

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE DVRPC REGIONAL CITIZENS COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 17, 2009**

Present: Warren Strumpfer (Chair), Tom Cooper, John Burkhardt, Larry Menkes, Pat Mulligan, Dennis Winters, Cheryl Tumola, John Boyle, Kathryn Garza, Elaine Cohen, Ernest Cohen, Robert Machler, John Pawson, Lorraine Brill, William Faltermayer, Ajay Creshkoff, Jim Richardson, Tim Kelly,, Bill Marston, Eugene Cipriani, Jeannine Missaoui, Mark McKee, Aissia Richardson, Catherine Zukoski (citizens); Rob Graff, Greg Krykewycz, Karin Morris, Sarah Oaks, Elise Turner, Jane Meconi, Candace Snyder (staff).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the January 13, 2009 RCC meeting were approved as mailed, with a clarification provided by Eugene Cipriani on page 2 which should read that Amtrak has a desire to develop the old Paoli rail yard.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:

Warren Strumpfer noted the "Annual Schedule of Activities for the RCC 2009" sheet that was distributed in an earlier mailing. This list highlights when public comments are due for DVRPC programs and plans, as well as when certain RCC business items are conducted.

At the January Board meeting, Mr. Strumpfer raised the noisewall issues that were discussed in the January RCC meeting, specifically, stating that the RCC objected to economic development funds being used for a purpose that does not create jobs in these communities and that the normal process for noisewall selection was bypassed. The TIP actions related to noisewalls were approved but Board members discussed the various types of noisewalls and felt that a presentation on their merits would be worthwhile. The RCC also asked about studies that show whether natural barriers have been used to reduce noise. The use of economic development funds was also discussed but the Board felt the Governor had the right to make this decision.

Mr. Strumpfer noted that he is still passing along the RCC's objections to DEMO funds and earmarks. In regard to the newly approved DVRPC Work Program, Mr. Strumpfer noted that there was a rewording of the alternative vehicles project and that he appreciated the consideration of this project as put forth by the RCC.

RTC REPORT:

Jim Richardson, RCC representative to the RTC, noted that the RCC approved all TIP actions as well as the Conformity action on this month's Action Item Agenda.

He also noted that the RTC heard information items presented related on an update on the DVRPC Congestion Management Program (CMP), TMA work programs, and the upcoming federal stimulus bill. Presentations included a TransitChek study and a new PennDOT program known as EGGS or Efficient Growth for Growing Suburbs.

Mr. Richardson noted that he received a response re: the US Mayor's projects list and how they relate to the projects proposed for the economic recovery legislation. It was noted that the Mayor's list was more of a "wish list" and that most projects proposed for the economic recovery funding may bear little resemblance to each other.

REPORTS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES:

Jim Richardson reported that he attended the recent JARC meeting. Thirty-nine JARC applications were received; Mr. Richardson provided comments to Eric Grugel, DVRPC Regional Planner.

DVRPC BOARD AGENDA ITEMS:

The items below are agenda items for the DVRPC Board. As per the new RCC format, a "consent agenda" format is in place, meaning that the RCC does not have to address every agenda item before them.

PA09-19a: Clay Ridge Road Bridge over Beaver Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #13014), Bucks County

John Boyle, RCC Action Task Force Chair, explained that PennDOT has requested that DVRPC amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project into the TIP, Clay Ridge Road Bridge over Beaver Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #13014), and programming preliminary engineering (\$60,000 Bridge/\$11,000 State/\$4,000 Local) and final design (\$120,000 Bridge/\$23,000 State/\$8,000 Local) in FY09 for the replacement of the Clay Ridge Road bridge. This project was identified by the PA subcommittee as a local bridge that could be advanced as part of an effort to fund more local bridge projects. This group of bridges selected to advance to design will be evaluated for construction funding during the next TIP Update. The project will include the reconstruction of a 25 foot long reinforced concrete arch bridge located in Tinicum Township which was originally constructed in 1909.

(Note: The RCC's question regarding how structurally deficient bridges are ranked was forwarded to the appropriate agency for comment, and a reply was received after the conclusion of the RCC meeting. The response follows: *The determination of structurally deficient bridges is made through a number of factors such as condition ratings, sufficiency ratings, ADT, and complexity of design which requires more time. Based on the current data, the PennDOT Bureau of Design now also calculates a "risk factor".*)

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA09-19a, PennDOT's request to amend the FY 2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project into the TIP, Clay Ridge Road Bridge over Beaver Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #13014), and programming preliminary engineering (\$60,000 Bridge/\$11,000 State/\$4,000 Local) and final design (\$120,000 Bridge/\$23,000 State/\$8,000 Local) in FY09 only if appropriate bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are made.

PA09-19b: Church Road Bridge over Valley Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #14261), Chester County

PennDOT has requested that DVRPC amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project into the TIP, Church Road Bridge over Valley Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #14261), and programming preliminary engineering (\$280,000 Bridge/\$53,000 State/\$18,000 Local) in FY09, and final design (\$240,000 Bridge/\$45,000 State/\$15,000 Local) in FY12 for the replacement of the Church Road bridge. This project was identified by the PA subcommittee as a local bridge that could be advanced as part of an effort to fund more local bridge projects. This group of bridges selected to advance to design will be evaluated for construction funding during the next TIP Update. The project will include the replacement of a structurally deficient bridge located in Tredyffrin Township. The bridge is functionally obsolete and posted for 20 tons.

(Note: The RCC's recommendation regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodation was forwarded to the appropriate agency for comment, and a reply was received after the conclusion of the RCC meeting. The response follows: *At this time, Chester County is not planning to include bicycle or pedestrian facilities on the Church Road Bridge. Church Road is not on Chester County's adopted Recommended Bikeway Network Map. Additionally, the Chester County Planning Commission is working with Tredyffrin Township on a multi-municipal trail feasibility study for the Patriots Path. The Warner Spur, which is an abandoned railroad line that parallels Church Rd. and is less than 0.5 miles away, is a proposed trail route within the Patriots Path Feasibility Study. The Warner Spur proposed trail is also documented in Tredyffrin Township's draft Comprehensive Plan as part of the Green Route Network. The Warner Spur multi-use trail will provide a safer and more direct connection between Swedesford Rd. and Yellow Springs Rd. for both bicyclists and pedestrians. If there is strong local interest and support for providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Church Rd. bridge, the County will consider it during the design process.*)

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA09-19b, PennDOT's request to amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project into the TIP, Church Road Bridge over Valley Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #14261), and programming preliminary engineering (\$280,000 Bridge/\$53,000 State/\$18,000 Local) in FY09 and final design (\$240,000 Bridge/\$45,000 State/\$15,000 Local) in FY12 only if appropriate bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are made.

PA09-19c: Station Road Bridge over Chester Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #15183), Delaware County

PennDOT has requested that DVRPC amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project into the TIP, Station Road Bridge over Chester Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #15183), and programming preliminary engineering/final design (\$544,000 Bridge/\$102,000 State/\$34,000 Local) in FY09 and right of way (\$16,000 Bridge/\$3,000 State/\$1,000 Local) in FY12 for the replacement of Station Road bridge. This project was identified by the PA subcommittee as a local bridge that could be advanced as part of an effort to fund more local bridge projects. This group of bridges selected to advance to design will be evaluated for construction funding during the next TIP Update. The project will include the replacement of single span bridge located in Thornbury Township.

(Note: The RCC's recommendation regarding bicycle and pedestrian accommodation was forwarded to the appropriate agency for comment, and a reply was received after the conclusion of the RCC meeting. The response follows: *The proposed design will widen the travel lanes and provide shoulders where none currently exist, which may aid bicyclists and pedestrians; however, there are currently no plans for the addition of specific bicycle or pedestrian facilities. If there is strong local interest and support for providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Station Road Bridge, the County will consider it during the design process.*)

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA09-19c, PennDOT's request to amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a new project into the TIP, Station Road Bridge over Chester Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #15183), and programming preliminary engineering/final design (\$544,000 Bridge/\$102,000 State/\$34,000 Local) in FY09 and right of way (\$16,000 Bridge/\$3,000 State/\$1,000 Local) in FY12 only if appropriate bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are made.

PA09-20a: Pineville Road Bridge Over Pidcock Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #13242), Bucks County

PennDOT has requested that DVRPC amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a project back into the TIP, Pineville Road Bridge over Pidcock Creek, Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #13242), and programming preliminary engineering (\$200,000 Bridge/\$50,000 State), final design (\$160,000 Bridge/\$40,000 State), and utility (\$40,000 Bridge/\$10,000 State) in FY09 for the replacement of Pineville Road bridge. This project was deferred last year due to negotiations on the turn-back agreement which have since been resolved. This project will replace the existing Pineville road (SR 2103) bridge over Pidcock Creek. The existing reinforced concrete T-beam bridge carries a single lane of traffic. The existing bridge has two 24-foot spans and 14.7-foot curb-to-curb width. The structure is in poor condition with a 15-ton maximum legal load weight restriction. The new structure will be a one-span 38 feet long bridge with 28-foot curb-to-curb width. The existing bridge pier will be eliminated to improve hydraulic performance. The new bridge will accommodate two 10-foot wide travel lanes with minimum 2-foot wide shoulders. The new structure will be constructed using the ConSpan precast arch system. The approach roadways will be reconstructed on the modified alignment for an approximate distance of 350-feet at each end of the new structure, transitioning into the existing roadway. Pole mounted aerial utility lines will be relocated to the modified roadway alignment.

Discussion: Jeannine Missaoui noted that there have been many bicycle fatalities in the area, as cycling is a popular tourist attraction. Dennis Winters noted that he felt 10' wide lanes were too narrow for the road.

(Note: Gastonia Anderson, DVRPC Transportation Planner, forwarded the RCC's questions re: bicycle/pedestrian uses and traffic calming to PennDOT for comment, and the following reply was received after the conclusion of the RCC meeting: *No specific bicycle/pedestrian facilities will be added to the project; the 20' bridge width is the preferred solution to traffic calming issues and the preference of Buckingham Township.*)

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action PA09-20a, PennDOT's request to amend the FY2009-2012 TIP for Pennsylvania by adding a project back into the TIP, Pineville Road Bridge over Pidcock, Creek Bridge Replacement Project (MPMS #13242), and programming preliminary engineering (\$200,000 Bridge/\$50,000 State), final design (\$160,000 Bridge/\$40,000 State), and utility (\$40,000 Bridge/\$10,000 State) in FY09 only if traffic calming and bicycle/pedestrian accommodations are made. The proposed configuration of 2' shoulders is insufficient for bicycle travel.

NJ09-07: Route 295/42/I-76 Direct Connection (DB #355), Camden County

NJDOT has requested that DVRPC modify the FY2009-2012 TIP for New Jersey by increasing the preliminary design phase of Route 295/42/I-76 Direct Connection (DB #355), by \$7.3 million (\$2,437,000 EB/\$4,863,000 I-Maintenance) in FY09. The preliminary design phase of the project has increased from \$9.5 million to \$16.8 million due to a better defined scope of work which includes the selection of an Initially Preferred Alternative. Preliminary design will include the design of two storm water pump stations and a sanitary sewer pumping station that were not originally anticipated, a more extensive effort to complete the traffic control, staging plans, development, maintenance, and updating of a Project Management Plan and a Financial Plan per FHWA requirements for major projects that was not included in the original preliminary design estimate, and the complete development of right of way plans and permit applications to accelerate the overall completion of the project.

The Direct Connection project is the most significant programmed transportation improvement in the New Jersey DVRPC region in terms of safety, congestion, and cost. At an estimated construction cost of over \$800 million, this project will address one of the top locations in the state in terms of crash data and congestion.

Discussion: RCC members questioned whether environmental assessments had been completed for this project. There was also a question as to whether the design of the project was the cause for the pumping stations or whether they were they needed anyway.

(Note: The questions were forwarded to the appropriate agencies for comment, and the following replies were received after the conclusion of the RCC meeting: *The Environmental Impact Statement is posted online at <http://www.state.nj.us/transportation/works/studies/rt295/feis.shtm>. DVRPC staff will send the Executive Summary to the RCC e-mail list. In response to the question regarding water run-off into the roads around the Direct Connection project, the project manager responded that there will be drainage improvements implemented to mitigate any flooding problems around the area.*)

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board not approve TIP Action NJ09-07, due to the earmark status of the project, as well as potential environmental impacts, particularly issues related to water.

NJ09-08: Route 130, Campus Drive (DB #95078B1), Burlington County

Burlington County has requested that DVRPC modify the FY2009-2012 TIP for New Jersey by programming a right of way phase for Route 130, Campus Drive (DB #95078B1), in FY09 (\$350,000 DEMO) and FY10 (\$350,000 DEMO) to enable the

purchase of the second “key piece” of property needed to complete a connector road. Right of way was not authorized in FY08 as anticipated, so the request is to add the phase back into the program. This project will provide for the relocation of jug handles from milepost 44.75 to Campus Drive (milepost 44.52) and modification of existing traffic patterns to serve identified community and safety needs. Campus Drive will be extended from Sunset Road to Salem Road (approximately 1/3 mile). A full intersection will be constructed at Route 130 enabling southbound access to the State Highway. Currently, access is limited to northbound only. The completion of this project will provide traffic relief for an older neighborhood along Salem Road and congestion relief at the intersection of Route 130 and Salem Road.

(Note: Gastonia Anderson forwarded the question regarding pedestrian and bicycle design for Campus Drive to Burlington County and received the following response after the conclusion of the RCC meeting. *It was noted that Campus Drive is a service road through an industrial park and will not contain specific bicycle or pedestrian facilities.*)

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board approve TIP Action NJ09-08, Burlington County’s request to modify the FY2009-2012 TIP for New Jersey by programming a right of way phase for Route 130, Campus Drive (DB #95078B1), in FY09 (\$350,000 DEMO) and FY10 (\$350,000 DEMO) only if enough ROW is purchased for shoulders and sidewalks. RCC members also noted their misgivings regarding the earmark funding process.

Adoption of the Conformity Finding Reaffirmation of the DVRPC FY 2009 Pennsylvania and New Jersey Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) and the Destination 2030 Long Range Plan (LRP)

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 2009 Pennsylvania and New Jersey TIPs and the Destination 2030 LRP.

In June 2008, the DVRPC Board adopted the conformity finding of the FY 2009 Pennsylvania TIP, FY 2009 New Jersey TIP, and the Destination 2030 LRP(Resolution # B-FY08-008). This conformity finding covers:

- Ozone (the entire DVRPC planning area);
- CO (Burlington, Camden, Mercer and Philadelphia Counties);
- PM2.5 (the Philadelphia-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE PM2.5 Non-attainment Area); and,

- PM2.5 (the DVRPC portion of the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island,
- NY-NJ-CT PM2.5 Non-attainment Area).

WILMAPCO is currently conducting a new conformity determination for their FY 2010-2013 TIP. Since New Castle County is included in the Philadelphia-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE PM2.5 Non-attainment Area, DVRPC must reaffirm its previous conformity determination to support WILMAPCO's conformity determination for their TIP. DVRPC has held a public comment period from January 20, 2009 to February 21, 2009. Currently, as of this summary sheet preparation date, no comments have been received regarding the draft conformity finding. All comments received by the closing of the comment period – and subsequent DVRPC responses – will be properly documented and reported to the Board.

Discussion: RCC members requested a status report on conformity as well as the EPA issues raised in the most recent DVRPC "Alert" issue.

ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC recommends that the DVRPC Board adopt the reaffirmation of the conformity finding of the FY 2009 Pennsylvania and New Jersey TIPs and the Destination 2030 LRP by approving Resolution B-FY09-004.

ADDITIONAL ACTION TAKEN BY COMMITTEE:

The RCC approved a motion to allow a self-selected group of members to develop a position paper regarding conformity. This paper would be submitted to the RCC e-mail database for comment; if 10% of members vetoed the comments, they would not be submitted.

STAFF PRESENTATION: REGIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY:

Rob Graff, DVRPC Manager, *DVRPC Office of Economic Analysis and Coordination*, provided an overview of DVRPC's Regional Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Inventory project. He noted that this was an opportunity for DVRPC to provide leadership, support and coordination in this area. The GHG Emissions inventory kicked off in May 2008, and an Inventory Advisory Group was convened with a variety of representatives from the public and private sectors as well as other stakeholders.

A GHG Inventory is an accounting of greenhouse gases emitted to or removed from the atmosphere over a period of time. Conducting the inventory is a first step in the process of reducing GHG emissions, in that it makes it easier to track emission trends, develop strategies/policies to reduce GHG emissions and assess progress.

Emissions associated with energy use (both mobile and stationary), waste disposal, agriculture, industrial processes, land uses and fugitive emissions from fuel systems are all included in the inventory. The inventory does not include emissions embedded in goods and services or activities from outside the region. Sources of information used in the inventory include electricity and natural gas from utilities, other fuels from state-level inventories, on-road vehicles (provided by the DVRPC model), and transit. Fugitive emissions were based on natural gas usage and refining capacity and was disposal was based on state averages. All data was taken from 2005.

Discussion: Jim Richardson asked if DVRPC is on trend with creating this inventory, or are we a leader? Mr. Graff replied that while many municipalities do undertake this type of exercise, this is a much larger undertaking in scope, which does make it unique. Mr. Graff provided a clarification for the "soils" category, noting that certain gases are released from the ground during cultivation, and certain gases are released as a result of fertilizer usage. There was also discussion as to how a GHG inventory related to larger issues such as global warming, and issues related to water.

STAFF PRESENTATION: THE AUTOMOBILE AT REST: TOWARD BETTER PARKING POLICIES IN THE DELAWARE VALLEY:

Karin Morris, Manager, DVRPC Office of Smart Growth, provided an overview of a recent DVRPC report which examined municipal parking standards and best practices for managing and designing parking. She explained that a conventional approach to parking is to maximize parking supply, minimize user cost, minimize walking and enhance property competitiveness. The ITE manual *Parking Generation* is traditionally used to develop parking estimates for 91 land uses and is based on peak demand, which may result in an oversupply of parking throughout the day or year. The ITE manual also ignores geography, economic and demographics which may impact the need for parking. For instance, the availability of transit, mixed land uses, density, and hours of commerce may impact parking requirements.

Ms. Morris noted that outdated parking standards hamper infill development and add costs, and that alternative parking demand assessments, such as ULI's *Dimensions of Parking*, which takes into account density, surrounding land uses and transportation choices offers another way to develop parking standards. The DVRPC report recommends various parking requirements for residential, office and commercial uses. For instance, a typical requirement for office space is 4-5 spaces for every 1,000 sf. DVRPC recommends -3 spaces for every 1,000 sf, and allows developers to determine the market for additional space.

The report concludes that most municipalities require too much parking, and that abundant free parking is not always the best idea. In addition, parking should be known but hidden, and to promote land uses that accommodate the auto while creating more livable communities.

Discussion: Karin Morris noted that the audience for this report is municipal officials and is designed to offer suggestions for rezoning and redeveloping parking requirements. Elaine Cohen asked if handicapped parking was addressed in the report and Ms. Morris noted that ADA requirements are addressed in the report. Aissia Richardson asked what year the data analysis was completed– Ms. Morris noted it was in 2008. Ms. Richardson also raised issues regarding parking rates, fines and the relationship between parking and transit.

STAFF PRESENTATION: DVRPC LONG-RANGE VISION FOR TRANSIT:

Gregory Krykewycz, DVRPC Senior Transportation Planner, presented DVRPC's Long-Range Vision for Transit, which is a feeder report for the upcoming *Connections* long-range plan. The report uses select capital projects to highlight the future regional benefits of a modernized, integrated transit network. The report also balances the appeal of the "vision" with "nuts & bolts" reality: cost challenges, ridership estimates etc.

DVRPC's first priority is to ensure that the existing transit network is in a state of good repair. Second priority is investments in operational improvements to extract additional benefits from the existing system. Finally, the third priority is to select network expansions that reinforce existing and planned centers.

Mr. Krykewycz highlighted systemwide improvements and investments such as fare modernization and interoperability, improved passenger information systems and investments in stations with coordinated TOD. The report also emphasizes improving traditional, reverse and inter-suburb commutes by constructing transit supportive infill development in previously auto-oriented locations.

The priorities and the projects contained in the report were drawn from outreach results (such as Dots& Dashes and LUTED) as well as other DVRPC work. Mr. Krykewycz noted that priorities and projects may change as DVRPC moves into project selection for *Connections 2035*. He also highlighted ways to achieve the vision by closing the funding gap, commitment and buy-in by local governments and to promote an ideal of seamlessness with regional partners working together, sharing data etc.

Discussion: Ajay Creshkoff noted that an integrated vision for an optimum overall (urban/suburban) transit network should be considered. In addition, he noted that the first priority should be: does the existing network warrant good repair? What parts of the network should be retained and repaired? A criteria should be established and determine what parts of the transit system meet that criteria and which do not. There was also discussion regarding the proposed R6 extension. Lorraine Brill noted that the Roosevelt Boulevard project and the Navy Yard project were lumped together, but they are separate projects. Dennis Winters noted that the DC metro has an iPhone application that lets users know about train service etc.– does SEPTA have anything like this planned?

Mr. Krykewycz stated that SEPTA is working toward more customer service applications, and currently has the "Train View" on its website, which lets customers know about certain service delays etc.

INFORMATION ITEM: FY 2010 TMA ASSISTANCE GRANT APPLICATION AND MOBILITY ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM:

Sarah Oaks, DVRPC Senior Transportation Planner provided an overview to the documents contained in the February RCC mailing as well as the meeting packets relating to the FY 2010 TMA Assistance Grant Application and Mobility Alternatives Program. Ms. Oaks noted that the deadline for comments is February 20, 2009. She noted that the TMAs, who have been collaborating with the county planning agencies, have until February 25 to incorporate comments and complete applications for final DVRPC Board approval in March.

Discussion: Ajay Creshkoff asked how these projects would be evaluated. Are the TMAs required to provide performance indicators? Ms. Oaks noted that the funding for these projects is very small, and PennDOT does not require efforts for evaluation, which may take away funds from such a small budget. She noted that there is accountability, but a balance must be to not take away resources from such small funding.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

Long-Range Plan Task Force

John Pawson noted that the Long-Range Planning Task Force had a ½ hour to meet. The following issues were discussed briefly and put on the agenda for the March meeting:

1. Route 422 Master Plan; apparent anomalies.
2. Northeast Philadelphia rail and bus rapid transit proposals of the Long Range Vision.
3. California High Speed rail and Southeast rapid rail projects and our perspective.
4. Mayor's Next Great City program and its manner of presentation.
5. Dual mode locomotive technology and the power grid.
6. Buzz-word "smart power grid" and possible intention to nationalize or locally socialize the unprofitable power grid in the manner of Amtrak and public transportation.
7. In general, the Long Range Vision for Transit publication.

OTHER BUSINESS:

LUTED Meeting

Dennis Winters noted that the next LUTED meeting is scheduled for February 24 at 10AM at DVRPC.

SEPTA Annual Service Plan Meeting

Aissia Richardson announced that the SEPTA's Annual Service Plan public meeting will be held on February 24 at 12 noon in the SEPTA Board Room at its Center City headquarters.

Environmental Strategy Task Force

Bill Marston asked if a task force could be convened on environmental strategy. This item will be put on the March RCC agenda, with the goal of developing a mission statement.

Economic Recovery Legislation

At the earlier Action Task Force meeting, Chick Dougherty, DVRPC Director of Technical Services, provided an overview of the economic recovery legislation that recently passed through Congress. He noted that since the bill underwent many changes and compromises, there may still be some unanswered questions as to how the stimulus will affect our region.

He noted that DVRPC is primarily focusing on transportation funding in the bill, and noted that FHWA was scheduled to receive \$27.5 billion, and FTA was to receive \$6.9 billion. Mr. Dougherty explained that the projects that would most likely be pursued for this funding are projects that are "shovel ready" and can get underway immediately. Larger-scale projects, or those that require environmental assessments (that have not already been completed) are not necessarily the types of projects that will be funded. Mr. Dougherty also noted that all categories of projects that DVRPC undertakes are eligible for STP funding, if they are ready to move.

The projects provided at the meeting today are "candidate" projects, and are not the final projects under consideration. This packet of information may or may not go to the Board this month for approval. If the packet does go for approval, it will be presented as a TIP action.

Book Recommendation

Kathryn Garza recommended *Right Relationship: Building a Whole Earth Economy* by Geoffrey Carver and Peter Brown. Candy Snyder noted that DVRPC will order it for the Commission's library.

January 13, 2009 RCC Minutes Clarification

Tom Cooper commented on certain railroad operating information furnished to Barry Seymour as reported in the January 2009 RCC minutes.

Mr. Cooper wished to debunk an assertion that certain so-called “middle tracks” at Paoli are required for movement of SEPTA deadhead trains. There are no westbound deadhead trains through Paoli, there are three eastward deadhead trains at odd hours such as 4 AM and 10PM intermingled with 51 scheduled eastward Amtrak and R5 SEPTA trains through Paoli. This negligible intermingling cannot be deemed to create a scheduling or movement issue. Amtrak’s plans call for the removal of the middle, eastward track that might otherwise be used for deadhead movements. Mr. Cooper stated that there would be no need for an additional interlocking at Paoli to reconnect the middle and outside tracks because the necessary facilities are already in place and have been for 60 years. Mr. Cooper pointed out that Norfolk Southern cannot resume freight service along the Harrisburg Line through Paoli, because on arrival at Philadelphia only two routes would be available. One route is through the upper level of 30th Street Station and into the Center City tunnel. The other route is through Amtrak’s lower level at 30th Street Station. Neither of these routes is remotely suitable for freight service.

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.