CHOICES & VOICES VERSION 2.0 RESULTS

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) launched Choices & Voices version 2.0 in October 2013 to reflect the newly adopted Connections 2040 Long-Range Plan key assumptions, including projected revenue through 2040, the updated transportation needs assessment, and to account for SEPTA’s proposed realignment plan. This online survey tool remains a key component of public outreach for long-range planning in Greater Philadelphia. Choices & Voices serves as a way for members of the public to share their preferences for future development patterns, transportation projects, and approaches to funding them. At the same time, it contains an educational component that offers the users a better understanding of the linkages between land use and transportation, the considerable basic maintenance and repair issues of the transportation network, and the consequences of failing to invest in transportation.

Shortly after Choices & Voices version 2.0 was launched, Pennsylvania passed a significant transportation funding bill, Act 89, which substantially increased transportation funding in the state and removed SEPTA’s realignment plan from the discussion. With the passage of Act 89, DVRPC did little to market Choices & Voices version 2.0. In spite of this, more than 500 people viewed the site, and 66 regional vision scenarios were submitted to DVRPC. Nearly 1,900 people viewed version 1.0 and more than 250 regional vision scenarios were submitted to the original version. As an online application open to anyone, results should not be construed as a scientifically representational sample. However, Choices & Voices is one of a number of components that are used to develop the Long-Range Plan. Other components include: regional indicators, scenario planning, dialogue with planning partners (state, county, and local governments, departments of transportation, and transit operators), additional public outreach, federal and state guidance, and other DVRPC programs such as the Transportation Improvement Program and the Congestion Management Process.

DVRPC PLANNING AREAS

DVRPC characterizes each of the region’s 352 municipalities as a Core City, Developed Community, Growing Suburb, or Rural Area, as a means of categorizing the types of communities and defining the corresponding long-range planning policies most appropriate for each type. Responses were analyzed for the region as a whole and for each of the four regional planning areas, using the ZIP code provided by the respondent.

DVRPC Planning Areas

![DVRPC Planning Areas Map](map_image_url)
More than two-thirds of the respondents to version 2.0 came from one of the region’s Developed Communities. Some 14 scenarios were submitted, but with ZIP codes that were missing or outside the nine-county DVRPC region. Those scenarios did not receive further evaluation.

**Count of Choices & Voices Submitted Scenarios by DVRPC Planning Area**

![Bar chart showing the count of scenarios submitted by DVRPC Planning Area.](chart)

*Submitted scenarios with missing ZIP codes or ZIP codes not in the nine-county region are not further analyzed.

Source: DVRPC 2014

The largest group of respondents to version 2.0 were those between 18 and 24 years old. More than half of all respondents to date (including version 1.0) have been under the age of 34. These age groups have typically been less involved in metropolitan planning organization long-range planning efforts.

**Age of Choices & Voices Respondents**

![Bar chart showing the age distribution of respondents.](chart)

Source: DVRPC 2014

**CHOICES & VOICES RESULTS**

Choices & Voices showed the correlation between development patterns and transportation system use. Based on the submitted scenarios, respondents on average favored a more sustainable transportation future that results in 1.4 percent fewer regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT), an eight percent increase in biking and walking trips, and a 24 percent increase in transit ridership. This would mean a 3.5 percent reduction in residential energy and transportation costs, and a four percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Improving fuel
efficiency and lowering carbon content fuels will be vital to achieving the Plan goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 60 percent by 2040.

The table below shows the marginal differences respondents to version 1.0 and version 2.0 proposed, compared to the existing conditions. As respondents provided their ZIP code, they were broken into geographic types to show how choices might be affected by where a respondent lives.

### Indicator Results from Submitted Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOICES &amp; VOICES INDICATOR</th>
<th>VERSION</th>
<th>REGIONAL VALUE IN 2040</th>
<th>MARGINAL CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORE CITY</td>
<td>DEVELOPED COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Developed (2010–2040)**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>811,000</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,121,600</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (annual per capita)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>–190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped Trips (annual per capita)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Trips (annual per capita)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Transportation and Residential Energy Costs (annual cost)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$13,130</td>
<td>$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$13,290</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions (metric tons CO₂ equivalent per capita)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>–0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>–0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (annual fatalities per 100,000 trips)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion (annual hours per year in traffic for drivers)***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Version 2.0 had no respondents from Rural Areas.

** Version 2.0 accounts for all types of land development, whereas version 1.0 accounted only for residential and commercial development.

*** Version 2.0 revised congestion assumptions based on new VISSIM travel demand model results (TIM 2.0), and incorporated delay from poor pavement conditions, which was not included in Version 1.0.

Source: DVRPC 2014

It is worth noting that congestion was recomputed between version 1.0 and version 2.0 to account for DVRPC’s improved travel demand model, TIM 2.0, which uses VISSUM software. Version 2.0 also accounted for delay due to deteriorating pavement conditions, which were not reflected in the first version. Version 1.0 focused solely on commercial, industrial, and residential land use to determine acres developed. Version 2.0 also accounted for additional types of development such as: community, recreational, transportation, and utility uses.

Some notable trends arise from the results of the two versions. First, respondents indicated little desire for more driving at a per capita level, particularly the residents from Core Cities and Developed Communities who decreased per capita annual VMT. Similarly, residents from more dense areas favored higher rates of alternative modes such as transit and walking/biking, perhaps seeing these as more readily available options than in less dense areas of the region. While respondents from all areas expected a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, respondents from denser areas were able to achieve even greater reductions. Respondents from all areas preferred growth patterns that are significantly more compact than the region has seen in recent development trends.

The chart on the next page demonstrates the variation in choices by respondent origin regarding VMT.
Change in Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita: 2010 to 2040 by Version

Source: DVRPC 2014

Continue reading to learn more about how individuals made their choices.

DEVELOPMENT PREFERENCES
Respondents to both versions identified a vision of a higher-density, mixed-use development pattern that is walkable, bikeable, and transit oriented. More than 90 percent of all respondents’ preferred future development that is located near existing centers, and where alternative transportation infrastructure is already in place. This is largely in line with the Connections 2040 vision of focusing development in more than 120 centers around the region (the Towns & Cities option), though the overall preference of the respondents was for a higher-density, more centralized land use pattern.

Respondents’ Development and Location Preferences by Planning Area (Versions 1.0 and 2.0)

Source: DVRPC 2014

The average respondent scenario would require developing roughly 36,400 new acres (proportionally accounting for all types of land uses in version 1.0) of land from 2010 to 2040. Continuing the development trends over the last two decades would mean around 60,000 to 70,000 additional acres developed over that period. Overall, respondents preferred a development pattern that would consume less new acreage compared to the trend.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING
In version 2.0, 96 percent of respondents selected additional funding for their scenario, a slight increase over the 93 percent of respondents who identified some level of additional funding in version 1.0. The average scenario in version 2.0 had $215 in additional funds per household per year. This is greater than the maximum allowed in version 1.0 of $240 per household per year; respondents in version 1.0 averaged nearly $140 of additional annual household funding.
The top funding options were raising the gas tax and congestion pricing, followed by adding vehicle registration fees. The Carbon Tax option was not available in version 1.0.

**Preferred Tax or Fee Option**

Selection of additional taxes or fees meant the average scenario had a transportation budget of $71.2 billion in version 1.0, and $67.9 billion in version 2.0 over the 27-year horizon for transportation investments. This is considerably more than the $52.5 billion forecast of reasonably anticipated funding in the original Connections 2040 Plan, prior to an increased forecast of $63.5 billion in the amended Connections 2040 Plan (due to the passage of Act 89 in Pennsylvania).

**TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS**

Choices & Voices simplified the region’s transportation investments into one financial plan, allowing for funding flexibility between modes and states that did not otherwise exist. It allowed users to identify a source and amount of additional funding. Choices & Voices also made use of Federal Transit Administration New Starts and Small Starts funds that the Connections 2040 Plan did not. Version 2.0 largely overhauled the transportation investments section, both expanding the number of investment options and simplifying them. Alternatively, in version 1.0 most options were based on funding specific projects, while version 2.0 moved to investing in categories of projects.
Version 1.0 had the highest overall level of expenditure. The base funding available for version 2.0 was much lower, due to the region’s worsening funding outlook prior to the passage of Act 89. Version 2.0 respondents had a base funding level of $48.3 billion, which was supplemented with an additional $19.6 billion in local taxes and fees. Even with more funding than the amended Connections 2040 Plan, a higher percentage of available revenue was dedicated to system preservation. Accordingly, a higher percentage of funds were directed toward operational improvements, with lower expenditures on bike and pedestrian and system expansion projects. Respondents to version 1.0 and version 2.0 left some money unspent.

Comparison of Funding Expenditure by Project Category*

* Does not include the ‘Roadway Other’ and ‘Transit Other’ funding categories in the Connections 2040 Plan.

Source: DVRPC 2014

Connections 2040 actually contains four separate financial plans. The Plan set a policy that limits highway expansion expenditures to 5 percent of available revenue. The good condition of the transit system in New Jersey allowed for additional investment in system expansion. This means that the region could move forward with BRT facilities along NJ 42/NJ 55 and US 1, along with beginning construction of the Glassboro–Camden Line. The more extensive transit system and the need to invest more in system preservation on the Pennsylvania side of the river meant that fewer new facilities could be funded there.

The amount of funding need identified for each transportation investment category in Choices & Voices comes from the regional needs assessment conducted as part of each long-range plan update. A more detailed analysis of the needs assessment can be found in the Connections 2040: Technical Analysis (DVRPC publication #13043).

Growing system preservation needs have been highlighted in numerous recent state and regional publications. The message appears to have resonated with the respondents of Choices & Voices. About 82 percent of available funding was slated toward system preservation. This is a little higher than the 79 percent the amended Connections 2040 Plan allocates to system preservation. Bridge repair and replacement is a particular concern in Pennsylvania, where the state still has the highest number structurally deficient bridges in the nation.
Likewise, the region’s transit system preservation needs out to 2040 are substantial. Version 2.0 saw lower funding for transit system preservation than version 1.0. However, the $20.8 billion allocated was enough to keep the system operating, avoiding SEPTA’s realignment plan, and was considerably more than the $12.6 billion that the initially adopted (pre-Act 89) *Connections 2040* Plan was able to allocate. Critical system preservation needs include replacing 80-year-old power substations; and rehabbing or replacing 100+-year-old bridges, and regional rail, trolley, Norristown High Speed Line (NHSL), and eventually Broad Street Line vehicles that already are or will be past their anticipated useful life.

**Transit Preservation Funding: 2014–2040**

The respondents used about 12 percent of their available transportation funding on operational improvements to make the existing system more efficient. This is a little more than the 11 percent the *Connections 2040* Plan allocates to operational and bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Substantial investment was allocated to increasing transit service frequency. This would appear to be the respondents’ top operational improvement priority. Bike and pedestrian improvements include constructing The Circuit, a 720-mile regional trail network; sidewalks; bike lanes; streetscape; and nonmotorized safety improvements. Operational improvements include intersection improvements, roadway realignments, intelligent transportation systems, and signal improvements. Additionally, transit frequency improvements include the purchasing of new and higher-seating-capacity rail vehicles and buses, operational costs for more frequent service, sidings, double tracking, and other on-time service improvements.
Version 2.0 Operational Improvement Investments

Transit Enhancements was the fourth operational improvement option. This includes elements like transit signal priority, more express service, and bus and trolley stops that feel more like stations. Capital costs associated with these projects are expected to be more than covered by future operating cost savings, meaning that these projects will have no net costs associated with them. About 60 percent of respondents selected this option, which would increase transit ridership. A greater percentage of respondents selected these improvements in the region’s Core Cities and Developed Communities, where there is more transit service, than in the Growing Suburbs and Rural Areas.

Transit Enhancements

Source: DVRPC 2014

In version 1.0, connecting the Circuit regional trail network, transit fare modernization, and transit first were the top operational improvement priorities. Transit fare modernization was dropped from version 2.0 because the project is already underway.
Version 1.0 Regional Operational Improvement Preferences

The respondents in version 2.0 spent six percent of available funding on system expansion, compared to about 4 percent in version 1.0. Both versions had expenditures that were weighted toward transit projects. This is less than the eight percent of funding allocated to system expansion in the Connections 2040 Plan, though there were some key reasons as to why this varied, discussed below. Roadway expansion expenditure was lower in both version 1.0 ($0.5 billion) and version 2.0 ($1.0 billion), than in the amended Connections 2040 Plan, which allocates $1.7 billion to new or widened roads, or new interchange movements. See the Connections 2040 Plan Major Regional Project List to see all of the system expansion projects under consideration.

Regional Roadway System Expansion Investments

The respondents spent more revenue expanding the transit system than they did the road. Not surprisingly, higher levels of expenditure were identified by respondents in the region’s Core Cities, given that a strong system already exists there.

Regional Transit System Expansion Investments

Source: DVRPC 2014
Choices & Voices allowed the respondent to select specific transit expansion projects from those in the Connections 2040 funded and vision plans. The top regional transit expansion priorities included extending the Broad Street Line to the Navy Yard, the NHSL to King of Prussia, and Roosevelt Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The Pennsylvania-oriented nature of these responses can be attributed to 89 percent of respondents residing in Pennsylvania ZIP codes.

**Regional Transit System Expansion Investments (Versions 1.0 and 2.0)**

*Fully funded in Connections 2040 Plan.
**Partially funded in the amended Connections 2040 Plan.
***Not included in version 1.0, percent of respondents based on version 2.0 only.
Source: DVRPC 2014

The Core Cities’ and Developed Communities’ top priority was extending the Broad Street Line to the Navy Yard. Growing Suburb respondents favored extending the NHSL to King of Prussia. Respondents from Rural Areas favored both a NHSL extension and extending the Elwyn Line to Wawa.

**COMMENTS**

Choices & Voices allowed for a comment to be entered at the end of the application; the 12 comments received for version 2.0 are summarized as follows (some comments contained multiple suggestions):

- Four of the comments wanted more investment in transportation options.
- Four comments suggested expanding the transit system (see below).
- Three comments identified the need for more road and transit maintenance.
- Two comments requested less reliance on the automobile through more car sharing and preference of lower car ownership rates.
- One commenter requested spreading regional growth around in towns and cities throughout.
- One commenter suggested focusing investments in cities and older neighborhoods.
• One commenter requested increased transit service frequency to make it easier for people to get around.
• One commenter suggested prioritizing roadway investments because more people use them.
• One commenter wanted to focus more on safety.
• One commenter did not want taxes raised.

A number of specific project concepts were contained within the comments, summarized as follows:

• Two comments wanted to invest in the NHSL Spur to King of Prussia.
• One commenter wanted to invest in the West Trenton Line.
• One commenter wanted to expand I-76.
• One commenter suggested a number of projects, including:
  o Penn’s Landing:
    ▪ new garage between Delaware Avenue and the Delaware River;
    ▪ new cap over I-95 between the existing caps (Chestnut to Sansom and Dock St. to Delancey Street) to create one large continuous cap; and new cap over Delaware Avenue between Walnut and Chester and over the new parking garage;
    ▪ new pedestrian bridge from Market Street over I-95 and Delaware Avenue to Penn’s Landing;
    ▪ new development in Penn’s Landing;
    ▪ improved Samson’s Walkway between Independence Hall and Penn’s Landing; and
    ▪ extending the South Street pedestrian bridge to Penn’s Landing.
  o new Delaware Avenue Light Rail Line extending from Philadelphia International Airport (PHL) to Girard Avenue;
  o extending the Broad Street Line to the Navy Yard;
  o creating a Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) loop that would use the existing Broad Street Spur to the Reading Tunnel near the Art Museum, run down the existing CSX freight tracks along the Schuylkill River, then connect back to the current line terminus in a new tunnel;
  o building a South Philly light rail line running along Washington Avenue from Delaware Avenue to the 25th Street Connector, then back to Delaware Avenue along Snyder Avenue;
  o realigning the Amtrak NE Corridor right-of-way along the Airport Line so that it can stop at PHL;
  o developing a new closed-loop subway around the airport;
  o redesigning the Ben Franklin Bridge, I-676, 5th Street, and I-95 interchange to simplify and add movements; and
  o using the Reading Viaduct to create an elevated bike path.

CHOICES & VOICES VERSION 2.0 CONCLUSION

Choices & Voices version 2.0 addressed the region’s transportation funding crisis by including the planning assumptions in the Connections 2040 Long-Range Plan. Included in this was SEPTA’s realignment plan, and a substantially lower revenue forecast than version 1.0 assumed. Weeks after version 2.0 was launched, Act 89 of 2013 was signed into law, significantly increasing transportation funding levels. As a result, this version was not heavily marketed. Those who did submit a scenario in version 2.0 again pointed toward a more sustainable future, and a willingness to pay for it. DVRPC thanks everyone who has participated in Choices & Voices.

Choices & Voices version 2.1 includes the latest financial and transportation needs data from the amended Connections 2040 Plan, including funding from Act 89. SEPTA’s realignment plan has been removed from the discussion. We invite you to continue to develop the region’s vision for a more sustainable and economically competitive Greater Philadelphia region by participating in Choices & Voices version 2.1 at www.dvrpc.org/choicesandvoices. Please help spread the word about this program by sharing it with your family, friends, neighbors, and colleagues.
Appendix. All Comments

This section presents all comments as received by Choices & Voices version 2.0 respondents. Personal information, such as names and e-mail addresses, have been removed. A large number of names were removed, as a local graduate-level university course encouraged participation.

- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- "my scenario"
- [Name removed]
- "The main issue with the current transportation system is that there needs to be more maintenance of the existing infrastructure. As already illustrated by the ASCE infrastructure report card, there is far too much neglect of existing structures and transportation systems. It seems counter intuitive to have significant new developments if there currently is so much neglect. If there are any development plans, they should be directed toward existing systems such as widening I-76."
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- I believe that there should be a focus on more transportation options and there should be a spread of growth and infill development in towns and cities across the region and not just one specific location. I think there needs to be additional funding to pay for "state of good repair" because the roads are in extremely poor condition. I would be willing to pay an increase in transit fares and vehicle registration fees if I was a resident that this would actually affect."
- [Name removed]
- [Name removed]
- "Although not every category changed for the positive, I do believe the choices I made throughout the survey were based on my realistic view rather than ideal. I do not have enough knowledge to understand the dollar amounts of each area. The annual cost per household was the value I related most to, but my lack of understanding for the amount invested for any given thing may skew the feasibility of my survey results. The feature I think that would be most useful to realize is the extension of the Norristown Highspeed Line to the King of Prussia Mall."
- [Name removed]
- "I think growth that balances between building up the cities and older neighborhoods is important to ensuring transport goes smoothly. With the increase in population I do not think more suburban sprawl would help. There needs to be more public transportation options to get a lot of these cars off the road to decrease congestion. Expanding the train lines would enable much more commuters to get where they need to be efficiently. More service to New York and New Jersey will enable more interstate commerce. King of Prussia is the second largest mall in the U.S. Providing service on the high-speed line there would enable more people to get there easily boosting the economy."
- "Ideas:
  Rail - http://tinyurl.com/k6qffir
  Penns Landing - http://tinyurl.com/mbbho3k
  BFB-95 interchange - http://tinyurl.com/lnw96kt
  City Line elevated (!) bikepath - http://tinyurl.com/mcw2rgr"
- "I think that it is important to maintain a balance between development of all transportation modes instead of just focusing in on one. Relying solely on automobiles for transportation would lead to a lot more congestion problems in the future when commuters adjust to the improvements, as well as create major pollution problems. By focusing also, on transit and low environmental impact options, these potential future
costs are mitigated. I do however, admit that I do not know specifics about the benefits of each individual method, but I feel (as an under-educated in this topic individual much like most of the public) that moderation and variety is key. I would very much like to see more frequency in transits runs, because as someone who relies often on transit, it is inconvenient to rely on transit schedules to make plans. 

- Increasing transit options and improving the transit network to a state of good repair while not building any new roads (but maintaining those that exist) should be the regions highest priority. My generation is interested in car sharing or having a maximum of one car per household. Please make this a feasible reality.

- One of the biggest decisions I made was putting most of the transportation funding into roadways. I believe that it is very important to have well maintained roadways in order to keep people and vehicles safe and functioning. I also increased the walking and biking trips to encourage alternative transportation in order to clear up the roads from increased traffic. Greenhouse gas emissions will also go down as a result of less vehicles on the roads. It will form a closer knit community, where people can have easy access to products around them. Rail expansion is not as important to me as roadways. Roadways should be the priority over rail because more people use it. -[Name removed].

- Without a more comprehensive plan and proper funding the region will not develop in a positive manner. Providing the options for transportation past the car-centric views of the past while also providing safety to people is a necessity.

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- Extent the West Trenton Line!

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- [Name removed]

- The financial situation of the system is really tough. The project plans are ambitious, but basically ignore the reality of the situation: there is no money to undergo projects like this. Unfortunately, there is barely enough money to maintain the system as it stands today—this is a big problem, and a reality that we have to deal with. While I do not know the answer, I do know what the answer is not: the answer is not raising taxes on citizens in various ways to get money to pay for these projects. Instead what should be emphasized is improving efficiency of operations in other sectors of government to free up more funding for public works projects like these. Another way to go about this problem is instead of planning an ambitious project and then look for the money, take the money that is allotted and really use every cent to improve the region in cost effective but high impact ways.

**VERSION 1.0 COMMENTS**

The 70 comments received in Choices & Voices version 1.0 are summarized as follows:

The highest number of comments were supportive of the various alternative modes (biking, walking, and transit), as well as transit-oriented development.

A number of comments addressed the tool itself. Many wanted to be able to select additional funding options and higher funding levels. Several commenters noted functionality issues with the tool, such as it was not clear that several funding options were slider bars (allowing for any funding level; version 2.0 incorporated many of these enhancement suggestions). A number of comments had positive things to say about the application itself.

There were a few additional calls for specific highway or transit projects, none of which are currently being pursued by DVRPC’s regional planning partners. These project ideas have been shared with the planning partners.

Additional funding option ideas included corporate sponsorships, land taxes, carbon taxes, and public–private partnerships.
Many of the requests for better functionality have been addressed in subsequent versions of Choices & Voices. The following are the comments received in Version 1.0 of Choices & Voices. Some DVRPC responses are in bold.

- "We need to maintain existing roadways and expand transit."
- "Just implemnt this! Up the gas taxes and registration fees and prioritize transit!"
- "More public transit!"
- "Consider the possibilities of reducing financial and construction burden to state and local governments through the utilization of P3 agreements for public transportation in PA, using the newly-enacted P3 legislation."
- "More public outreach and education is required regarding infrastructure and the role it plays on day to day lives. People do want improvements but never want to pay for them. An outreach plan would provide good information to people indicating why we need to do infrastructure improvements now instead of later at more critical and costly levels. I think it is imperative to get people involved now in doing upgrades and improvements BEFORE a bridge collapse or a sinkhole forms in a roadway that makes a project and emergency and that much more difficult and costly to complete."

DVRPC Response: DVRPC has one such ongoing campaign: Which Way Now http://www.dvrpc.org/WhichWayNow/. If you would like to have someone come and speak to your organization about these issues please contact DVRPC by e-mail at public_affairs@dvrpc.org.

- "Excellent tool. I would like to add that broad based tolling needs to be a component of increased revenue and decreasing prevailing wage commitments needs to be a component of cost savings."
- "Prioritize Rapid transit!"
- "Good tool except several different till, tax & fee options are better than limiting us to 1."
- "No fancy bike paths, just maintain the rightmost 24" of the road as good as or better than the rest of the road."
- "Look at corporate sponsorship for bike lanes, Park entrances and greening projects with minimal tax increases to citizens. SEPTA can improve its infrastructure through Federal and State Grants. Green and diversify transportation options with corporate sponsorship and private donations. Good Luck!"
- "We should prioritize dense transit-oriented, urban development to save our farmland and ecosystem."
- "More dedicated funding for transit, biking, and walking. I make 95% of my trips by these three modes. WOULD be willing to pay more in taxes to improve our transportation system."
- "This was a really easy-to-use and informative interface. I really like that there was a strong educational component."
- "I would like to see most $ spent for mass transit, trails and development of down towns and small surrounding towns."
- "I think there is an amount between $120 and $240/household/year increase in costs that I would agree with if it meant that our infrastructure were maintained and nothing else. While I could handle the increase to $240, I think, many others cannot, so that is why $120 is what I chose. Overall, I think this is a great exercise, and thank you for the opportunity to participate. I hope that this leads to a vision of the region that lets us dial back on sprawl and use/improve more of what we have, including making older car-oriented suburbs and some urban areas more livable and walkable, rather than using up more land. Thanks again."
- "Question: Where does certain income in the city go? (ie. from parking meters, tolls, gambling?) I think it is worth looking at where income from parking and other services in Center City are allocated. Then reallocating money received through PPA so that it is reintroduced into the funds for maintenance of roads used. Also, reduce "free parking" zones (ie. "Free Parking" in the bike lanes Sunday) and create incentives for people to take public transit in lieu of driving."

DVRPC Response: Toll revenues are collected by the Delaware River Port Authority (DRPA) and used primarily to maintain the Betsy Ross, Ben Franklin, Walt Whitman, and Commodore Barry bridges, the RiverLink Ferry, and the Port Authority Transit Corporation (PATCO) transit line. Parking meter revenue is collected and managed by the Philadelphia Parking Authority (PPA). Net revenue from the on-street parking program is split between the City of Philadelphia and the...
School District of Philadelphia. Gambling revenues are collected by the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board and are used for statewide property tax reduction, and in the City of Philadelphia for wage tax reduction. Each of these agencies submit annual reports, available on their websites, which detail revenues and expenditures. Reallocation of any of these funding streams would require state legislation.

- "This model should include consideration for complete streets."
- "Would be nice, if I could add more funding... I tried but was not able to get the funding for good highway maintenance..."
- "I reject the premise that all existing roads and bridges should be maintained. This is a motorist-centric viewpoint, and as this survey shows is not a sustainable long term solution. We should look to reduce the number of roads, interchanges, and other major highway projects in favor of mass transit and other alternative transportation. In general this is an extremely biased survey furthering a very narrow-minded worldview."
- "322 bypass from Barry to 55, or maybe finish 90 bypassing 73 to maybe form a belt from the barry bridge to betsy... probably would help SJ as much as another train leading to glassboro williamstown and vineland, or even better to wildwood."
- "Bicycle support in the inner suburbs is currently very bad. Much more needs to be done. Planned transit routes were near impossible to imagine and assess. For example, what is the point of the Delaware Ave line in Phila?"
- "I would pay for my program with a combination of congestion pricing, land value tax and gas tax increase. Unfortunately I could only choose one option from the menu."
- "Awesome tool, great interaction and information."
- "there should be a broad spectrum of funding sources achieving higher levels of funding so that higher states of repair to the infrastructure can be maintained"
- "Philadelphia bus routes should be combined to offer greater frequency on fewer streets. High level platforms for rail lines needed urgently; step climbing discourages riders."
- "I think a balanced, combination approach to raising revenue is best (congestion pricing + dynamic pricing for parking + modest increase in sales tax + vehicle registration fees). Also, I think transit oriented development and a more pedestrian + bike friendly infrastructure would help a lot in making the region a good place to live and work."
- "We need a multi-modal future. We need to make sure all driving is SAFE. We have far too many traffic deaths in this region–especially pedestrians."
- "We need more highway options like improving I-76, and I-476"
- "What about preserving the space from automobiles and putting more safe biking lanes in?! You cannot build your way out of congestion so expanding roadways will not cure the problem."
- "Loved the format of the survey!"
- "Fund transit, bike, pedestrian improvements!"
- "There should be an option with an array of funding sources."
- "What a great application! You must have one amazing web developer! Thanks for helping me understand the give and take necessary for our growing region!"
- "Great interface!"
- "More revenue needs to be raised to pay for these projects. I believe citizens need to pay more in a general sales tax and have high vehicle registration rates assessed. Also, I like the idea of taxing unhealthy foods and luxury items at a high rate."
- "Great app! We must must must invest in transit, cycling, and walking transportation options and build our environment to match. And I live in the burbs. =)
- "More mass transit!!"
- "Incentives for telecommuting could be a cost effective game-changer."
- "great site! The more rail transit the better!"
- "I believe the Newtown Line Extension should be a priority. There are cost effective ways to build it. Fox Chase is crowded every day."
- "There are options not shown in this example."
DVRPC Response: We would like to know what options you would like to see.

- "Tunnel under US 76 from King of Prussia to South Philadelphia"
- "everything here seems to hinge on the road maintenance question-- and there is no intermediate choice allowed between spending $26B and $66B!"
- "We must focus on transit and development that is not focused on individuals in their cars, and be willing to fight for state and federal funding for it."
- "I take issue with the revenue projections for congestion tolling versus 24/7 tolling on all limited-access highways; any palatable congestion charge would not capture much or any revenue in the off-peak. While a rush-hour surcharge is desirable from an efficiency standpoint, establishing a revenue stream from highway drivers is the priority. Gas taxes, sales taxes, and state and federal aid are no longer sufficient to the transportation needs of the region."

DVRPC Response: We reviewed and revised the elasticity of demand for congestion pricing in relationship to tolling in version 2.0, adjusting its anticipated impacts. The elasticity now anticipates that the greatest impact will be a shift in VMT from peak period to off-peak period, reducing peak period congestion, while VMT fees would have a greater overall VMT reduction compared to congestion pricing.

- "We need to invest in transit. We need to decongest the roads so that trucks and deliveries can go more quickly and so interstates will be for interstate uses and not commuters. We need to preserve our open spaces and revitalize our towns."
- "We must decrease VMT & GHG by moving people, not automobiles."
- "Funding for regional trails is a priority for me as a bicycle commuter as well as recreational user. The total benefits a connected trail network brings to our community exceed the costs in ways greater than any other transportation investment being considered."
- "Located the very northern tip of the mapped area, which is marked as "open space," with no access to public transportation it is depressing to see nothing that will have any bearing on getting public transportation into the outlying areas."
- "We need a balance between road and transit choice. So both forms of transit need equal funding. But overspending just to do a minimal difference in travel convience must be avoided. Sometimes planners over build facilities like transit stations and parking lots. On the road side better traffic light coordination and sensible turning lanes could speed traffic at lower cost than more lanes and new highways."
- "Pretty restricted set of options, but basically anything that pushes more people out of cars and onto bikes/transit is a good thing for economic development. More revenue from a gas tax than you allowed (maybe $500/yr) would be better than the $240/yr for congestion pricing."
- "Can you please consider linking the West Trenton rail line to the NEC line so that you could get from the northern PA suburbs to NYC without having to go all the way into Philadelphia or driving to Trenton?"

DVRPC Response: The West Trenton Line would connect with the NJ Transit Raritan Valley Line which offers service into New York City.

- "THank you for opening my eyes to the massive cost for our transportation infrastructure. It was very hard to decide, given the specific amount of $, which projects to endorse as well as how much current funding to maintain the infrastructure we have is going to cost. Not easy decisions."
- "Edgmont Township, Planning Commission, Delaware County"
- "Using blue route shoulder will cause many accidents and slow traffic much more"
- "The Devon development around the R7 Sedgwick station is built on contaminated land and the Wingohocking Creek. It was illegal built and has thus far killed one person from bad planning over the creek. See youtube East Mt Airy and Germantown flood with environmental engineer Name Removed. Also neighbor at XXX East Sydney is still very ill and has been displaced from her home for 7 years due to illegal chemical dumping and illegal handling of contamination at that railyard that belonged to SEPTA/ Name Removed and Name Removed LLC. Clean up illegal and failed due diligence. Crimes were committed and
still obstruction of justice by official and whistleblower retaliation harming neighbor. Eventually the bad building and planning will catch up. Suggestion. Restorative Justice and tearing down current structures as they begin to sink and fumes emerge and rehabilitating this historic area properly. Opening up and cleaning creek and building a destination point of park, open creek and first class environmental rehab education center. Educate on how to clean the water/soil, proper environmental due diligence/education on health issues of urban land. This rail yard has been industrial since 1876 and rail yards are a red flag for brownfield conditions plus we have the creek where chemicals were dumped daily for years, possibly causing a toxic plume. Felonies were committed and eventually this will catch up with those who abused their political power and intentionally harmed person to cover up these crimes. "

- "Rail transit options that do not necessitate travel to and from center city would be nice—a beltway around Philadelphia, connecting the ring suburbs! Changes to the rail system should be aimed at reducing miles driven, not luring customers from their home communities to distant rail stations. This could be achieved by offering different pricing for parking at suburban stations, such that local residents get favorable parking fees."
- "Great program!"
- "No more taxes! Start managing the tax revenue like you would your personal finances. Tax money is not free, it comes out of the pockets of the people that you were hired to serve."

DVRPC Response: One of the myriad of things that Choices & Voices attempts to show is the negative consequences of disinvestment in the region’s transportation infrastructure. Current funding levels mean deteriorating pavements, posted and closed bridges, and a significant loss of passenger rail infrastructure. This will make regional transportation more expensive for residents and businesses, while increasing congestion and reducing safety. Over the long term, this means a less economically competitive region with a lower quality of life.

- "You give us 8 funding options but allow us to only pick one. The game should be redesigned to pick more than one."
- "Rail transit investments should be focused on increasing rider miles (miles travelled on rail), not ridership. Increasing the number of riders does no good if they still drive many miles to get to a station."
- "yoooo"
- "Focus on moving toward a more transit-oriented infrastructure, supporting more transit modernization initiatives and bicycle infrastructure modernization."
- "Invest in transit first, then the roads."
- "Transit first! And spend money to keep transit in a good state of repair."
- "We need more rapid transit in South Jersey other than the one PATCO line."
- "I believe additional funding should be made possible than this tool made possible. I also believe that a carbon tax is the most effective way to raise these funds."
- "This model is flawed and yields bogus results the funding should have multiple options the span between maintenance levels should be optioned with levels of maintenance and you do not have local nonstate roads in this discussion."
- "Public transportation is critical to our growing economy. That should be our first priority."
- "Give SEPTA the funding it needs!"
- "Truly sustainable transit increases local access and encourages people to walk or bike or take a train. Parking garages combined with decreased local service (forcing people to drive to hubs) equal poor thinking. Expand the network of train service, get local municipalities to create bike lanes and safer walking roads, and get cars off the roads!"
- "CM = >VMT = >GHG"
- "Instead of proposed ""cultural corridor"" line: extend Patco to Schulykill, connect to existing rail lines at grade, tunnel under eakins oval, used abandoned Reading (?) line north of callowhill, and reconnect to Patco at franklin Sq using Ridge line spur. This can create a Center City loop that hits all the points of interest."
"I am not happy with this scenario, but given the budget that is available, there is no way to do any of the projects given and maintain a high condition of roads and transit systems."

"Review current rail schedules and adjust to encourage more rail travel over automobile use."

"Clearly an increased gas tax is not enough; funding from the state general fund is needed in greater quantities, as well as increased federal support, to ensure proper growth in the Greater Philadelphia region as well as other places. Although local budgets are also tight, greater participation on their part in funding regional transportation funding is also a must, as other large metropolitan areas do."

"We need another plan for transportation funding."