

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS
RELATED TO DVRPC BOARD ACTION ITEMS

JANUARY 26, 2012

BOARD
AGENDA ITEM

2. DVRPC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Actions

a. PA11-55: SEPTA Bus Purchase Program - 60' (MPMS# 90512), SEPTA

From: Jon Frey

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19134

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I cannot support this project because DVRPC's online commenting system does not provide any interaction with DVRPC staff that was previously available through the RCC. This lack of interaction prevents me from gaining access to as much information as possible on the proposed TIP action, and provide opportunities to address secondary questions as information flows back to me from DVRPC's planners.

Response: Thank you for your comments. You are welcome to contact DVRPC staff directly, or attend the Regional Transportation Committee meetings, where these actions are presented and discussed.

b. PA11-56: Energy Wayside Storage Project (MPMS# 94805), SEPTA

From: Jon Frey

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19134

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I cannot support this project because DVRPC's online commenting system does not provide any interaction with DVRPC staff that was previously available through the RCC. This lack of interaction prevents me from gaining access to as much information as possible on the proposed TIP action, and provide opportunities to address secondary questions as information flows back to me from DVRPC's planners.

Response: See response to Agenda Item 2a.

c. NJ12-04: South Pemberton Road (DB# D9912), Burlington County

From: John Boyle

County: Burlington

Zip Code: 08010

Date Received: January 17, 2012

Comment/Question: The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia supports the inclusion of 6 foot shoulders. added should be signed and painted as bicycle lanes. If bike lanes are not included please help us contact NJDOT to obtain a response.

Response: This comment was sent to NJDOT and to Burlington County for comment. Burlington County will sign and stencil the six foot shoulders on CR 530 for bicycles upon completion of the project.

e. PA11-49: Transit and Regional Rail Station Program (MPMS# 77183), SEPTA

From: John Boyle

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19102

Date Received: January 17, 2012

Comment/Question: The Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia supports this project as it will be an important link between multi-use path in Von Neida Park and a future path connection to the Delaware River Heritage trail to the 36th St Station.

Response: This comment will be submitted to the DVRPC Board.

3a. DVRPC Fiscal Year 2012 Planning Work Program Amendment: Schuylkill Expressway Operational Research Model – Continuation

From: Michael Gross

County: Pennsylvania

Zip Code: 18976

Date Received: January 17, 2012

Comment/Question: As mentioned, consider the frequency of multiple in city events such as convention center home show and flyers game with incidents on rt 63 as well as i95 south. I was delayed enough to miss appointment even though gps and radio warnings revised my routing.

Response: Thank you for your comment, which was forwarded to the Project Manager. There will be two models developed—one for existing conditions, and one based on future population forecasts. The models will be very flexible and can accommodate a variety of scenarios, including multiple special events. Your comment will be submitted to the DVRPC Board.

From: Jon Frey

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19134

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I cannot support this project because DVRPC's online commenting system does not provide any interaction with DVRPC staff that was previously available through the RCC. This lack of interaction prevents me from gaining access to as much information as possible on the proposed TIP action, and provide opportunities to address secondary questions as information flows back to me from DVRPC's planners.

Response: See response to Agenda Item 2a.

4. Adoption of the DVRPC Fiscal Year 2013 Planning Work Program

From: Arthur Alexander

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: Thank you for your comments. There are a variety of ways for the public to continue to participate in the regional planning process. All DVRPC committee meetings, including the Regional Transportation Committee and the DVRPC Board, are open for the public to attend. Public meetings and other events are held for the Long-Range Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program, and for many other projects. DVRPC staff is available to answer any questions you may have, and the online commenting feature has broadened public input to Board action items far beyond what the limited RCC membership could supply. We invite you to review the Public Participation Plan during the public comment period, and to apply for the Public Participation Task Force.

5. Approval to Release for Public Comment the Draft DVRPC Public Participation Plan: A Strategy For Citizen Involvement

From: Jeffrey Olawski

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Action Item 5 and 6 I urge you to not support these action items. Replacement of the RCC with a public participation task force was a substantial change to the federally-approved public participation plan (PPP). For all intents and purposes, that action has created a new PPP. Federal law provides any interested with the right to be involved the development of the PPP. As a corresponding member of the former RCC, I do not recall being provided with notice offering an opportunity to be involved in the development of the proposed PPP. It defies common sense that the RCC members, both voting and corresponding, would not be considered as interested parties by DVRPC. It is clear that the intended an interested party's involvement in development of a PPP to be something more than just an opportunity to comment, as proposed in this action item. I ask you to consider you ratification of this action item.

Response: Thank you for your comments. Federal law regarding the Public Participation Plan is being met and your opportunity for involvement in the content of the Plan is available during the 45-day public comment period, which will open on January 30, 2012.

From: Ronald Dunbar

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote NO: DVRPC used the RCC only as a way to claim they were paying attention to public input. When RCC members started suggesting rational changes to regional transportation policy that didn't fit DVRPC's pre-ordained agenda they killed it. DVRPC doesn't listen, so the RCC must be reinstated without restrictions so we the public can be heard.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Tom McHugh

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: Wyncote, PA

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Residents interested in regional planning issues were encouraged to attend RCC meetings, where they could contribute to and participate in discussions of regional issues. I attended every monthly meeting of the RCC for the last fifteen months of its existence. After working 35 years in fields of alternative energy, and energy conservation, I wanted to attend RCC meetings to discuss and promote high efficiency, less polluting transportation systems in our region.

Prior to February 2011 RCC meetings included free and open discussions. All citizens were welcome to contribute to the member initiated conversations and most regular attendees could vote to endorse or reject ideas and resolutions put before the group. It was democratic and exactly what a good public participation program should be. Reductions of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were discussed. Efficient ways to move people instead of cars, environmental sustainability, quality of life, and economic sustainability of our extensive system of roads, highways and bridges, were some of the topics.

As resolutions relating to energy efficient and less polluting alternatives to automobile traffic were discussed and passed, many members had a sense of accomplishment. That enthusiasm turned to disappointment in February 2011 when the subcommittee\ structure and member voting rights were unilaterally changed by the executive committee. The most productive discussions were shut down. Members were told to restrict their discussions to existing DVRPC policy. Resolutions and discussion of issues inconsistent with the status quo were described as a waste of time. The one quiet member of a rail advocacy group that attended most meetings was villainized by the executive committee.

Well reasoned, logical, low cost and technically sound ideas to promote the most efficient and least polluting form of mass transportation were perceived by staff and the executive committee to be disruptive. The real source of disruption was the embarrassing and unyielding resistance of the executive committee and staff to anything related to promoting commuter rail. This is all especially puzzling because recent FTA data clearly shows that commuter rail produces one fourth the GHG emissions of automobiles per passenger mile, and is the most energy efficient form of mass transit.

Board Action Items 5 and 6 need to be rejected. Online comments without follow-up questions and comments is one-way communication. For communication to be meaningful and productive it must be a free flowing face-to-face exchange of ideas. Hand picked and indoctrinated ("trained") citizen representatives are no substitute for taxpayer volunteers gathered to discuss regional issues, share and exchange opinions freely, and working together for the good of the entire region. Reinstatement of the free and open RCC in a way that encourages public participation from all points of view. The issues facing our region are much too important to neglect and real

interactive taxpayer participation is needed.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Miriam Moss

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19027

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: I urge you to return to the former process of having a REGIONAL CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE (RCC), . It offered the opportunity to have realistic solutions to our regionalplannign needs. And it is important NOT to censor or eliminate this kind of group of concerned citizens from our communities.. Thus I urge you to viote against Item 3 on the agend for the 1/26/12 meeting.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Bill Mettler

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Dear DVRPC: Please do not make the mistake of disbanding your RCC and replacing it with hand-picked citizens. Otherwise, designs and action items based on past availability of cheap fossil fuels will continue to be made and acted on. For example the intention to build hub stations with parking garages. With the RCC--citizens who are studied and interested in a viable future based on the reality of ever-increasing oil costs will make decisions that we can sustain--like increasing service to outlying local stations. In the near future train riders will need to ride the train over as many miles as possible because gasoline prices will be too expensive for even a partial commute into the city.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: B Maisey

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to ourregional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equalreplacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free andopen consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Emily Stine

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Allan Lundy, Ph.D.

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: This plan clearly is designed to limit, rather than increase, public input. In the long run, the DVRPC, let alone the residents, will be better served by facing difficult issues now rather than later, and difficult issues are far more likely to be brought up by persons who are truly representative of the community than hand-picked cronies of those invested in doing things as they have always been done.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Jon Frey

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19134

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I cannot support this project because DVRPC's online commenting system does not provide any interaction with DVRPC staff that was previously available through the RCC. This lack of interaction prevents me from gaining access to as much information as possible on the proposed TIP action, and provide opportunities to address secondary questions as information flows back to me from DVRPC's planners.

Response: See response to Agenda Item 2a.

From: Lora Lehmann

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote No --- Citizens Comments and free discussion are needed in this process . When it LOOKS like you have invited the public - but they are muzzled and unable to be part of the true decision making process it is a sign of an agency not fairly representing it's constituency. Limited comment is not satisfactory nor is it representative of a real inclusionary process.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Brooke Welsh

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Susanne Whitehead

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: No, I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Kurt Ahrens

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Joyce Weiner

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Chris Blazic

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Keep the RCC. The RCC encourages discussion and is not a limited participation process as proposed. It is the people's region and as such we should be able to be heard. The RCC provides a voice for the people.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Judith Gratz

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." Your plan would make it more difficult for the public to communicate with the DVRPC. Silencing opposing ideas is fascism of the first order. Veiling it to look like open comments are welcome is blatantly wrong. I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion. DON'T

IGNORE THE INPUT OF OTHERS THROUGH AN RCC; THEY HAVE IMPORTANT KNOWLEDGE & PERSPECTIVE THAT WOULD CREATE SYNERGY AND IMPROVE UPON YOUR IDEAS. Protect free & open speech by reinstating the RCC.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Janet Boys

County: Pennsylvania

Zip Code: 19119

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Allison Nguyen

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Leslie Williams

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion. I vote No.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Bonita Hay

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Georgia McWhinney

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: Whatever happened to the earlier RCC? It was truly representative of citizen input and the ideas expressed were truly helpful in guiding the vision of DVRPC? Why was that committee disbanded by DVRPC?

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Olga McHugh

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Teresa Warnick

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: I vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Dottie Baumgarten

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19038

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: No. I request that you reopen the Regional Citizens Committee. The proposed change does not support free and open discussion that is equal to the RCC.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Gail Post

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: I am asking that you reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, and not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not a comparable replacement for the RCC, just as limited

commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

6. Approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), the New Jersey Department of Transportation, and the New Jersey Transit Corporation and a MOU Concerning Special Procedures for Expediting TIP Amendments and Modifications for the Pennsylvania Portion of the DVRPC Region

From: Tom McHugh

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: Wyncote, PA

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Residents interested in regional planning issues were encouraged to attend RCC

meetings, where they could contribute to and participate in discussions of regional issues. I attended every monthly meeting of the RCC for the last fifteen months of its existence. After working 35 years in fields of alternative energy, and energy conservation, I wanted to attend RCC meetings to discuss and promote high efficiency, less polluting transportation systems in our region.

Prior to February 2011 RCC meetings included free and open discussions. All citizens were welcome to contribute to the member initiated conversations and most regular attendees could vote to endorse or reject ideas and resolutions put before the group. It was democratic and exactly what a good public participation program should be. Reductions of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were discussed. Efficient ways to move people instead of cars, environmental sustainability, quality of life, and economic sustainability of our extensive system of roads, highways and bridges, were some of the topics.

As resolutions relating to energy efficient and less polluting alternatives to automobile traffic were discussed and passed, many members had a sense of accomplishment. That enthusiasm turned to disappointment in February 2011 when the subcommittee structure and member voting rights were unilaterally changed by the executive committee. The most productive discussions were shut down. Members were told to restrict their discussions to existing DVRPC policy. Resolutions and discussion of issues inconsistent with the status quo were described as a waste of time. The one quiet member of a rail advocacy group that attended most meetings was villainized by the executive committee.

Well reasoned, logical, low cost and technically sound ideas to promote the most efficient and least polluting form of mass transportation were perceived by staff and the executive committee to be disruptive. The real source of disruption was the embarrassing and unyielding resistance of the executive committee and staff to anything related to promoting commuter rail. This is all especially puzzling because recent FTA data clearly shows that commuter rail produces one fourth the GHG emissions of automobiles per passenger mile, and is the most energy efficient form of mass transit.

Board Action Items 5 and 6 need to be rejected. Online comments without follow-up questions and comments is one-way communication. For communication to be meaningful and productive it must be a free flowing face-to-face exchange of ideas.

Hand picked and indoctrinated (“trained”) citizen representatives are no substitute for taxpayer volunteers gathered to discuss regional issues, share and exchange opinions freely, and working together for the good of the entire region. Reinstate the free and open RCC in a way that encourages public participation from all points of view. The issues facing our region are much too important to neglect and real interactive taxpayer participation is needed.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Ronald Dunbar

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote NO: DVRPC used the RCC only as a way to claim they were paying attention to public input. When RCC members started suggesting rational changes to regional transportation policy that didn't fit DVRPC's pre-ordained agenda they killed it. DVRPC doesn't listen, so the RCC must be reinstated without restrictions so we the public can be heard. The proposed Public Participation task Force is simply a high-sounding smoke screen to allow DVRPC to continue ignoring recommendations that they don't like but can't defend.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Jeffrey Olawski

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Action Item 5 and 6 I urge you to not support these action items. Replacement of the RCC with a public participation task force was a substantial change to the federally-approved public participation plan (PPP). For all intents and purposes, that action has created a new PPP. Federal law provides any interested with the right to be involved the development of the PPP. As a corresponding member of the former RCC, I do not recall being provided with notice offering an opportunity to be involved in the development of the proposed PPP. It defies common sense that the RCC members, both voting and corresponding, would not be considered as interested parties by DVRPC. It is clear that the intended an interested party's involvement in development of a PPP to be something more than just an opportunity to comment, as proposed in this action item. I ask you to consider you ratification of this action item.

Response: See response to Mr. Olawski in Agenda Item 5.

From: Emily Stine

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is

not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Richard Schultz

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19134

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: The PUBLIC deserves to have its voices heard regarding how PUBLIC dollars are being spent in this city. The job of our elected officials is not to decide this for us, but to listen to the constituency. Closed door meetings do nothing to facilitate this process.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Allan Lundy, Ph.D.

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: This appears to be another attempt to weaken public involvement in regional planning. We need more study and more careful debate about options, rather than streamlining the present process.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Jon Frey

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19134

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I cannot support this project because DVRPC's online commenting system does not provide any interaction with DVRPC staff that was previously available through the RCC. This lack of interaction prevents me from gaining access to as much information as possible on the proposed TIP action, and provide opportunities to address secondary questions as information flows back to me from DVRPC's planners.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Arthur Alexander

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Brooke Welsh

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question:Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Susanne Whitehead

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I am against this proposed action. I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Kurt Ahrens

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Joyce Weiner

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Chris Blazic

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Reopen the RCC to insure open discussion and no censure of citizens' thoughts on DV planning issues. We need free and open discussion. Not just lip service on citizen participation

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Judith Gratz

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Janet Boys

County: Pennsylvania

Zip Code: 19119

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Allison Nguyen

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Leslie Williams

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion. I vote No.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Bonita Hay

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 25, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Georgia McWhinney

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: I vote "No" because I feel the Regional Coordinating Committee already represented this region's thinking re the DVRPC.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Olga McHugh

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: Vote "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Teresa Warnick

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19095

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: "NO." I request you to reopen RCC so that free and open discussion relating to our regional planning is encouraged, not censored. The new proposed public participation task force is not an equal replacement for the RCC, just as limited commenting is not the same as free and open consultation and discussion.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: Dottie Baumgarten

County: Montgomery

Zip Code: 19038

Date Received: January 24, 2012

Comment/Question: No. I request that you reopen the Regional Citizens Committee. The proposed change does not support free and open discussion that is equal to the RCC.

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

From: John Scott

County: Philadelphia

Zip Code: 19125

Date Received: January 20, 2012

Comment/Question: The RCC plays a role in the currently applicable ppp as a means for not simply gathering data from the public, but gathering a consensus of public opinion. the develop of this consensus requires not just the one-way collection of public comments, but the interaction between members of the public and DVRPC staff, but also members of the public and other mem of public. This interaction allows for far more informed input from the public as it allows better appreciation of the underlying information (with the help of DVRPC staff) and better appreciation of issues (with the help of other members of the public). For example, a resident of one community may not recognize the importance of a project in another community until he or she has had a chance to discuss it with a diverse membership. The RCC Fulfilled this role in a way that no other existing program can. Without a direct immediate equivilant repl for the RCC, modification of the MOU should not occur. In the absence of RCC what single existing program allows mem of gen public to learn, comment and become part of a consensus position on tip action items?

Response: See response to A. Alexander in Agenda Item 4.

7. Year 2040 County and Municipal Population Forecasts

From: Jerry Foster

County: Mercer

Zip Code: 08550

Date Received: January 23, 2012

Comment/Question: Please see the West Windsor planning board report from Oct 2011:

http://www.westwindsornj.org/res_activity_list.pdf

http://www.westwindsornj.org/comm_develop_activity.pdf

It shows 243 units are under construction, including 3 units from Grovers Mill but not counting the theological seminary's 200 units - I believe that's all replacement. Plus 232 units that have site plan approval, plus 16 single family homes that have subdivision approval. 491 units total. Or from the Land Use element of the master plan as of August 2010: "Combined, new single family and multi-family residential dwellings approved for construction, but not yet built, equal 2,847 new units." <http://westwindsornj.org/MasterPlan/Section%203/Section3.pdf> If we believe the DVRPC estimates for 2114 new people in West Windsor over the next 30 years, we'd have to also believe many of these approved developments won't be built in the next 30 years, or if built, nobody will move in. Respectfully, Jerry Foster

Response: Thank you for your question. In addition to estimating that there were 2,847 units approved for construction but not yet built (as noted in the public comment), the 2010 Land Use Element of West Windsor Township's Master Plan notes that "... the population has risen from 8,452 persons in 1980 to an ... estimate of 21,572 persons", referring to the 2000 population. The Master Plan goes on to state that the Township's population "is estimated to increase by another 6,668 persons **once all currently approved but unbuilt residential projects are complete** [emphasis added]." The Plan therefore projects a total population of 28,240 (21,572 plus 6,668) once all the approved projects are built.

The 2000 Census population of West Windsor Township was 21,905 and the 2010 population was 27,165. DVRPC's 2040 population forecast is 29,279, an increase of 2,114 residents between 2010 and 2040, and 1,039 more people than the Township's projection of 28,240 once all the currently approved projects are built. The Mercer County planning staff and DVRPC therefore believe that the proposed 2040 forecast of 29,279 is reasonable.