

**MEETING MINUTES  
OF THE DVRPC REGIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE  
JUNE 13, 2006**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes of the May 16, 2006 RCC meeting were approved as mailed.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:**

Warren Strumpfer, Chair, welcomed back Ernest Cohen who has been absent due to illness. Mr. Strumpfer noted the May RCC report to the Board, stating that he had emphasized the Scudders Falls Bridge resolution regarding the need for bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Representatives of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission were present and promised a response which is attached to the RCC's Summary of Board Response. DVRPC staff will continue to follow this issue. Mr. Strumpfer also reported to the Board on the RCC's presentation on Closed Loop Systems. He also noted the Federal Certification Review which took place at DVRPC on May 31 and June 1. He and other RCC members participated in a dialogue with federal government representatives. A report should be forthcoming in about 90 days.

**RTC REPORT:**

John Boyle, RTC representative, stated that Cathy Popp-McDonough had been elected RTC Chair and Matt Lawson, Co-Chair, for FY 2007. He also explained Lee Whitmore's concern about the delay of certain projects. The RCC discussed the lack of funding across the region for all types of transportation improvements, including railroads, transit, highways, etc.

**AJAY CRESHKOFF PAPER RE: SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA REGIONAL  
TRANSPORTATION, LAND USE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INTEGRATION  
STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN:**

Ajay Creshkoff explained the paper he had submitted in May and that is now up for action. His paper addresses DVRPC's initiative for an integrated transportation, land use and economic development strategy, declaring that an organizational approach to project management is needed, along with a map or matrix that shows the process and key players. Mr. Creshkoff stated that the Commission needs to be more proactive in coordinating and implementing at the federal level. His paper calls for DVRPC to create a model process that is smart and sustainable, and to include the New Jersey counties which currently are not represented in the study. He firmly believes that quality of life and social issues need more attention. (The complete paper is attached as if a sample "map.")

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

***MOTION*** (by Ajay Creshkoff, seconded by John Pawson) to forward to the Board and staff the Ajay Creshkoff paper and matrix on DVRPC's *Southeastern Pennsylvania Regional Transportation, Land Use and Economic Development Integration Strategy and Action Plan*, noting in particular the following major points:

- The New Jersey counties in this region should be included;

- Additional weight need to be given to quality of life issues;
- Funding has been diluted over two fiscal years and may not be sufficient.

**MOTION CARRIED.** (See Item A on voting record.)

**TIP ACTION PA05-76: QUAKERTOWN/STONY CREEK RAIL RESTORATION STUDY (PROPOSED NEW DEMO PROJECT), BUCKS AND MONTGOMERY COUNTY:**

John Boyle explained that Bucks County has requested that DVRPC amend the FY2005-2008 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project to the TIP, The Quakertown Rail Line Passenger Service Restoration Alternative Analysis using \$300,000 DEMO/\$75,000 local match. \$50,000 would be programmed in FY06, with the balance of \$325,000 programmed in FY07. Specially earmarked DEMO funds were made available for this study which will build on the Quakertown/Stony Creek Restoration Study which was completed in 2000. The study will be conducted by Bucks and Montgomery Counties, with Bucks County as the project manager. The rail line is owned by SEPTA, and parts of it are operated by CSX, Norfolk Southern, and the Penn Eastern short line railroad for freight movement. The study would investigate the feasibility and costs of opening up the line for passenger service. Previous studies indicated that significant capital investment of \$100 to \$200 million would be required on the line in order to improve it to current standards.

*Discussion: Mr. Boyle noted that the April DVARP newsletter had an article on this issue. The RCC discussed that fact that this project would fall under the FTA's "Small Starts" program which would require that "off the shelf" commuter equipment that is FRA-compatible must be used. Tom Cooper stated that he believes that this project should not be added to the TIP until better funding is available. Lorraine Brill felt that this should be compared to the alternative of extending R-5 service.*

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by John Boyle, seconded by John Pawson) to recommend that the Board approve TIP Action PA05-76, Bucks County's request to amend the FY 2005 TIP for Pennsylvania (FY2005-2008) by adding a new project to the TIP, The Quakertown Rail Line Passenger Service Restoration Alternative Analysis using \$300,000 DEMO/\$75,000 local match. The RCC also adopted the following statement:

The current scheme appears to be for some diesel-powered, trolley-like shuttle operating frequently on existing light-density freight lines over two disparate segments which have been cobbled together into a package. The first: from the R6 terminus at Norristown Elm Street to the R5 station at Lansdale (Stony Creek Line, 9.5 miles, perhaps 18 minutes). The second: From the R5 Lansdale station northward to a spot on rt. 309 called Shelley, located beyond Quakertown (Bethlehem Line, 19.3 miles, perhaps 30 minutes).

The Stony Creek line is a cross line, and any new stations on it would be only two or three miles from existing R6 and R5 stations. So its economics are inferior to the longer Bethlehem Branch segment was and still is effectively a radial, outward extension of R5 that would go 16 miles farther into new, unserved territory.

When you learn that local R6 trains to Elm Street take 46 minutes from Market East while local R5 trains to Lansdale take only two minutes longer, it is obvious that most travelers to

center city will seek to transfer at Lansdale, not ride the Stony Creek segment to transfer at Norristown so as to save about 16 minutes.

Given the flaws, the study does seem useful as a \$375,000 "place saver". However our approval could ask that certain issues be addressed, such as:

1. The Bethlehem segment appears much more viable than Stony Creek, and the two segments should be separated in all considerations so that the former is not weighed down by the latter.
2. No through service to any inner Philadelphia station (more valuable for most customers) appears contemplated, only the outlying shuttles.
3. Not apparently considered are partial (i.e., off peak) bus shuttle alternatives from R5 Lansdale or R5 Colmar stations (rt. 309 intersection), and thus the large amount of off-peak train miles will weigh heavily on the operating cost structure.

***MOTION CARRIED.*** (See Item B on voting record.)

**TIP ACTION PA05-77: PHILLY CARSHARE (MPMS #68075), VARIOUS COUNTIES:**

DVRPC requests a modification to the FY2005-2008 TIP for Pennsylvania to note that the federal funds previously approved for use by PhillyCarShare in February, 2006, will not be used to secure a low interest loan from the State. Funds will instead be processed on a standard reimbursement basis to PhillyCarShare, and PhillyCarShare will pay back the region in the future as increased revenues become available. Current funding is programmed with \$2.0 million in FY 2006, \$1.5 million in FY 2007, and \$0.5 million in FY 2008.

The PhillyCarShare Program is a short term car rental program which allows participants to "pay as they go." The private non-profit provider currently focuses on communities in the city of Philadelphia, utilizes primarily hybrid-electric vehicles, and rents to members on an hourly basis (car sharing), using sophisticated reservation and monitoring systems. Members reserve a car on-line or via phone, walk to the designated vehicle in the neighborhood, use an electronic key to access a vehicle, and are tracked by an on-board computer for hours that they drive. The additional funding would allow the service to expand into suburban areas, increase from 2,000 to 50,000 participants, and expand from a fleet of 40 to a fleet of 1,000 new environmentally-friendly car-sharing vehicles in transit-friendly neighborhoods.

***ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:***

***MOTION*** (by John Boyle, seconded by John Pawson) to recommend that the Board approve TIP Action PA05-77, DVRPC's request to modify the FY 2005 TIP for Pennsylvania (FY2005-2008) by acknowledging that funds made available to PhillyCarShare will not be used to obtain a Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB) loan, but will instead be handled on a standard PennDOT reimbursement agreement basis.

***MOTION CARRIED.*** (See Item C on voting record.)

**TIP ACTION PA05-78: UPPER DARBY EARMARK (PROPOSED NEW DEMO PROJECT),  
DELAWARE COUNTY:**

Upper Darby Township has requested that DVRPC amend the FY2005-2008 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project to the TIP, the Upper Darby Parking Facility (MPMS #74799) using \$5.44 million DEMO funds received via SAFETEA LU. The \$11.758 million project will provide a parking facility at West Chester Pike and Bywood Road, near the 69th Street Terminal of the Market Street Elevated line. The parking garage of 325 spaces will support economic development in the community and will also provide parking for commuters using SEPTA's 69<sup>th</sup> Street terminal. The project is a companion project to Gateway streetscape and lighting improvements already underway. Two earmarks are available for this project: #316 for \$3.44 million DEMO; and #4736 for \$2 million DEMO. Local funds totaling \$6.358 million will be used as match, including \$5 million State Redevelopment Assistance funds from the Department of Community and Economic Development.

*Discussion: The Transportation Subcommittee had misgivings about this project. Subcommittee members stated that there is no information on how many spaces would be used by tenants of the new office building and how many would be used by transit patrons. The subcommittee recommended urging the FTA to work with the sponsors of this project to ensure adequate commuter parking. Anne Carroll pointed out that the paperwork submitted neglects to mention that part of the \$11.758 million for the project includes an office building as well as the 325 parking space garage. The total amount seems very expensive for such a small garage (about \$36,000 per space). However, the supporting project summary from the Upper Darby Township indicates that the \$11+ million is "to purchase associated land and to construct an office building and parking structure..." The claim is made that the parking spaces will "address the parking needs of the area", will support the local business community and will provide parking for commuters using SEPTA's 69th Street hub and transportation system." Notably absent is any discussion of how many spaces would be used by the tenants of the new office building; how only 325 spaces will support the additional population on that block as well as the current people who "support the local businesses" or "commute using SEPTA"; or any plan to dedicate parking spaces to these uses. The project also states that it will add "approximately 750,000 square feet of office space to the area, and attract at least 3,000 new jobs to the region."*

**\_\_\_\_\_ ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by John Boyle, seconded by John Pawson) to recommend that the Board approve TIP Action PA05-77, Upper Darby's request to amend the FY 2005 TIP for Pennsylvania (FY2005-2008) by adding a new project to the TIP, the Upper Darby Parking Facility (MPMS #74799) using \$5.44 million DEMO funds and \$6.358 million Local match.

**MOTION DEFEATED.** (See Item D on voting record.)

**MOTION** (by Finley Shapiro, seconded by Pat Horrocks) to recommend that the Board postpone its vote on TIP Action PA05-77, Upper Darby's request to amend the FY 2005 TIP for Pennsylvania (FY2005-2008) by adding a new project to the TIP, the Upper Darby Parking Facility (MPMS #74799). The RCC feels there is not sufficient information on this project and discrepancies exist in the information provided, including the expense of the proposed parking facility at a rate of \$36,000 per parking space.

In addition, this facility is far enough from the terminal that it may discourage transit use and may provide parking only for those in the proposed office building.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**TIP ACTION NJ06-12: GLOUCESTER COUNTY BUS PURCHASE (DB #D9807), GLOUCESTER COUNTY, MERCER COUNTY:**

Gloucester County has requested that DVRPC modify the FY2006-2008 TIP for New Jersey by increasing the Gloucester County Bus Purchase Program by \$180,000 CMAQ in FY06 for the purchase of 3 additional transit style passenger vans. The Gloucester County Division of Transportation Services (DTS) has operated since 1985. DTS currently maintains a fleet of 42 vehicles serving senior citizens, persons with disabilities, rural residents and Medicaid eligible clients. DTS operates 4 types of service, demand response, subscription, modified fixed route (under rural transportation) and feeder service. The only portion of the service open to the general public is the rural transportation under the FTA Section 5311 program. DTS provides 120,000 rides per year (approximately 500 trips per day). The vehicles requested, three 16 passenger mini-buses with 2 wheelchair positions, will be used to replace two existing non-wheelchair vehicles and one of the requested buses will be used for service expansion. The service expansion is anticipated in 2007 with additional employment rides for persons with disabilities. DTS is looking for county funding to support the operation of the expanded service. Funding for this project can be drawn from the DVRPC Local CMAQ Initiatives Line Item, DB #X065 which has \$725,000 in FY06 still available for funding projects.

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by John Boyle, seconded by John Pawson) to recommend that the Board approve TIP Action NJ06-12, Gloucester County's request to modify the FY 2006 TIP for New Jersey (FY2006-2008) by increasing the Gloucester County Bus Purchase Program (DB #D9807) by \$180,000 CMAQ in FY06. The RCC also believes that bicycle-accessible vehicles should be employed because modified fixed-route service is part of this project. In addition, the committee urges the county to consider purchasing alternative fuel or hybrid vehicles.

**MOTION CARRIED.** (See Item E on voting record.)

**ADOPTION OF THE DVRPC FY 2007-2010 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) FOR NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA:**

Elizabeth Schoonmaker, DVRPC TIP Manager, noted that every other year DVRPC develops a TIP that covers both state portions of the region (the New Jersey portion is done every year). Work began in September 2005 on the development of the FY2007-2010 TIP each state. The New Jersey and Pennsylvania Subcommittees of the RTC, under the direction of the DVRPC staff, have been working on a draft TIP that meets the requirements of the federal laws and regulations, including those concerning financial constraint, air quality, plan consistency and environmental justice.

In addition, DVRPC and PennDOT held a joint public meeting last summer to gather input for the PA transportation program, while DVRPC conducted outreach through its NJ Problem Identification and Prioritization project to gather input for the Study and Development Program portion of the NJ transportation program.

The FY2007-2010 TIP for the New Jersey portion of the region contains over 140 projects worth \$1.8 billion (an average of nearly \$450 million per year), including \$833 million for projects primarily addressing the highway system and \$954 million for transit projects for DRPA/PATCO and NJ TRANSIT. The FY2007-2010 TIP for the Pennsylvania portion of the region contains nearly 500 projects worth \$3.3 billion (an average of \$819 million per year), including over \$1.6 billion for projects primarily addressing the highway system and nearly \$1.7 billion for transit projects for SEPTA, Pottstown Urban Transit, and the state's Keystone Service.

The projects in the Draft TIP represent a consensus of the regional improvements to be made. The TIP has been fiscally constrained to the available financial resources identified by PennDOT and NJDOT, as negotiated for this region's projects. All non-exempt projects have been included in the regional conformity analysis.

The Draft TIP document was made available for public review during a 30-day period which ended on June 4, 2006. Legal notices explaining the public comment process were published in the *Inquirer*, the *Tribune*, *La Actualidad*, the *Trenton Times* and the *Courier Post*. Media releases were issued to over 60 outlets prior to the start of the public comment period. Notices were also sent to over 3,000 individuals and organizations through a joint effort of DVRPC, the League of Women Voters, our Transportation Management Associations, and the Chambers of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia and South Jersey. All TIP related documents were published on the Internet and copies were placed at 34 major public libraries in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. DVRPC held a public meeting in its offices to give the public the opportunity to pose questions about the process and projects to state, county, transit, and DVRPC staff. Presentations were also made and documents distributed to DVRPC's Regional Citizens Committee and Environmental Justice Subcommittee as well as to other committees within the Commission's organizational structure.

DVRPC's website played a vital part in our public outreach effort. The entire Draft TIP three volume set was placed on our website, as were the dates and locations of the public meetings and libraries and general information about the TIP and how it was developed, as well as other related documents. Many people downloaded the TIP materials from the website, as evidenced by the TIP page being one of the most frequently hit pages on the DVRPC website. In response to Title VI and Environmental Justice concerns, outreach was targeted to specific communities as well as to the region as a whole. DVRPC sent notices of the public comment period and the public meeting to individuals and organizations representing traditional and underserved transportation users, minority and low income populations, the welfare-to-work community, and other citizens. Over 20 individuals or agencies provided written comments on the TIP. A copy of those comments was provided to the RCC.

*Discussion: Lorraine Brill requested that a copy of the RTC-proposed changes be supplied to the RCC. Because the RCC has not provided input formally to the TIP, comments will be received by Candace Snyder via the Yahoo chat room that has been established, and a conference call will be initiated at 3 p.m. on June 20 to review comments.*

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by Dennis Winters, seconded by John Boyle) to recommend that the Board adopt the FY2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for New Jersey and for Pennsylvania as the region's official selection of transportation projects for federal funding, by passing Resolution B-FY06-010, and recognizing the RTC's proposed changes. RCC comments are pending and will be submitted directly to the Board,

**MOTION CARRIED.** (See Item F on voting record.)

**ADOPTION OF CONFORMITY DETERMINATION OF THE FY 2007 - 2010 TIP FOR NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA AND THE DESTINATION 2030 LONG-RANGE PLAN:**

Jienki Synn, AICP, Ph.D., Senior Transportation Planner, stated that transportation conformity is a process established by the Clean Air Act to ensure that federal transportation projects and transportation investment activities are consistent with ("conform to") state commitment for meeting air quality goals. DVRPC has performed a regional emissions analysis to determine transportation conformity of the FY 2007 TIPs and the *Destination 2030* Long Range Plan.

Additionally, the New Jersey State Air Quality Implementation Plan (SIP) revision – and the imbedded motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) for Mercer County (i.e. the DVRPC portion of the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT PM<sub>2.5</sub> Non-attainment Area) – has been published in the *Federal Register* on June 8, 2006. The MVEBs will become effective 15 days after the announcement, which is June 23, 2006.

In April 2006, the DVRPC Board authorized staff to open a minimum 30-day public comment period to receive comment on the draft conformity finding of the FY 2007 Pennsylvania TIP, FY 2007 New Jersey TIP, and the *Destination 2030* Long Range Plan. This conformity finding covers:

- Ozone (the entire DVRPC planning area);
- CO (Burlington, Camden, Mercer and Philadelphia Counties);
- PM<sub>2.5</sub> (the Philadelphia-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE PM<sub>2.5</sub> Non-attainment Area); and,
- PM<sub>2.5</sub> (the DVRPC portion of the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT PM<sub>2.5</sub> Non-attainment Area).

DVRPC has held a public comment period from May 5, 2006, to June 4, 2006, and has hosted one public meeting. DVRPC has not received any comments regarding the draft conformity finding during the comment period.

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by John Boyle, seconded by Ernest Cohen) to recommend that the Board approve the conformity finding of the FY 2007 DVRPC TIPs and the *Destination 2030* Long Range Plan by adopting Resolution No. B-FY06-011.

**MOTION CARRIED.** (See Item G on voting record.)

**ANNUAL SELF-CERTIFICATION OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS:**

Candace Snyder stated that federal regulations for metropolitan planning (23 CFR 450 and 49 CRF 613) require the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to annually certify to the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration that its transportation planning process addresses the major issues facing the area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements. The regulation lists specific requirements which must be addressed. DVRPC's compliance with these requirements is outlined below:

1. Improvements to the transportation system in the region have been the result of continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning process carried out by state and local officials.
2. The transportation planning process, including the adoption of the TIP, is consistent with the Clean Air Act and is in conformance with the applicable State Implementation Plans.
3. Private citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, other affected employee representatives, private providers of transportation, and other interested parties were provided with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the TIP and planning process.
4. The TIP includes a financial plan that demonstrates how the TIP can be implemented, indicates resources from both public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available, and recommends innovative financing techniques.
5. DVRPC's planning process is administered in accordance with FTA Circular 4702.1, Title VI, and DVRPC employment practices comply with FTA Circular 4704., Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines for Grant Recipients.
6. DVRPC's programs are conducted consistent with Title 49 CFR Part 23 as implemented by FTA Circular 4716.1A regarding disadvantaged business enterprise programs.
7. The Region's public transit operators have certified that they are making special efforts to provide transportation services which can be utilized by elderly and handicapped persons.
8. Congestion Management System phase-in requirements for non-attainment Transportation Management Areas have been met.
9. Environmental justice for low income and minority populations is being addressed.
10. The provision of 49 CFR part 20 regarding restrictions on influencing certain activities has been met.

*Discussion: RCC members asked that they be provided with the codes that the Self Certification resolution references and how DVRPC is specifically addressing them.*

***ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:***

***MOTION*** (by Dennis Winters, seconded by Ajay Creshkoff) to recommend that the Board adopt Resolution No. B-FY06-012 certifying that the DVRPC Regional Transportation Planning Process is in conformance with federal regulations implementing TEA-21, the Clean Air Act Amendments, and other federal legislation. The RCC also urges the Board to add the following clause to the resolution:

*WHEREAS, DVRPC recognizes the federal standards that are place but strives to exceed those standards, whenever possible, to ensure the health of the region's citizens and the sustainability of the Delaware Valley.*

***MOTION CARRIED.*** (See Item H on voting record.)

**APPROVAL OF 2005-2006 PENNSYLVANIA TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS/HOME TOWN STREETS/SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (TE/HTS/SRS) PROJECTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE DVRPC TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:**

Ryan Gallagher, DVRPC Project Implementation Coordinator, explained that PennDOT has allocated over \$22 million in Transportation Enhancements, Home Town Streets and Safe Routes to School (TE/HTS/SRS) funds in the DVRPC region during the 2005-2006 cycle. Additionally, \$70 million in funds have been allocated for other projects statewide. During the 2005/2006 regional competition 89 applications were received via internet submission by the September 30, 2005 due date. Each application was reviewed and scored based on criteria established by the selection committee comprised of representatives from PennDOT District 6-0, the counties, the Regional Citizens Committee and the DVRPC. The scores were standardized and normalized, then a ranked list was considered and discussed by the selection committee on December 22, 2005.

In February, the Board approved the recommended list of regional projects for funding and sent the list of projects to PennDOT. The Board also approved sending a recommended list of projects to be funded by a discretionary set-aside for the Secretary of Transportation to award for projects of statewide significance. PennDOT recently approved the entire list of new regional projects submitted by the DVRPC. In addition, PennDOT approved two (2) of the DVRPC recommended discretionary funded projects along with three (3) additional projects selected by the Secretary. The RCC was provided with the list of prioritized projects.

*Discussion: Hans van Naerssen served as the RCC's representative to this committee and expressed his concern regarding the weighting of votes and the ranking of projects. Mr/ Gallagher stated that he will work with Mr. Van Naerssen on these issues. The next round of competition begins next summer.*

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by Cheryl Tumola, seconded by Lorraine Brill) to recommend that the Board amend the FY2006 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by adding the PennDOT approved Transportation Enhancements, Home Town Streets, and Safe Routes to School projects as individual projects, with funding to be allocated from the appropriate line items in the amount approved, as may be available when each is ready to advance to construction.

**AMENDMENT** to state that the RCC will work with DVRPC staff and the states to address concerns regarding the weighting of votes and the ranking of projects.

**MOTION CARRIED, AS AMENDED.** (See Item I on voting record.)

**FY 2006 JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC) GRANT PROGRAM:**

Karen Cilurso, DVRPC Senior Regional Planner, outlined the JARC Program. She stated that the program is intended to help fund transportation services and supportive activities that facilitate access to jobs for welfare recipients and lower income persons, as well as reverse commute trips for the general population.

TEA-21 has expired and been replaced by the new *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU) for Fiscal Years 2006 to 2009. The JARC program was maintained under FTA administration. However, given unexpended TEA-21 JARC fund balances for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005 (\$5.38 million in southeastern Pennsylvania and a statewide balance of \$5.2 million in New Jersey), it is essential to fully encumber these funds before using funding from the new Act. A 50% non-Department of Transportation funds match is required for the JARC grant program.

FTA regulations require metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), in regions over 200,000 in population, to select project applicants, evaluate the consistency of proposed projects with an adopted *Areawide Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation Plan* and commit to add projects to the regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), pending grant approvals.

Following project solicitation in November 2005, DVRPC received Letters of Intent from nine Pennsylvania applicants and four from New Jersey applicants by the January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2006 submission date. Staff forwarded the submissions to the pertinent Pennsylvania and New Jersey Special Committees, established by the Board for previous rounds of the JARC program, for their review. On March 23<sup>rd</sup> the recommended FY 2006 New Jersey JARC projects and priorities were approved by the DVRPC Board.) On February 21<sup>st</sup>, April 4<sup>th</sup> and May 22<sup>nd</sup>, DVRPC convened the Pennsylvania Special Committee (composed of city, county, public transit agency and Regional Citizens Committee representatives) to review the project proposals and to formulate a recommendation for Board action.

After review and coordination with the applicants, the Committee found that:

(1) all of the proposed projects are consistent with DVRPC's adopted Job Access Plan; (2) the total amount of funding requested in all the LOIs exceeded the available JARC funds; and (3) the expected level of JARC funds via the new SAFETEA-LU formula program shows a substantial reduction in average annual funding to approximately \$1.6 million per year for southeastern Pennsylvania. As a result, the committee recommends the following:

- Select no new projects (which affects proposed projects from SEPTA, Libertae, Bucks County TMA, Delaware County TMA, GVFTMA, and GPUAC).
- Due to project management and service delivery issues, the Committee recommends that the GPUAC be placed in a probationary status, which would result in not providing additional funding for their existing services through funds from the FY2006/2007 JARC Program. (Based on GPUAC's current spending pattern, there are sufficient funds already available to continue these services through March 2007; consolidation of these funds into a single service would enable this service to continue beyond March 2007). The Committee also agreed to establish a Task Force composed of representatives from SEPTA, the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, and DVRPC to meet with representatives of GPUAC every other month, over the next nine months, to monitor their progress in addressing project management and future service delivery issues.
- Selected projects should be funded for two fiscal years (FY 2006 and FY 2007) to fully allocate the remaining TEA-21 JARC funds for southeastern Pennsylvania; and,
- Finally, that a contingency fund, consisting of uncommitted TEA-21 JARC funds of \$321,181, be established to deal with unforeseen fuel cost increases or future service adjustments.

*Discussion: The RCC discussed the funding match issue as well as the drop in funding for Pennsylvania (and probably for New Jersey) now that this program will be based on a funding formula.*

**ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:**

**MOTION** (by Dennis Winters, seconded by William Marston) to recommend that the Board approve the applicant qualifications; areawide JARC plan consistency; proposed project priorities; TIP programming commitment (for future project grant approvals); GPUAC's probationary status and monitoring process; and create a \$321,181 contingency fund (for potential fuel cost increases and service adjustments) for the FY 2006 and FY 2007 Pennsylvania JARC projects, as recommended by the Pennsylvania Special Committee by passing Resolution No. B-FY06-013.

**MOTION CARRIED.** (See Item J on voting record.)

**TRACKING PROGRESS TOWARD 2030: INDICATORS FOR THE LONG-RANGE PLAN:**

Zoe Neaderland, DVRPC Senior Transportation Planner, reviewed the scope, methodology, performance measures, objectives and framework of the *Tracking Progress Toward 2030: Indicators for the Long-Range Plan* project. She indicated that break-out sessions had been held with input from a wide variety of representatives and citizens regarding the questions to be asked and the indicators to be used, and that staff would be acting on the resulting input.

This project will identify and apply indicators of progress toward attaining the transportation, land use, economic development and environmental protection goals adopted in the Long-Range Plan. The results will be used to help optimize investment in the region's infrastructure and to achieve the region's vision. This effort will be coordinated with and support related efforts at other agencies for the good of the region. Ms. Neaderland then asked the RCC to take a few minutes to fill in their thoughts on a questionnaire regarding the project.

*Discussion: Ajay Creshkoff indicated that leading indicators are issued by the Council of Economic Advisors and that the National Conference Board publishes updates every three months. DVRPC should check this information for input to the process. He noted that there are "lagging indicators" as well which can suggest which indicators are more important. In addition, "precursors" can be used to point to the possibility of leading indicators. He noted that "surrogates" can be proxies for indicators and provide direction. DVRPC needs to show whether projects are moving in the direction of its goals. Hiring a good economist and sociologist would be a step in the right direction. None of these issues exist in a vacuum and all have social implications.*

**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP): LIMITING TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND ACHIEVING REGIONAL GOALS:**

Ms. Neaderland explained that CMP is a systematic process for managing congestion; it provides information on transportation system performance and recommends a range of strategies to minimize congestion and enhance the mobility of people and goods. These multimodal strategies can include operational improvements, travel demand management, policy approaches, and additions to capacity. The CMP advances the goals of DVRPC's Long-Range Plan and strengthens the connection between the Plan and the TIP.

It is also part of federal transportation regulations and enhances the existing concept of the Congestion Management System. It identifies congested corridors and multimodal strategies to mitigate the congestion. Ms. Neaderland went on to explain how the CMP helps the region, the establishment of corridors, how analysis is done, criteria used, the implications of the strategy, and coming products. She indicated that additional outreach is needed and that the advisory committee will continue its work. She also supplied a number of materials which the RCC found particularly helpful.

*Discussion: The RCC will need to appoint new representatives to the CMP process in July. Mr. Creshkoff suggested that there should be a step in the CMP chart that shows an evaluation process and the process of going back to correct for lessons learned. The RCC also indicated the need to work with WILMAPCO and other agencies bordering on the region.*

### **CAN I WALK OR BIKE TO THE TRAIN? NONMOTORIZED ACCESS TO RAIL STATIONS:**

Greg Krykewycz, PP, AICP, DVRPC Transportation Planner, presented the benefits of bicycle/pedestrian access which include expanding transportation options for non-drivers; providing a smaller parking footprint and less traffic impact; and the capitalization of rail stations as a community asset and focal point. He indicated that the premise for this study is that people will only bike or walk to a train station if they can do so safely and from within a comfortable distance. He discussed the difference between bicycle/pedestrian levels of services and auto levels of service. In this study, scores were given based upon various roadway configurations, the availability of on-street parking, the presence and width of sidewalks, street tree spacing, and traffic volume. He noted that stations were studied that showed high bicycle/pedestrian demand. The Beverly/EW Park Station recommendations include a Cooper Street Crosswalk over Penna/Railroad Ave.; bike lanes and "sharrows" along Cooper Street; and possible integration with the Heritage Trail. He then showed images of the highest and lowest bike/ped compatibility among six study areas. This report will be used as a resource for local planners and transit agencies.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS AND ACTIONS:**

**Transportation:** John Boyle reported that John Pawson had provided an extensive resolution on Seamless Transportation. Ms. Snyder will edit the paper, as per the subcommittee's wishes, and place on the Yahoo chat room site.

**2030 Task Force:** There was no 2030 report since the Transportation Subcommittee continued its work through the time allotted for this task force. Their goals of providing a Seamless Transportation resolution were the same.

**Environmental Justice Task Force:** Ms. Snyder reviewed the EJ Task Force from May and indicated that she is concerned with the low attendance to date. She and staff, as well as Mr. Strumpfer, will look at this issue in the next two months, and may come back with additional suggestions for beefing up this task force.

### **OLD/NEW BUSINESS:**

Lorraine Brill reported that the Historical Commission had hired a consultant to analyze the Germantown Ave. situation (as reported two months ago by Catherine Franklin).

This consultant's report and the Commission have recommended maintaining the concrete blocks that are now in place on the road. It is unknown how the City is currently responding.

The RCC thanked Kendall Miller for her work on their behalf. They asked to be provided with a DVRPC staff organizational chart.