you offering to reschedule the meeting.

VI. SUBCOMMITTEE AGENDAS

The agenda of any subcommittee is determined not by interested RCC members, but by either the DVRPC staff, Jim Richardson, or Aissia Richardson. This effectively eliminates all public participation that is not approved by the DVRPC staff or the Chair/Vice-Chairs of the RCC.

On November 12, 2010, I was discouraged by Jim Richardson from presenting a map to the LRPTF. Most disturbingly, Jim responded, "I am willing and available to use my access to these people to help give your interests a fair hearing." (see page 33). In a subsequent reply, Candace Snyder pointed out, among other things, that "The RCC's agenda is set by the chair and staff; not by individuals or groups." (see page 32).

On December 10, 2011 another attempt was made by Jim Richardson to reduce the allotted time of this meeting by proposing a 5 minute discussion called "Funding the Gap" (see page 35). Ultimately, this subject was not addressed because the earlier Action Task Force meeting ran over its allotted time.

On December 12, 2010, John Pawson presented a specific agenda for the LRPTF. After John emailed the RCC, Vice Chair Jim Richardson proposed an alternate agenda. The agenda that Jim proposed contained no substantive issues whatsoever - the entire time was to be devoted to process discussion. The email is attached (see page 28).

Questions:

- a. What special access has been provided to Jim Richardson that is not available to the general membership of the RCC, or the public?
- b. How is the requirement for public input satisfied, when the chair, vice chair, and staff act as gatekeepers for the agenda and determine which ideas are presented and which ones are not?
- c. When an appointed subcommittee chair's agenda is completely replaced by the RCC vice chair's, and the vice chair's proposed agenda is completely devoid of any substance and focused only on process, how can public input at the subcommittee level be achieved?

Jon Frey

From: Snyder, Candy [csnyder@dvrpc.org]
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2011 12:32 PM
To: jfrey40535@gmail.com
Cc: henry.droughter@dot.gov; mattkelly@state.pa.us; Aissia Richardson; Meconi, Jane
Subject: RE: RCC Participation Questions

Jon:

In response to your email, I would like to clarify a couple of points. When I said that we would talk at the April 19th RCC meeting, I meant that I would speak in person with you to answer your questions. I never indicated that this would be an agenda item for the entire committee to discuss. I didn't feel the need to open this up to the committee again because we have addressed these points at the last two RCC meetings.

I don't believe that the path that we are now taking will in any way hamper us in attracting a diverse group of individuals to the table. In fact, as you will note, the attendance at meetings has increased significantly over the past three months. Our efforts, along with those of the RCC officers and various members, have brought a more diverse audience to meetings.

As I'm sure you will recall, the Long-Range Plan Task Force, in particular, was comprised of representatives only from Philadelphia, and Montgomery and Bucks counties. No initiatives were brought to the RCC except for those related to SEPTA, Newtown, Jenkintown, and trails in very specific locations within Montgomery and Bucks counties. There was no one attending from New Jersey; there was no diversity whatsoever; and the focus of the group had become very limited. The goal of the LRP Task Force is to work with DVRPC staff and provide input to the regional plan; this was not being achieved in the task force's former iteration.

Decisions regarding who serves at the task force or subcommittee level are made by the RCC officers (whom the RCC unanimously elected/endorsed in January) with input from DVRPC staff. These decisions are based upon geographic and cultural diversity; length of service on the committee; and exhibited knowledge of a particular subject area. The listing of these appointments is included in every RCC mailing and posted on the web.

The controls that allow the new procedure to function are inherent in those individuals who vote at the task force level – representing various geographic, ethnic, and cultural interests. And, as you know, the full RCC has the right to question or discuss any issue further, if it deems it necessary. In addition, any individual may voice their own concerns to a DVRPC Board member or the Board as a whole at their monthly meetings.

I hope this addresses your concerns.

Candace Snyder
DVRPC
Director, Office of Communications and Public Affairs
Phone ... 215-238-2875
Fax ... 215-592-9125
Email ... csnyder@dvrpc.org
Follow us on Twitter ... www.twitter.com/DVRPC

From: jfrey40535 [mailto:jfrey40535@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2011 9:00 AM
To: Snyder, Candy
Cc: henry.droughter@dot.gov
Subject: RCC Participation Questions
Importance: High

Ms. Snyder:

Previously we discussed the changes to the Regional Citizens Committee (RCC) voting procedures and subcommittee membership, as well as the policy under which voting rights and appointments to the subcommittees are made. You mentioned you would prefer to speak about this at the April 17, 2011 meeting. I downloaded the meeting minutes from April, and these issues are not mentioned.

I would like to have these questions thoroughly answered before the May 17 RCC meeting. There are many members of the RCC aside from myself who would like to have answers to these lingering issues. I respectfully ask that you provide an answer to these questions, in writing.

I feel that this is a very important issue, because it has considerable impact on the makeup of the RCC and the ability of the RCC to attract a diverse group of citizens who can actively participate and contribute to the regional planning process. The Action Task Force and Long Range Action Task Force (currently suspended) are two such examples where subcommittee members generate action items for the general committee. In order to remain unbiased, diverse, and open to all citizens, the RCC must have a transparent voting process, and at the moment we are unsure about the current procedures and controls for selecting voting members. Transparency is the foundation for fair representation.

I have reduced my list of questions to the following:

1. What controls are in place to ensure that input is unbiased at the subcommittee level of the RCC, where voting rights and membership is appointed?
2. What is the process for selecting one member over another from a particular area, for membership to a subcommittee and rights to vote on items at the subcommittee level?
3. What parties or individuals make the decisions as to who is or is not appointed to be a member of a subcommittee, and have the ability to vote on action items? Are records of these appointments available to the general RCC membership (and the public)?

Thank you for your understanding and attention to these concerns,

Jon Frey
PA-TEC
P.O. Box 76
Southampton, PA 18966
www.PA-TEC.org
Office/Mobile: (215)634-2997

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE DVRPC REGIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 16, 2010**

Present: Aissia Richardson (Chair); Wanda Stuart, Guy Aiman, John Johnson, David Hojsak, Terri Falbo, Jeff Knowles, John Nacchio, Tom Cooper, Ernest Cohen, Elaine Cohen, Andy Sharpe, Bob Machler, John Pawson, Lorraine Brill, Bridget Chadwick, Jon Frey, Susanne Whitehead, William Faltermayer, Jim Richardson, Tom McHugh, John Burkhardt, Warren Strumpfer, Larry Menkes, Cheryl Tumola, Ray Rauanheimo, Pat Mulligan, Dennis Winters, Sue Herman, Kathryn Garza, Kathy Zukoski (citizens); Candy Snyder, Jane Meconi, Karin Morris, Chloe Maher (staff); Andrew Dolby, Alice Wright Bailey, Melissa Jest, Martin Cohen, Linda Richardson (guests).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the October 12, 2010 RCC meeting were approved as mailed.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

There will be a special RCC, scheduled for December 15, 2010 at 12 Noon in DVRPC's Conference Room, at which time the election of the 2011 Chair will take place. Barry Seymour will discuss the FY12 DVRPC Work Program process, and Patty Elkins will present *The Economic Value of Open Space*, a study recently completed by DVRPC and the GreenSpace Alliance.

The Long-Range Task Force will meet on December 15 at 11AM in the DVRPC Conference Room. No other task forces will meet.

The Nominating Committee was appointed by the Chair and includes John Burkhardt, Jim Richardson, Warren Strumpfer, Kathryn Garza, and Sue Herman. The Committee will meet prior to the December 15, 2010 RCC meeting at 11:30AM to determine the slate of nominees. Anyone interested in running for chair should contact John Burkhardt at 610-495-7942 or bevburkhardt@comcast.net. RCC nominating procedures are attached.

CHAIR'S REPORT:

Aissia Richardson submitted the attached report.

RTC REPORT:

Jim Richardson submitted the attached report.

Warren Strumpfer asked for a clarification regarding DVRPC's administrative role in Transportation Management Associations.

(NOTE: Upon checking with Dr. Don Shanis, DVRPC's Deputy Executive Director, these administrative duties would include processing invoices and payments, and posting progress reports. However, there is the possibility that the North Jersey MPO may handle this for all New Jersey TMAs so this has yet to be determined.)

REPORTS FROM RCC REPRESENTATIVES TO OTHER COMMITTEES:

Lorraine Brill attended the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Committee meeting. Participants received various documents describing current CMP methodology and proposed changes in data resources and software.

Dennis Winters and Andy Sharpe attended the October 21, 2010 Special RCC Meeting/Public Listening Session on Environmental Justice in Chester, PA; Warren Strumpfer, Pat Mulligan and Jim Richardson attended the October 27, 2010 Special RCC Meeting/Public Listening Session in Collingswood New Jersey. Jane Meconi noted that these meetings have been successful in getting the word out about DVRPC and the RCC, and more meetings will be scheduled in the spring.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: THE PRESERVATION AND PROMOTION OF PHILADELPHIA'S HISTORIC/CULTURAL SITES:

Melissa Jest, Preservation Alliance Neighborhood Coordinator and Field Representative for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, presented an overview of the Preservation Alliance's work on behalf of cultural and historical sites in the Greater Philadelphia region. The Preservation Alliance's main focus is advocacy on behalf of preserving historic and cultural sites in Philadelphia (see fieldnotesphilly.wordpress.com), as well as an educational component for the general public, such as walking tours, the Old House Fair (scheduled for March 26, 2011), and working with Community Development Corporations and community organizations.

Ms. Jest also highlighted the Preservation Alliance's African American Historic Sites Initiative, which is a multi-layered program that promotes access and preservation of African American cultural and historic sites, the utilization of historic preservation as a means for neighborhood stabilization and development, and the development of partnerships to promote the program in the region and beyond. Some sites include the Legendary Blue Horizon, the Marian Anderson Residence Museum, the Paul Robeson House, The Uptown Theater, The Johnson House, the John Coltrane House and Tindley Temple. As part of the program, a series of advisory workshops were held which highlighted interpretive strategies and marketing, and also surveyed how these organizations could raise funding, recruit volunteers and board members, and track information. The benefit of participating in the initiative is that promoting your historic site as one of a series can have a beneficial aspect that promoting your site alone, and that historic sites with common themes are easier to promote when bundled together.

Discussion: The development of a "trail" (bicycle, walking etc.) was discussed to link historic sites. Other issues included merging historical sites with for-profit ventures; the linking of sustainability practices and historic preservation, particularly energy efficiency; and utilizing technology to promote the historic and cultural sites.

STAFF PRESENTATION: SMART GROWTH AND AN AGE-FRIENDLY REGION:

Karin Morris, Manager, DVRPC Office of Smart Growth, presented an issue that will impact the Greater Philadelphia region in the coming years: the aging of its citizens and the movement to create a built environment that is amenable to aging in place, particularly through smart growth principles. Smart growth recognizes the impact transportation investments have on land use and community form, revitalizes existing urban centers and older towns, preserves open space, and focuses on human-scale, street-level urbanism – walking, biking and transit. including denser housing development, transit-oriented development and universal design principles. Ms. Morris

noted that the Age 65+ cohort is the fastest growing group in the region, and the age 85+ cohort will also increase dramatically in the coming years.

Aging households have lower incomes and are more likely to live in poverty than younger households. Also, senior renters and owners pay more of their income towards housing.

Additionally, most of the region's elderly live in suburban single-family homes, which are not designed for older people and make accessing health services more difficult.

All of DVRPC's work supports the EPA's Principles for Building Healthy Communities for Active Aging:

1. Social Connectedness
2. Access to Transportation
3. Flexible Housing Options
4. Access to Healthy Foods

DVRPC's "Aging of the Baby Boomers: Housing Seniors in the Delaware Valley" report recommended enhancing and expanding affordable housing for the elderly and near elderly near public transit and services, including encouraging Transit-Oriented Development and co-housing opportunities. Aging in place policies can include flexible zoning codes that allow for shared housing and accessory dwelling units. Future work and collaboration in this area is to integrate aging issues more explicitly in DVRPC studies, enable collaboration between the city and suburbs, and study demand for senior housing.

Discussion: RCC members discussed Naturally Occurring Retirement Communities (NORCs) and the growing development of Active Adult Communities, as well as the challenges those types of communities may face as their population ages. The importance of transit and pedestrian safety, particularly for older people, was reiterated. Transit accessibility for older residents was also mentioned.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Task Force: The Action Task Force (ATF) met prior to the RCC meeting and developed RCC recommendations for Board Action Items (attached).

Note: Board Action Items are no longer voted on at the primary RCC meeting.

Long-Range Plan Task Force:

Members discussed prioritization criteria for projects. There was also continued discussion regarding the TIP ranking process, and whether TIP projects should be evaluated similarly to CMAQ projects.

Funding of transportation projects continues to be a top issue. The RCC Chair will consider appointing a task force on Transportation Funding in the new year.

The DVRPC FY12 Work Program proposal: Feasibility Study for Interstate Highway Improvement Financing Options in Southeastern Pennsylvania (attached) was reviewed, and the following action was passed:

ADDITIONAL ACTION TAKEN BY THE RCC:

The RCC expresses its support for the proposed Feasibility Study for Interstate Highway Improvement Financing Options in Southeastern Pennsylvania work program proposal.

In today's climate of increasingly scarce funding, efforts like this to increase and streamline financing is important.

The RCC strongly recommends that similar work on all modes of transportation spending and funding be undertaken as well.

Work Program Task Force: The next meeting will be held on January 19, 2011.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Kathryn Garza distributed information regarding the Marcellus Shale fracking issue.

DVRPC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. DVRPC's website may be translated into Spanish, Russian, and Traditional Chinese online by visiting www.dvrpc.org. Publications and other public documents can be made available in alternative languages or formats, if requested. For more information, please call (215) 238-2871.

RCC NOMINATING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

1. The Nominating Committee shall be appointed in October. The RCC Chair shall appoint 3-5 members to the Committee, representing a geographic diversity, and instruct the Committee regarding its duties.
2. A majority quorum of the Nominating Committee shall hold at least one face to face meeting to select its own chair, to discuss nominees for the position of RCC Chair and to complete its mission.
3. The Nominating Committee shall report nominee(s) in an unbiased manner to the RCC in November.
4. The election of the Chair shall be held at the November RCC meeting. The first order of business at the November meeting shall be the election of the Chair.
5. If for any reason the election is delayed, the Chair shall take office immediately following the election whenever it occurs.
6. The term of office for all officers shall be one year or until newly elected officers take over.
7. The term of office shall run from January 1 to December 31 of each year.
8. The term of office shall be limited to three consecutive complete terms.
9. The newly elected Chair shall nominate the other key officers (Vice Chair(s) and Representative to the Regional Transportation Committee - RTC) at the meeting following the election. An election shall then be held with nominations for these positions also accepted from the floor.
10. Subcommittees shall elect their own chairs at the first meeting of each calendar year.
11. Proxy ballots shall not be permitted; RCC members must be present for presentations and/or discussions in order to vote on the RCC written ballot.

November 16, 2010
RCC – Chair's Report
Submitted by Aissia Richardson

1. Attended October 28 Board meeting & presented a report on RCC activities. There were no TIP actions to approve:
 - a. The Board approved the 13 recommended projects selected by the RTC Pennsylvania Subcommittee to forward to PennDOT as DVRPC's recommended Pennsylvania Community Transportation Initiatives projects for our region. *I thanked Jim Richardson for reviewing 60 of the 69 projects and providing RCC recommendations to the board.*
 - b. Reports were given by Board Members and alternates on the activities of their counties/agencies. *Phila. - South Street bridge reopens 11/6; Mercer – Bi-Annual conference on Sustainable Development/Urban Forestry www.arborday.org; Camden- Cooper/Rowan medical school groundbreaking, Rutgers new dorm; Chester – proud of Chester Valley Trail quality of life addition; Delaware – Open Space purchase, Elwyn Institute Land; SEPTA-SLVs first revenue run 10/29; New Jersey – NY/NJ tunnel killed by NJ due to lack of funding; Montgomery-Transportation Authority created re feasibility of Norristown turnpike interchange.*
 - c. The Regional Citizens Committee (RCC) Chair reported the activities of the RCC Meeting of October 12, 2010. *I spoke about the presentations from Martin Kotsch on clean air conformity; Allison Hastings on Food System grants; upcoming presentations from Preservation Alliance and GPMTTC.*
 - d. The following presentations were made to the Board: (1) *Overview of Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority's (SEPTA) American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Projects. Forty stations in state of good repair. Great report would RCC like to have presentation?* (2) *The Economic Value of Open Space. I asked staff to arrange presentation from Patty Elkins on Economic Value of Open Space. Public launch 11/16 @ Valley Forge National Park.*
 - e. The Executive Director reported on the following items: (1) Summary Notes from the Annual Board Retreat; (2) Mid-Atlantic Roundtable; (3) PennDOT Planning Partners Meeting; (4) Economy League Scenario exercise; (5) Central New Jersey Forum; (6) Regional Economic Development Forum; (7) Board Policy Analysis Committee Meeting scheduled for November 18; and (8) results of recent grant applications – *Two projects funded. EPA Regional Energy Circuit rider; PA statewide to promote broadband. Tiger II funding for Dillworth Plaza renovations.*
 - f. The following Committee Highlights were distributed to the Board for their review: (1) Planning Coordinating Committee/Regional Transportation Committee; and (2) Delaware Valley Goods Movement Task Force. *I attended 11/14 event on Future Freight Flows that had 4 scenarios for 2040 and asked participants to prioritize funding. Will ask Ted Dahlberg to present to RCC once MIT prepares findings.*
 - g. The Executive committee authorized the Executive Director to enter into, negotiate and execute a contract with Aloysius, Butler and Clark for design and printing services for TransitChek. If such negotiations prove not to meet the financial

requirements of the Commission, to proceed on to negotiations with Monroe, the second-ranked firm.

- h. The FY 2011 DVRPC Planning Work Program First Quarter Report was distributed to the Executive Committee for their review. *I attended two Board Work Program committee meetings on 10/14 and 10/28. I am pleased to report two projects from the RCC have been accepted as work programs. Accessibility and Mobility Report including Transit Oriented Services. Environmental Justice Mapping revisions. The FY 12 Draft Work Program will be prepared in December for comments. Final version will be completed in January.*

2. *Election of Officers will be in December.*

Summary of RTC Meeting 11.9.10 - Jim Richardson, RCC Representative

The committee reviewed and approved a rather large slate of TIP Action items. Tom Wospil, Director of Capital Investment, Planning and Development for NJ DOT informed the committee that NJ has revised their planning process and will be submitting TIP amendments and modifications on a quarterly basis. So we are likely to see a batch of these coming in four times during the year.

Several members and Don Shanis (DVRPC) expressed concern about recent right-of-way expense increases for projects related to Route 42 (NJ10-39a and NJ0-39b). Circumstances suggest a possibility of land owners seeking to benefit unfairly from recent revisions of the course of an intersection. Don requested additional information on the increase and this was promised from NJ DOT.

An interesting point was made by Tony Fauver, PennDOT Deputy Secretary for Local Area Transportation, regarding the Coatsville Train Station Rehabilitation project (PA11-03). This station is one of several potential rehab projects along the Amtrak Keystone Corridor and was chosen for rehab now because the Paoli and Ardmore stations would be so much more expensive to rehab that it is not practical to tackle them now. Leo Bagley of Montgomery County made a point of praising the positive impact on ridership that previous station improvements have made.

Of great interest to RCC members concerned about the impact of climate change on regional transportation infrastructure, RTC saw a brief presentation on a related work program amendment. Namely, an FHWA program to create a conceptual model for conducting climate change vulnerability and risk assessments. Several states, including New Jersey were selected to do pilot programs. For more information, go to http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/climate/conceptual_model62410.htm. A TIP action draft was also prepared.

Chick Dougherty provided a summary of activity at the annual meeting of all Pennsylvania MPOs, RPOs, and Central Office representatives. Areas addressed included new linkage between planning and the NEPA process. This change helps address concerns often expressed by RCC members who want to see environmental issues addressed early in the project planning and design processes.

Sarah Oakes presented finalists for special studies funding and the PA sub-committee met during lunch to discuss and approve them. Results of that meeting were:

- Next fiscal year's call for projects will include provision that entity submitting a special study for consideration must also pledge to provide match.
- Each project had a sponsor that agreed to provide match. There are no region-wide special studies.
- The Clean Air Council will provide draft survey for consideration by the Subcommittee and will collaborate with DVRPC so that survey questions do not overlap or duplicate DVRPC's upcoming SEPTA survey project.
- The SEPTA Design Standards project budget was reduced by \$10,000 to \$70,000.
- The City of Philadelphia's Archive project was not approved unanimously, there were two no votes and one abstention.
- Chester County will hire consultant to perform work of Atglen Feasibility Study
- The \$10,000 remaining in the special studies budget will be divided equally among member governments. Each Member Government will get an additional \$2,000 each this year only. FY 13 Base core budgets will revert to FY 11 amounts pending Special Study submissions for FY 13.

Lastly, Don Shanis announced that NJ DOT has invited DVRPC to provide administrative oversight of the NJ TMAs.

**DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
REGIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE
HIGHLIGHTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RCC ACTION TASK FORCE
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 16, 2010**

PRESENT: Tom McHugh, Sue Herman, Aissia Richardson, Susanne Whitehead, Jim Richardson, John Pawson, William Faltermayer, Larry Menkes, Dennis Winters, Lorraine Brill, Bridget Chadwick, Warren Strumpfer, Bob Machler, John Burkhardt (citizens); Jane Meconi, Gastonia Anderson, Elizabeth Schoonmaker, Candy Snyder, Rob Graff (staff)

PA11-03: Coatesville Train Station Rehabilitation (MPMS #87534), Chester County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA11-03, PennDOT's request to amend the FY2011-2014 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding the Coatesville Train Station Rehabilitation project (MPMS# 87534), back into the TIP and increasing the FY11 engineering, right of way, and construction phase by \$15,687,500 (\$4,679,014 Section 5309/ \$7,870,986 Section 5307/ \$2,890,000 State/\$247,500 Local) provided by the Statewide Keystone Corridor Line Item as additional funding to the DVRPC Region.

NJ10-39a: Route 295/42, Missing Moves, Bellmawr (DB #355A), Camden County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board **NOT** approve TIP Action NJ10-39a, due to the earmark status of the project's funding.

NJ10-39b: Route 42, Southbound Roadway Improvements (DB# 355A2), Camden County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board **NOT** approve TIP Action NJ10-39b, due to the earmark status of the project's funding.

NJ10-40: Route 29, Memorial Drive (DB# 02396B2), Mercer County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board **NOT** approve TIP Action NJ10-40, due to the earmark status of the project's funding.

NJ10-41: Route 295, Paulsboro Brownsfield Access (DB #04321), Gloucester County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ10-41, NJDOT's request to amend the FY2010-2013 TIP for New Jersey by adding a project back into the

TIP, Route 295, Paulsboro Brownshfield Access (DB# 04321), and programming engineering, right of way, and construction in FY11 (\$6,000,000 STATE) and FY13 (\$1,000,000 STATE).

NJ10-42a: Route 130, Brooklawn Circles (DB #99312), Camden County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ10-42a, NJDOT's request to amend the FY2010-2013 TIP for New Jersey by advancing a Study and Development graduate project to the TIP, Route 130, Brooklawn Circles (DB# 99312), and programming the design (\$800,000 NHS) and right of way (\$1,000,000 NHS) phases in FY11, and construction in FY12 (\$3,685,000 NHS).

NJ10-42b: Route 168, Bridge over Big Timber Creek (DB# 09327), Gloucester County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ10-42b, NJDOT's request to amend the FY2010-2013 TIP for New Jersey by advancing a Study and Development graduate project to the TIP, Route 168, Bridge over Big Timber Creek (DB# 09327), and programming the preliminary engineering phase in FY11 (\$500,000 Bridge), design in FY12 (\$700,000 Bridge), and construction in FY14 (\$3,450,000 Bridge).

NJ10-43: Route 30, Evesham Road Intersection Improvements (DB #93263), Camden County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ10-43, NJDOT's request to modify the FY2010-2013 TIP for New Jersey by federalizing a project, Route 30 Evesham Road Intersection Improvements (DB# 93263), and programming design (\$500,000 NHS) and right of way (\$1,800,000 NHS) in FY11.

NJ10-46: Route 77, Swedesboro-Hardingville Road, Intersection improvements (CR 538) (DB #97049), Gloucester County

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ10-46, NJDOT's request to modify the FY2010-2013 TIP for New Jersey by increasing the construction phase of the Route 77, Swedesboro-Hardingville Road, Intersection Improvements (CR 538) project (DB# 97049), by \$2.1 million, increasing the cost of the construction phase from \$800,000 to \$2.9 million, and advancing the construction phase to FY12. Additionally, advancing the design and right of way phases from FY13 to FY11, and increasing the design phase by (\$150,000 STP) and the right of way phase by (\$80,000 STP). Programming for this project will be reflected as follows: design (\$350,000 STP) and right of way (\$100,000 STP) in FY11, and construction in FY12 (\$2,900,000 STP).

NJ10-47: TMA-DVRPC (DB #X43J), Various Counties

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ10-47, NJDOT's request to modify the FY2010-2013 TIP for New Jersey by switching funding of the engineering and construction phase for TMA-DVRPC (DB# X43J), from CMAQ to STP-STU in FY11 (\$2,200,000 STP-STU), FY12 (\$2,200,000 STP-STU), FY13 (\$2,200,000 STP-STU), FY14 (\$2,200,000 STP-STU), and LFYs (\$11,000,000 STP-STU), as this project is no longer eligible to be funded with CMAQ funds as a result of FHWA direction given to NJDOT. NJDOT has agreed to provide additional obligation authority to the DVRPC region for the \$2.2 million STP-STU funds for the TMA program.

Discussion: It was noted that at the time of these votes, there were no New Jersey RCC representatives, and the need to further outreach efforts in New Jersey for RCC members.

PA11-04a: Transit and Regional Rail Station Program (MPMS #77183), SEPTA

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA11-04a, SEPTA's request to modify the FY2011-2014 TIP for Pennsylvania by increasing the scope of the following program: Transit and Regional Rail Station Program (MPMS# 77183), to include the Parkside Bus Loop Reconstruction and Wayne Junction Intermodal Facility projects. As a result, the program will increase by a total of \$7.175 million, which will be programmed in FY11 (\$5,740,000 Section 5309 (from competitive program)/\$1,389,000 T-Bond/\$46,000 Local).

Discussion: SEPTA has a variety of reports available online at www.septa.org/reports, including County Service Plans. Also, when utilizing the DVRPC TIP mapping function, information for projects is available by link.

PA11-04b: State of Good Repair (MPMS #77180, SEPTA)

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA11-04b, SEPTA's request to modify the FY2011-2014 TIP for Pennsylvania by increasing the scope of the State of Good Repair program (MPMS# 77180), to include a new project: Transit Asset Management System. As a result, the program will increase by a total of \$8 million, which will be programmed in FY11 (\$6,400,000 Section 5309 (from competitive program)/\$1,548,000 T-Bond/\$52,000 Local).

Discussion: For transparency, RCC members requestd that SEPTA incorporate a web application to allow read-only public access to the information in the system.

DVRPC FY 2011 Planning Work Program Amendment: Regional Circuit Rider for Energy Efficiency in Local Government Operations

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board amend the DVRPC Fiscal Year 2011 Planning Work Program to include the Regional Circuit Rider for Energy Efficiency in Local Government Operations project.

Discussion: Staff will follow up with scheduling a presentation on the Energy Works program at a future RCC meeting .

Fiscal Year 2011 Planning Work Program Amendment: Climate Change Vulnerability Analysis Tool Pilot Project

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board amend the DVRPC Fiscal Year 2011 Planning Work Program to include the Climate Change Vulnerability Analysis Tool Pilot Project.

DVRPC Draft Fiscal Year 2012 Planning Work Program

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends to authorize distribution of the DVRPC Draft Fiscal Year 2012 Planning Work Program for review and comment.

Approval of DVRPC communication to elected officials in support of the Commuter Benefit Equity Act

Comment for DVRPC Board:

The RCC Action Task Force recommends that the DVRPC Board approves the attached communication to be sent to the Representatives and Senators whose districts represent the DVRPC region as well as Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY), who introduced the legislation in the Senate. Further, the RCC Action Task Force urges that the letter also be sent to newly elected officials.

Discussion: Copies of the letter will be provided to RCC members who wish to promote the Commuter Benefit Equity Act to their own elected officials.

DVRPC FY2012 Work Program
Feasibility Study for Interstate Highway Improvement Financing Options in
Southeastern Pennsylvania

The short and long-term transportation funding needs for the reconstruction and operational improvements to the interstate system (I-95, I-476, and I-76) in Southeastern Pennsylvania are overwhelming. The working number for the first phase of I-95 improvements is \$2 billion (\$9+ billion all phases) along with multiple hundreds of millions for improvements for I-476 and I-76. The economic competitiveness and mobility of people and freight in the region requires a state of good repair and an operation efficiency of the interstate system that allows it to compete on a national and global level.

The ability of the region to bring funding to the table to partner with other federal, state and potentially private sources needs to be explored. This feasibility study would examine a range of options being explored and implemented nationally, e.g. variable pricing by time of day; high occupancy/toll (HOT) lanes; technology that provides travelers (including drivers and transit riders) with pre-trip and real time congestion and pricing information; EZ Pass gantry tolls at New Jersey and Delaware borders; and other state of the art ideas.

The study would look at conceptual project designs, sketch level financial analysis of revenue options, public participation, consensus building, modeling, anticipated effects—pros and cons—of the tolling effort, potential capital projects on the interstate and its affected corridors, and system operating costs.

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE DVRPC REGIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 15, 2010**

Present: Aissia Richardson (Chair); Wanda Stuart, John Johnson, David Hojsak, Leah Colley, Ernest Cohen, Elaine Cohen, Andy Sharpe, Bob Machler, John Pawson, Bridget Chadwick, Jon Frey, Susanne Whitehead, William Faltermayer, Tom McHugh, John Burkhardt, Warren Strumpfer, Larry Menkes, Cheryl Tumola, Ray Rauanheimo, Dennis Winters, Jerome Lutin, Sue Herman, Dan Rappoport, Juanita Lewis Hatton, Kathryn Garza, Kathy Zukoski, John Butler, Carol Butler, Kamil Siddiqi, Li Dongquan(citizens); Candy Snyder, Jane Meconi, Patty Elkins, Gregory Krykewycz, Barry Seymour (staff); Donna Pitz (guest).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the November 16, 2010 RCC meeting were approved as mailed.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

John Burkhardt reported that the Nominating Committee met prior to the RCC meeting and were unanimously submitting the name of Aissia Richardson for RCC Chair for Calendar Year 2011. The floor was opened for nominations; none were submitted and nominations were closed.

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

MOTION to unanimously elect Aissia Richardson as RCC Chair for Calendar Year 2011.

MOTION CARRIED.

Warren Strumpfer noted that the RCC should review the Nominating Committee procedures. Candace Snyder stated that it may also be a good time to review the RCC general operating procedures as well. In January, Aissia Richardson will appoint a task force to review these. RCC Vice Chairs and RCC representatives to other DVRPC committees will be named at the January RCC meeting.

CHAIR'S REPORT:

Aissia Richardson reported that there was an additional Board action item that was not reviewed by the RCC, entitled "Regional Trails Network Re-Grant and Technical Assistance Program". This Work Program amendment, which is in conjunction with the William Penn Foundation, was approved by DVRPC, and will be an information item at the January RCC meeting.

Ms. Richardson also noted that there was a lot of discussion at the Board meeting regarding the Climate Change Vulnerability Analysis Tool Pilot Project Work Program amendment.

RTC REPORT

The RTC does not meet in December.

REPORTS FROM RCC REPRESENTATIVES TO OTHER COMMITTEES:

Warren Strumpfer and Jim Richardson attended the Safety Action Task Force Meeting in November. The primary focus of discussion was the importance of keeping vehicles on the road. 38% percent of fatal road accidents occur when a vehicle leaves the road.

Dennis Winters is planning to attend the Regional Aviation Committee meeting on 12/16. He also wanted to thank DVRPC for the excellent Staff Showcase on December 3. There was discussion about whether the Showcase could be planned at a time where more RCC members could attend.

DISCUSSION ITEM: OVERVIEW OF THE DVRPC FISCAL YEAR 2012 WORK PROGRAM

Barry Seymour, DVRPC Executive Director, presented how DVRPC develops its Work Program, which is the agency's primary "blueprint" for all Commission activities within a given fiscal year. The Work Program is in place by March, and goes into affect at the start of DVRPC's fiscal year, July 1. The annual budget for the Work Program is \$25 million, and 25 percent of those funds pass through DVRPC directly to its member governments. Forty percent of the budget is contract work that DVRPC undertakes; i.e., DVRPC acts as a non-profit consulting firm to complete projects such as traffic counts, the Classic Towns program etc. The projects that DVRPC undertakes in this capacity have to be consistent with the agency's policies. Thirty-three percent of the budget is federal dollars that can be assigned to complete projects under the discretion of the Board. Several mandated projects, such as the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Environmental Justice/Public Participation, and the Long-Range Plan also fall under this category. The remainder of funding is then used to fund Work Program projects.

Work Program development begins in early fall, with outreach to the Board, RTC, RCC, other DVRPC committees, and member governments to identify priorities. DVRPC staff looks at the initial proposals as a preliminary screen to assess if the project can be done, how it could be funded, if it supports the Commission's policies, and if it fits into existing Work Program areas.

Every year, there are projects that are submitted that do not make it into the Work Program, including those that are submitted by staff and Board members. That doesn't mean that the project won't someday be included in some form, but at the time there may be funding issues (the Work Program is fiscally constrained) or the project is not identified as a priority by the Board.

Four RCC proposals were submitted to the Board this year, and two (Accessibility & Mobility Report for EJ communities and Transit Oriented Services) will be included in the Environmental Justice Work Program area, which will receive additional funding for Fiscal Year 2012.

The Work Program is not a static document; Work Program amendments come to the Board for review and approval throughout the fiscal year. The Work Program is currently under public review until January 14, 2011. The draft Work Program is available online and members of the public can submit comments or questions. The Work Program will go before the Board in January 2011 for approval.

Discussion: RCC members expressed the opinion that there seemed to be more car-related projects than projects for transit, or projects that lessen VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled). Mr. Seymour replied that DVRPC is one of the few MPOs that actually "flex" highway dollars to transit and that DVRPC's TIP is evenly split between highway and rail/alternative transportation modes.

Also, many program areas, such as the Congestion Management Process and Smart Growth, intrinsically support transit, pedestrian and bicycle planning. RCC members also discussed that the RCC's process for developing Work Program proposals went very smoothly this year. Finally, it was noted that the Work Program illustrates an enormous amount of creativity and contains a great list of projects.

STAFF PRESENTATION: SCOPING A SUCCESSFUL WORK PROGRAM PROJECT

Gregory Krykewycz, Senior Transportation Planner, DVRPC Office of Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning, presented how to scope a successful Work Program project. First, Mr. Krykewycz defined "success" in that the goals of a Work Program study or project should ultimately be about setting policy, actionable outcomes, and offer useful information to decision-makers. There are many planning reports that only sit on shelves; a successful report should always be implementable. The goal of a study is not simply to produce a report.

Mr. Krykewycz outlined the following steps for developing a Work Program proposal:

- 1: Start with a concrete idea that can be described in one paragraph. A study should note what question it is trying to answer; there should be no "fishing" to see what can be done.
- 2: Reach out to relevant implementing partners. Is there a related question that they would like answered through a study? The RCC can reach out to DVRPC staff to assist in coordinating this as well as to help package an idea.
- 3: Find a partner early in the process. If a project has any shot at being implemented, an implementing agency should be involved in the process.

Discussion: RCC members asked whether it would be beneficial to reach out to the counties when suggesting a Work Program idea. Mr. Krykewycz responded that county support would be greatly beneficial and could certainly enhance a proposal's chance of being selected for the Work Program.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF PROTECTED OPEN SPACE

Patty Elkis, DVRPC Director, Comprehensive Planning, and Donna Pitz, Executive Director of the GreenSpace Alliance, presented a recently released study that documents the economic value of protected open space in Southeastern Pennsylvania.

The study found that there were specific benefits in the following areas:

Property value impacts: Open space adds \$16.3 billion to the value of Southeastern PA's housing stock, and protected open space generates \$240 million annually in property tax revenues to support county and municipal governments and local school districts

Environmental impacts: Southeastern PA realizes nearly \$61 million in annual cost savings from protected open spaces' ability to naturally filter out pollutants and replenish water supply. Also, trees on protected open space are estimated to provide \$17 million in annual air pollution removal and carbon sequestration services.

Recreation Impacts: Each household in the region saves \$392 a year by having open space available for recreation and exercise. There is a yearly \$1.3 billion of health-related cost savings, of which \$795 million of those are related to medical cost savings.

Economic Activity Impacts: Economic activity associated with open space in southeastern PA results in more than 6,900 jobs and \$299 million in annual earnings, as well as \$30 million per year in state and local tax revenue.

A media event was held in November to introduce the study and drew support from more than 80 attendees representing various organizations through the region. The results of this study will be used to educate the public and decision-makers about the economic value of protecting open space; raise political and financial support for more open space prevention; promote policy changes that will favor open space protection; and re-frame the dialogue about open space as a benefit, not just an expense. The study is not a cost of community services study, a cost benefit analysis, or can be construed to be used for one particular property.

Discussion: It was noted that this study should bolster the City of Philadelphia's efforts in its Green 2015 effort.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Action Task Force: The Action Task Force did not meet, as there were no Board action items to review.

Long-Range Plan Task Force:

ADDITIONAL ACTION TAKEN BY THE RCC:

The RCC supports the successful “rails-with-trails” principle as a highly desirable way to achieve both freight or passenger rail service and pedestrian trails in the same corridor.

Specifically, we believe that the Pennypack Trail, already built, paved, and operating across Northeast Philadelphia as far as Pine Road, should be extended to the banks of the Pennypack Creek and to the proposed Cross County Corridor in eastern Montgomery County. This route should replace the disconnected gravel path built upon the Fox Chase-Newtown rail line between Rockledge Borough and Route 232. Further north, it should incorporate the existing Creek Road Trail, instead of the rail grade.

Such alignment will likely prove to be the least expensive, most promptly achieved, most direct, and most physically attractive routing for the Pennypack Trail.

Non-use of the Fox Chase-Newtown rail grade in this trail alignment will facilitate the ultimate restoration of rail service.

Transportation Research Board (TRB) Synthesis 374 entitled “Preserving Freight and Rail Passenger Corridors and Service” contains many relevant concepts for the Fox Chase-Newtown line, and for other dormant rail corridors in our region such as Quakertown-Hellertown Wawa-Chadds Ford Junction, and the Warminster-New Hope line. Included in the TRB document is the concept of marking dormant corridors at conspicuous points with signs stating that the future use of the grade for freight or passenger services may occur and warning persons in general from detracting in any way from that future use, such as using the right-of-way for dumping or removing material contained in it. The document contains two pictures of such signage actually in use.

We specifically recommend that this practice be used on the rights-of-way listed above.

RCC members will be following up with DVRPC staff, but it was noted by some RCC members that the focus of the resolution should be on policy and practice. This item will be further discussed at the January RCC meeting before it is brought to the Board at the end of January.

Work Program Task Force: The next meeting is scheduled for January 18, 2011.

OTHER BUSINESS:

John Pawson noted that there needs to be more balanced representation at the RCC in relation to a member's geographic location. This has been discussed many times both at the RCC level and at the Board and federal certification levels as well. Staff will provide a breakdown of membership by location, as well as by other demographic information.

Kathryn Garza noted that some good news has been released from the recent UN Climate Change conference in Cancun, Mexico.

DVRPC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. DVRPC's website may be translated into Spanish, Russian, and Traditional Chinese online by visiting www.dvrpc.org. Publications and other public documents can be made available in alternative languages or formats, if requested. For more information, please call (215) 238-2871.

Jon Frey

From: rcc_transportation@yahoogroups.com on behalf of Jim Richardson [jim_663@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, December 12, 2010 2:48 PM
To: RCC; jfrey40535; Thomas McHugh
Cc: Jane Meconi; Candace Snyder; Mike Boyer
Subject: Re: [rcc_transportation] Preliminary Long Range Task Force Agenda for 12/15/10

Given the charter of RCC's **Long Range Plan** task force to address and contribute to long-term, strategic and regional issues, I would like to propose an alternative agenda. I also recommend that future agendas be specific with respect to time allotted for specific issues. A list of items to cover is not an agenda.

Discussion/debate of specific Work Program items do not belong on the LRP agenda and should be addressed within a work program context.

The proposed Rails with Trails resolution is, likewise, not a long-range planning topic. I request that this be brought up again either at an Action Task Force meeting or the general RCC meeting.

The SEPTA capital budget topic should be discussed within the larger context of overall TIP funding.

If this task force intends to effectively address long-term issues with the intention to impact the next LRP update and the direction of future planning decisions, I recommend that we inform our deliberations with a brief from Mike Boyer on DVRPC's early vision for that update and a discussion with him on how RCC can provide useful input. Member questions and concerns can be voiced with an eye toward directing task force attention to issues that are pertinent to the LRP and toward ensuring that open discussion can be scheduled on all relevant topics.

I propose the following agenda for Tuesday's meeting:

11:00 Task force called to order by the chair.

11:00 – 11:10 Review and agreement on the purpose of the task force

11:10 – 11:20 Overview from Mike Boyer on status of next LRP update, including any insight he may have on the overall direction and areas of emphasis

11:20 – 11:25 Questions from members on topics they would like to incorporate in task force deliberations and the LRP update

11:25 – 11:30 Outline by Jim Richardson of proposed approach to future discussions on funding the gap between the region's identified needs for highway, bridge and transit maintenance and expansion and funding available from existing sources. (This will be posted to the group not later than noon on Monday.)

11:30 Agreement on next steps and adjourn

From: [JohnPawson Pawson](#)

Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 2:47 PM

To: [RCC](#) ; [jfrey40535](#) ; [Thomas McHugh](#)

Cc: [Jane Meconi](#) ; [Candace Snyder](#)

Subject: [rcc_transportation] Preliminary Long Range Task Force Agenda for 12/15/10

1. DVRPC Draft Work Study Program

- a. The RCC-recommended Bucks-Montgomery Transportation Needs study was listed as "not funded".
- b. A project entitled "Unused Rail Right of Way Assessment and Preservation" seems to have been substituted.
- c. The Pennsylvania Transportation and Community Development Initiatives (TCDI) program has an element for older communities for growth or infill. Some of these outlying communities (like Southampton and Souderton) have significant public transportation needs that are not being met.
- d. Travel and Land Use Modeling. The calibration of models involved deals with station tributary areas. We might discuss the theories that a station's tributary area is a "balloon" reaching out equally in all directions or a "torch" leading away from center city on radial highways.
- e. Atglen station feasibility study. Atglen is located 48 miles from Suburban Station near the Chester-Lancaster county line on the Amtrak Philadelphia-Harrisburg route. SEPTA service ends at Thorndale, 35 miles out while Amtrak serves the stations beyond.

2. Public transportation funding and restructuring. The future of PATCO is suddenly in doubt; and discussion about the political structure of SEPTA is likely also to be under discussion, for one alternative mentioned for PATCO would involve merging it into SEPTA.

Connections, Chapter 6, pages 119-131 should be reviewed. Funding-source comparisons are made to peer metropolitan areas. Local funding options are tabulated.

A Chicago-like division of SEPTA into three authorities with specific directorship and varying sales-tax funding for each is another organizational and funding option. A bi-state agency is another form that has been suggested.

3. Rails with Trails resolution. I have walked all major existing trails in the Pennypack corridor. Although one member was told of difficulties in extending the existing Pennypack Trail north of Pine Road and into Montgomery County, observations of design elements along the existing paved trail through Northeast Philadelphia show that the same techniques can be used north of Pine Road. A map has been distributed to interested parties, and it has been shown at the previous RCC meeting.

A resolution on the table is as follows, quoted from the October minutes:

The RCC supports the successful "rails with trails" principle as a highly desirable way to achieve both freight or passenger rail service and pedestrian trails in the same corridor.

Specifically, we believe that the Pennypack Trail, already built, paved, and operating across Northeast Philadelphia as far as Pine Road, should be extended to the banks of the Pennypack Creek and to the proposed Cross County Corridor in eastern Montgomery County. This route should replace the disconnected gravel path

built upon the Fox Chase-Newtown rail line between Rockledge Borough and route 232. Further north, it should incorporate the existing Creek Road Trail, instead of the rail grade.

Such alignment will likely prove to be the least expensive, most promptly achieved, most direct, and most physically attractive routing for the Pennypack Trail.

Non-use of the Fox Chase-Newtown rail grade in this trail alignment will facilitate the ultimate restoration of rail service.

4. SEPTA Capital Program, other matters.

For the regular meeting under New Business, I would like to raise the issue of obtaining a more representative membership for RCC, specifically more members from outlying parts of the region.

Some years ago, I determined that "outside the beltway" (the cordon of Woodhaven Road, route 1, Turnpike, and Blue Route) reside about 65% of the five-county residents. By contrast, the recently-revised list of voting RCC members shows that only about 31% give addresses outside the beltway. An added issue is that two New Jersey counties are completely unrepresented among voting members.

According to the experience of some other regional organizations of which I've been a part, rotating the meeting site may not prove successful; for it tends to limit attendance. especially critically by the more experienced members. Perhaps some kind of electronically connected simultaneous meetings might be possible.

Comments on all of these matters welcome.

John Pawson

[Reply to sender](#) | [Reply to group](#) | [Reply via web post](#) | [Start a New Topic](#)
[Messages in this topic](#) (4)

RECENT ACTIVITY:
[Visit Your Group](#)

MARKETPLACE

[Get great advice about dogs and cats. Visit the Dog & Cat Answers Center.](#)

[Stay on top of your group activity without leaving the page you're on - Get the Yahoo! Toolbar now.](#)

[Hobbies & Activities Zone: Find others who share your passions! Explore new interests.](#)

Jon Frey

From: Snyder, Candy [csnyder@dvrpc.org]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 12:17 PM
To: jfrey40535@gmail.com; 'Jim663v'
Cc: rcc_transportation@yahoogroups.com; Meconi, Jane; 'Aissia Richardson'; jscott5180@hotmail.com; 'Paul Iverson'
Subject: RE: Nov RCC agenda

Jon:

I'm now calling a halt to these emails that are straying toward conjecture that is simply not true. No one on the RCC speaks for DVRPC.

Let me be clear that:

1. The RCC is not an independent group. It functions only as the Board deems fit.
2. The RCC's role is to advise the Board on issues that are within the purview of DVRPC.
3. The RCC's agenda is set by the chair and staff; not by individuals or groups.

As the staff person who is ultimately responsible for the relationship between the Board and the RCC, I want to make it clear that a single issue is not going to dominate the RCC's agenda every month. As issues arise, they will be dealt with as time permits. Tomorrow's Action Task Force has a very long agenda of Board action items to review in approximately one hour. That is the group's responsibility and nothing else will be dealt with until these action items are completed.

To address your other question, Jon ... there has been some very rude correspondence sent from Paul Iverson to Barry Seymour, on behalf of PA-TEC. The tone of the email was enough to make me lose respect for the way your group functions. I suggest that you address that issue before sending out more emails.

Candy Snyder

From: jfrey40535@gmail.com [mailto:jfrey40535@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 9:26 AM
To: 'Jim663v'
Cc: rcc_transportation@yahoogroups.com; Meconi, Jane; Snyder, Candy; 'Aissia Richardson'; jscott5180@hotmail.com; 'Paul Iverson'
Subject: RE: Nov RCC agenda
Importance: High

Jim,

To the best of my knowledge, all of the correspondence to DVRPC has been sent for the sole purpose of gathering information, suggesting alternatives, and correcting erroneous information. It is within the rights of citizens and the job of a citizen's committee to perform this oversight. On the other hand, if you have been told that some of the correspondence has gone beyond this purpose, please bring it to my attention and I will make sure it ceases.

In the meantime, please understand that we will continue to press DVRPC for information, both through the RCC and independently. They are a taxpayer funded organization, and we are taxpayers. The private sector has plenty of roles for people who wish to keep things from the public eye. The "planning commission" is not one of them. They are a wealth of information about all sorts of things pertaining to this region and we encourage everyone to take full advantage of that fact.

Based on the tone of your email, I'm guessing that DVRPC is objecting to this level of questioning, and you have been asked to politely tell us to back off or risk the RCC losing credibility. Members of the RCC asking fewer questions will not make the RCC more relevant. The RCC maintains credibility *because* of its independent role, not in *spite* of it. It is my

hope that the RCC can continue to maintain it's objectivity on the issues pertinent to the region and the long range plan, and not simply "rubber stamp" predetermined agendas.

If you have any other concerns, please let me know, and I will be happy to discuss them with you.

Sincerely

Jon Frey, President
PA-TEC
P.O. Box 76
Southampton, PA 18966
www.R8Newtown.com

IT Systems Engineer
Richmond Computer
www.RichmondComputer.com
"Applying the Right Technology"
Home: (215)634-7976

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim663v [mailto:jim_663@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 8:08 AM
To: jfrey40535@gmail.com
Cc: rcc_transportation@yahoogroups.com; Jane Meconi; Candy Snyder; Aissia Richardson
Subject: Nov RCC agenda

John, what would be the goal of discussing this map at RCC?

Frankly, if this is yet another attempt to gain committee support for an R8 extension under the guise of advocating for a trail, it's a waste of committee time and energy.

I have discussed your group's interest in the rail matter with a number of the planning professionals whose support your effort must gain in order to succeed. I did this to see if there is a productive course of action that can be taken via regular planning channels. They tell me that PA-TEC has systematically and thoroughly alienated their organizations with harassing tactics, threats and other actions which serve only to drive away their support and any chance you might have to gain ground. Insofar as RCC becomes connected with this kind of activity, it loses credibility with regional planning professionals and thereby suffers when we try to get other important work done.

I am willing and available to use my access to these people to help give your interests a fair hearing. I will only do so if and when the harassment by PA-TECH stops and when civil and productive dialogue can take place. Otherwise, you should not expect any support from me to include this issue in committee deliberations.

Jim Richardson
Sent from my iPad

Date: Tue, 15 Mar 2011 16:14:23 -0400 [03/15/2011 04:14:23 PM EDT]

From: "Snyder, Candy" <csnyder@dvrpc.org>

To: "jscott@pa-tec.org" <jscott@pa-tec.org>

Subject: RE: Right to Know Request

Mr. Scott:

In response to your request for information dated March 8, 2011, meeting minutes of the DVRPC Regional Citizens Committee's Executive Committee for the months requested do not exist.

Records of the nominations of the executive committee are contained in the attached December, 2010 and January, 2011 RCC meeting minutes.

We do not have a memo from Aissia Richardson re: the appointment of new voting members of the RCC. A copy of our memo regarding the appointment of members to the RCC Action Task Force is attached.

These are the public records responsive to your request. We deem any other materials as predecisional deliberations of DVRPC staff and committee representatives, and therefore exempt from public disclosure, as per Section 708(b)(10) of the Pennsylvania Right to Know Law, Act 3 of 2008, effective January 1, 2009.

Candace Snyder

DVRPC

Director, Office of Communications and Public Affairs

Phone ... 215-238-2875

Fax ... 215-592-9125

Email ... csnyder@dvrpc.org

Follow us on Twitter ... www.twitter.com/DVRPC

-----Original Message-----

From: jscott@pa-tec.org [mailto:jscott@pa-tec.org]

Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2011 10:10 PM

To: Snyder, Candy

Subject: Right to Know Request

Pursuant to section 102 of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's right-to-know law, I am requesting a copy of all records in the possession of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) on the following subjects:

1. Meeting minutes of the Executive Committee of the DVRPC Regional Citizens Committee (RCC) that occurred in the following months: September 2010, October 2010, November 2010, December 2010, January 2011, February 2011
2. Records of nominations of the current executive committee of the DVRPC's Regional Citizens Committee
3. Records related to the appointment of new voting members of the Regional Citizens Committee as stated in a memorandum from Aissia Richardson to members of the RCC on 3/7/2011.

Records will include email records between DVRPC staffers Candy Snyder (csnyder@dvrpc.org) and Jane Meconi (jmeconi@dvrpc.org); and Aissia Richardson, chairperson of the RCC, and Jim Richardson, vice-chairperson of the RCC on the subject of items 1 thru 3 in this request.

Electronic records will be e-mailed to: jscott@pa-tec.org

Paper records will be mailed to:

Jon Frey

From: rcc_transportation@yahoogroups.com on behalf of Jim Richardson [jim_663@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 3:25 PM
To: RCC; jfrey40535; Thomas McHugh
Cc: Jane Meconi; Candace Snyder
Subject: Re: [rcc_transportation] Preliminary Long Range Task Force Agenda for 12/15/10

Thanks for forwarding a list of topics for the meeting, John. Given that we have 30 minutes for this meeting (11:00 – 11:30), followed by the nominating committee meeting, this seems a bit ambitious. I would like to include approx. 5 minutes to provide an introduction to the topic of Funding the Gap, which will provide members with a suggested outline for future presentations on this subject and an opportunity for comment and to request specific data.

Jane, if the Work Program is going to be discussed, I recommend that we have appropriate staff members present to address questions.

Jim Richardson

From: [JohnPawson Pawson](#)
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 2:47 PM
To: [RCC](#) ; [jfrey40535](#) ; [Thomas McHugh](#)
Cc: [Jane Meconi](#) ; [Candace Snyder](#)
Subject: [rcc_transportation] Preliminary Long Range Task Force Agenda for 12/15/10

1. DVRPC Draft Work Study Program

- a. The RCC-recommended Bucks-Montgomery Transportation Needs study was listed as "not funded".
- b. A project entitled "Unused Rail Right of Way Assessment and Preservation" seems to have been substituted.
- c. The Pennsylvania Transportation and Community Development Initiatives (TCDI) program has an element for older communities for growth or infill. Some of these outlying communities (like Southampton and Souderton) have significant public transportation needs that are not being met.
- d. Travel and Land Use Modeling. The calibration of models involved deals with station tributary areas. We might discuss the theories that a station's tributary area is a "balloon" reaching out equally in all directions or a "torch" leading away from center city on radial highways.
- e. Atglen station feasibility study. Atglen is located 48 miles from Suburban Station near the Chester-Lancaster county line on the Amtrak Philadelphia-Harrisburg route. SEPTA service ends at Thorndale, 35 miles out while Amtrak serves the stations beyond.

2. Public transportation funding and restructuring. The future of PATCO is suddenly in doubt; and discussion about the political structure of SEPTA is likely also to be under discussion, for one alternative mentioned for PATCO would involve merging it into SEPTA.

Connections, Chapter 6, pages 119-131 should be reviewed. Funding-source comparisons are made to peer

metropolitan areas. Local funding options are tabulated.

A Chicago-like division of SEPTA into three authorities with specific directorship and varying sales-tax funding for each is another organizational and funding option. A bi-state agency is another form that has been suggested.

3. Rails with Trails resolution. I have walked all major existing trails in the Pennypack corridor. Although one member was told of difficulties in extending the existing Pennypack Trail north of Pine Road and into Montgomery County, observations of design elements along the existing paved trail through Northeast Philadelphia show that the same techniques can be used north of Pine Road. A map has been distributed to interested parties, and it has been shown at the previous RCC meeting.

A resolution on the table is as follows, quoted from the October minutes:

The RCC supports the successful "rails with trails" principle as a highly desirable way to achieve both freight or passenger rail service and pedestrian trails in the same corridor.

Specifically, we believe that the Pennypack Trail, already built, paved, and operating across Northeast Philadelphia as far as Pine Road, should be extended to the banks of the Pennypack Creek and to the proposed Cross County Corridor in eastern Montgomery County. This route should replace the disconnected gravel path built upon the Fox Chase-Newtown rail line between Rockledge Borough and route 232. Further north, it should incorporate the existing Creek Road Trail, instead of the rail grade.

Such alignment will likely prove to be the least expensive, most promptly achieved, most direct, and most physically attractive routing for the Pennypack Trail.

Non-use of the Fox Chase-Newtown rail grade in this trail alignment will facilitate the ultimate restoration of rail service.

4. SEPTA Capital Program, other matters.

For the regular meeting under New Business, I would like to raise the issue of obtaining a more representative membership for RCC, specifically more members from outlying parts of the region.

Some years ago, I determined that "outside the beltway" (the cordon of Woodhaven Road, route 1, Turnpike, and Blue Route) reside about 65% of the five-county residents. By contrast, the recently-revised list of voting RCC members shows that only about 31% give addresses outside the beltway. An added issue is that two New Jersey counties are completely unrepresented among voting members.

According to the experience of some other regional organizations of which I've been a part, rotating the meeting site may not prove successful; for it tends to limit attendance, especially critically by the more experienced members. Perhaps some kind of electronically connected simultaneous meetings might be possible.

Comments on all of these matters welcome.

John Pawson