

TIP

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM



Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Received during the
Public Comment Period
(June 1 – June 30)

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Bucks County		
MPMS# 13248 - Walnut Street (Bridge #13)		
A.1	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Project should include 4' shoulders or bike lanes</i>
MPMS# 13727 - Bristol Road Intersection Improvements		
A.2	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Why are bicycle facilities not included in this project?</i>
MPMS# 50633 - PA 263/Old York Road Concrete Rehab and Overlay		
A.3	Warwick Township	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
A.4	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Potential bicycle improvements to include in project</i>
A.5	Joe Gable	<i>The eight (8) mile section from Bristol Road to Sugar Bottom Road should be moved to the highest priority</i>
A.6	Bill Carpenter	<i>The section of road on Rt. 263 from Bristol Rd to Sugar Bottom Rd. is a safety hazard</i>
A.7	Norman Goldenberg	<i>The section of road on Rt. 263 from Bristol Rd to Sugar Bottom Rd. is in very poor condition</i>
MPMS# 57639 - Newtown-Yardley Road		
A.8	Steve Santarsiero, State Representative	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 57641 - Bridgetown Pike		
A.9	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
MPMS# 64781 - Swamp Road Culvert at Penns Woods Road		
A.10	Steve Santarsiero, State Representative	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
MPMS# 72906 - Afton Avenue Streetscape HTSSRS		
A.11	Steve Santarsiero, State Representative	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 74827 - Delaware Canal Enhance		
A.12	Steve Santarsiero, State Representative	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
R8 Newtown Rail Line Re-activation		
A.13	Marian Teter	<i>There is no public transpiration whatsoever within Northampton Township of Bucks County</i>
Chester County		
MPMS# 14515 - PA 100, Shoen Road to Gordon Drive (02L)		
A.14	Uwchlan Township	<i>Uwchlan Township is appreciative of the Route 100 Widening Project (SR 0100, Section 02L - MPMS # 14515) being placed back on the TIP</i>
MPMS# 14613 - PA 41, Gap Newport Road		
A.15	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Expression of support for project. Make sure bicycle traffic is accommodated at the roundabout.</i>
MPMS# 57664 - Newark Rd.		
A.16	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>General inquires concerning bicycle improvements as part of project</i>
MPMS# 70227 - PA 29 Phase III		
A.17	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Expression of opposition for right turn straight through lanes unless bicycle markings are included to guide bicyclists across intersections.</i>
MPMS# 77457 - Church Street Streetscape Project		
A.18	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Include bike racks in project</i>

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Chester County		
MPMS# 77459 - Phoenixville Streetscape Project		
A.19	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Include bike racks in project</i>
MPMS# 77470 - Operation Safe Kids - Phoenixville		
A.20	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 83710 - Boot Road Extension Bridge		
A.21	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Project should include bike lanes</i>
MPMS# 86698 - Osborne Road Bridge (CB #30)		
A.22	Michael Brown	<i>This project should be limited to repairs of the bridge to keep it sufficient to 3 tons</i>
Railroad Bridge in Chester County		
A.23	Linda Boyer	<i>General inquiry regarding a specific railroad bridge</i>
Delaware County		
MPMS# 15345 - PA 252, Providence Rd.		
A.24	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Issues concerning bicycle/pedestrian improvements as part of project</i>
MPMS# 15468 - Concord Road (Bridge)		
A.25	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Shoulders should be included in this project to accommodate bicycles</i>
MPMS# 65127 - Chester Waterfront Development/ Streetscape		
A.26	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Include bike lanes or shoulders in project</i>
Montgomery County		
General highway improvements and concerns in Montgomery County		
A.27	Lower Merion Township	<i>Lower Merion Township is disappointed in the apparent lack of support for the projects sponsored by the Township</i>
General transit improvements and concerns in Montgomery County		
A.28	Christopher J. Blazic	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.29	Jon Frey, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>PA-TEC agrees that regional funding for capital projects for SEPTA is severely limited</i>
General transit improvements and concerns in Various Counties		
A.30	Scott Gillanders	<i>Expression of opposition to garages</i>
MPMS# 87938 - Bethlehem Pike Roadway Streetscape Improv. (TCSP)		
A.31	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 57864 - Cowpath Rd./Godshall Rd./Broad St.		
A.32	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Install a bike pocket to the left of right turn lanes</i>
MPMS# 73214 - Ardmore Transit Center		
A.33	Greater Valley Forge Transportation Management Association	<i>Request that the Ardmore Transportation Center (MPMS #73214) be added to DVRPC's FY 2011-2014 TIP</i>

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Montgomery County		
MPMS# 84642 - Jenkintown Platform and Garage Project		
A.34	John Scott, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>A popular station pulling from a large area is a good thing, except under one condition - when it cannibalizes the other stations</i>
A.35	John Scott, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Additional parking in Jenkintown won't accomplish the objective of increased new ridership</i>
A.36	Thomas K. McHugh	<i>Clarification of the project description</i>
A.37	Melanie Vallerio	<i>Concerns regarding the location of the parking garage</i>
A.38	H. Lee Schwartzberg, Jr.	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.39	Jason Donahue	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.40	Jim Muldoon, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.41	Joseph Avon	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.42	Lindsay Snyder	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.43	Hans Peters	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.44	Andrew D Hoffman	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.45	Cathy Lipshutz	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.46	Patricia Scorsone	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.47	Steven Spadt	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.48	John Goodman	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.49	Paul Iverson, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.50	Beverly Maisey	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.51	Thomas K. McHugh	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.52	Olga McHugh, President of Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens (CCC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.53	Ed Tennyson, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.54	Olga S. McHugh	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.55	Deb & Dave Conly	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.56	Beverly Levitsky	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.57	Emily Stine	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.58	Suzanne Zak	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.59	Wendy Comisar	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.60	Nancy Zosa	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.61	Janet Starwood	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.62	David R. Loeb	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Montgomery County		
A.63	Denise Jervis	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.64	Edward Joseph Green	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.65	Mark and Claudia Ainsworth	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.66	Gail Post	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.67	Olga McHugh, President of Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens (CCC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.68	Cathie	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.69	Ed Tennyson, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.70	Justine Gerety	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.71	Jon Frey, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.72	Jack Craig, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.73	Stuart J. Rubin	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.74	Bonita Hay	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.75	Jacob Ketter	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.76	Diane Driban	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.77	Olga McHugh	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.78	Susanne Whitehead	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.79	Judith Gratz	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.80	Richard DiDio	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.81	Georgia Mcwhinney	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.82	Timothy Clifton	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.83	Paul Iverson, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>General inquiry on the Jenkintown Garage and Platform Project</i>
A.84	John Scott, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Jenkintown garage study</i>
A.85	John Scott, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Jenkintown is NOT overflowing in terms of parking capacity</i>
A.86	Henry D'Silva	<i>Restoration of an electrified R-8 Newtown line would be a far better choice and serve a larger number of the community than constructing a garage</i>
A.87	Jason Donahue	<i>Suspend project until a feasibility study for restoration of R8 Newtown Line service is conducted</i>
A.88	Louise H. Kidder	<i>This project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from a wider region</i>
A.89	Deborah	<i>This project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from all over the region</i>
MPMS# 89715 - Sanatoga Interchange Project		
A.90	Limerick Township	<i>Request for the reinstatement of the Sanatoga Interchange project (MPMS# 89715) on the FY 2011 TIP</i>
R8 Newtown Rail Line Re-activation		
A.91	Denise Jervis	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Philadelphia County		
MPMS# 61712 - N Del Riverfront Greenway/Heritage Trail/K&T - Line Item		
A.92	Sarah Clark Stuart, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	General inquiry concerning TIGER funding as part of this project
MPMS# 87107 - Philadelphia School District's Safe Routes to School		
A.93	Aissia Richardson	General inquires regarding project
Philadelphia County		
General highway improvements and concerns in Philadelphia County		
A.94	M. F. Harris	One problem related to promoting good traffic mobility in Philadelphia is the frequency with which the City does things that worsen the problem
General transit improvements and concerns in Philadelphia County		
A.95	P. McNulty	Northeast Philadelphia would really benefit from either an extension of the existing subway lines, or a completely new one
MPMS# 17460 - 40th Street (Bridge)		
A.96	Aissia Richardson	Recommendation to expedite project
MPMS# 17697 - Island Ave. (Signals)		
A.97	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Include a bike box to accommodate straight and left turning bicyclists
MPMS# 17813 - North Broad St./Avenue of the Arts and MPMS# 87937 - Avenue of the Arts Revitalization & Stscape (TCSP)		
A.98	Aissia Richardson	Expression of support for projects/recommendation of a comprehensive corridor study that examines how to link the diverse populations and institutions along the corridor
MPMS# 46956 - North Delaware Ave. Extension		
A.99	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Expression of support for project
MPMS# 56768 - 41st Street (Bridge)		
A.100	Aissia Richardson	Recommendation to expedite project
MPMS# 57893 - Lehigh Ave. East (Signals)		
A.101	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Include bike boxes at major intersections of project
MPMS# 57898 - Lancaster Ave. (Signals)		
A.102	Aissia Richardson	Expression of support for project
MPMS# 64844 - 30th Street Bridges - 6 Structures		
A.103	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Expression of support for project
MPMS# 69913 - Grays Ferry Ave. (Bridge)		
A.104	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	Include bicycle improvements in project
MPMS# 87937 - Avenue of the Arts Revitalization & Stscape (TCSP)		
A.105	Aissia Richardson	Expression of support for project
Wayne Junction Substation Replacement		
A.106	Paul Iverson, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	General inquiry on the Wayne Junction Substation Replacement

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Various Counties		
Comments on the FY2011 Draft TIP for Pennsylvania		
A.107	Paul Barton, Seneca-Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma	<i>Location of FY2011 Draft TIP projects do not endanger known sites of interest to the Seneca Cayuga Tribe</i>
A.108	Jason Ross, The Delaware Nation	<i>The Delaware Nation cannot submit comments to your office by June 30th, 2010</i>
General bicycle and pedestrian improvements and concerns in Various Counties		
A.109	Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Overall, we are disappointed that the TIP does do more to advance bicycle/pedestrian facilities and that it does not reflect an adherence to PA's Complete Streets check list</i>
General highway improvements and concerns in Various Counties		
A.110	Charles Bode, Tri-State Citizens' Council on Transportation	<i>Transportation plans must reduce the need for transportation</i>
A.111	Bridget Chadwick	<i>Whereas the region does not meet current Clean Air Standards; and whereas the Federal Office of Transportation is encouraging implementation of Complete Streets policy</i>
General transit improvements and concerns in Various Counties		
A.112	Georgia Mcwhinney	<i>Clean, efficient, reliable public transit is the only truly sensible transportation for the future</i>
A.113	Judith Gratz	<i>Expansion of SEPTA transit service and sustainability of our transit system</i>
A.114	William Shelton	<i>Expansion of the Broad Street Subway to South Jersey and Northeast Philadelphia</i>
A.115	Jacob Ketter	<i>More funding being made available for improved mass transit and bicycle transit availability</i>
A.116	Gail Slesinski	<i>Please carefully review how you use your funding for transportation services in the Delaware Valley Region</i>
A.117	John Pawson	<i>Priority must be given to those projects and elements within projects that maintain the operations of buses, trolleys, and trains; attract passenger miles; and reduce motor vehicle miles</i>
A.118	William Shelton	<i>Replace the Chestnut Hill Lines (R7&R8) with light rail or subway lines</i>
A.119	Judith Gratz	<i>Transit Oriented Development</i>
A.120	Olga McHugh	<i>We must stop wasting energy for the sake of our own National security and our environment</i>
A.121	Jim Gagne	<i>We need to move faster before it's too late</i>
Improving the TIP document and process		
A.122	Fritz	<i>Indicate what modes a project reflects</i>
MPMS# 14675 - Chester Valley Trail, Phase 2 (Sec 2/3)		
A.123	Michael Brown	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 59966 - Capital Asset Lease Program		
A.124	Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers (DVARP)	<i>Amount of funding SEPTA pays to lease Amtrak tracks</i>
MPMS# 60255 - Regional Rail Signal Modernization Program		
A.125	Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers (DVARP)	<i>Concerns regarding SEPTA's recent rail signal projects</i>

Index of Comments on the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

ITEM #	COMMENTOR	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Comments Received from the General Public		
Various Counties		
MPMS# 60286 - SEPTA Bus Purchase Program - 40`		
A.126	John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 60574 - Paoli Transportation Center		
A.127	Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers (DVARP)	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
MPMS# 60611 - Fare Collection System/New Payment Technologies		
A.128	Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers (DVARP)	<i>Support for advancing project</i>
MPMS# 84642 - Jenkintown Platform and Garage Project		
A.129	Jim Muldoon, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.130	Thomas K. McHugh	<i>Expression of opposition to project</i>
A.131	Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers (DVARP)	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
A.132	Ed Tennyson, Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition (PA-TEC)	<i>Restore the Newtown Rail Corridor as an alternative to the Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage project</i>
MPMS#s 60286/90512 - SEPTA Bus Purchase Program - 40` & 60`		
A.133	Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers (DVARP)	<i>Expression of support for project</i>
R8 Newtown Rail Line Re-activation		
A.134	Alice Maxfield	<i>Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown</i>
A.135	Kyle Coppola	<i>The reactivation of the Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor must be included in long-term planning</i>
SEPTA Substation Upgrades		
A.136	Bob Clearfield, SEPTA's Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)	<i>Priority of RRD substation upgrades</i>
Comments Received from the Regional Citizens Committee		
Various Counties		
Improving the TIP document and process		
B.1	DVRPC's Regional Citizens Committee (RCC)	<i>The RCC seeks complete transparency at all stages of the planning process</i>
Comments Received from the DVRPC Planning Partners & Agencies		
Bucks County		
Technical Corrections		
C.1	Bucks County	<i>Modify the project details of various projects in Bucks County</i>
C.2	PennDOT, Central Office	<i>Modify the project details of various projects in the DVRPC Region</i>
Chester County		
Technical Corrections		
C.3	Chester County	<i>Modify the project details of various projects in Chester County</i>

**Index of Comments
on the
DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
for Pennsylvania**

<i>ITEM #</i>	<i>COMMENTOR</i>	<i>SUMMARY OF COMMENT</i>
Comments Received from the DVRPC Planning Partners & Agencies		
Delaware County		
Technical Corrections		
C.4	Delaware County	<i>Modify the project details of various projects in Delaware County</i>
Montgomery County		
Technical Corrections		
C.5	Montgomery County	<i>Modify the project details of various projects in Montgomery County</i>

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Bucks County

MPMS# 13248 - Walnut Street (Bridge #13)

A.1: *Project should include 4' shoulders or bike lanes*

This project should include 4' shoulders or bike lanes.

MPMS# 13727 - Bristol Road Intersection Improvements

A.2: *Why are bicycle facilities not included in this project?*

Is the Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklist being used here. If so then we would like to know the reason that bicycle facilities are not being added to this road.

MPMS# 50633 - PA 263/Old York Road Concrete Rehab and Overlay

A.3: *Expression of support for project*

The Board of Supervisors, on behalf of the residents of Warwick Township, would like the financial support for the Route 263 PADOT reconstruction project to remain in place. This project is in the final design and an earlier overlay TIP (2009) was delayed in anticipation of this project. While the details of the final plan have yet to be reviewed, the condition of this road is very poor and requires continuous filling of concrete holes and removal of concrete pieces of roadway. Route 263 is a main road linking Buckingham and Warminster. The improvement projects on Route 263 for the adjacent municipalities have been completed. It is imperative that the project be fully funded in the 2011-2014 TIP program.

A.4: *Potential bicycle improvements to include in project*

Is the Bicycle and Pedestrian checklist being used on this project? Although the corridor has 8' shoulder it is not consistent especially at conflict points. Some changes simply using paint such as carving out bike pockets to the left of right turn lanes could make this road bicycle friendly.

A.5: *The eight (8) mile section from Bristol Road to Sugar Bottom Road should be moved to the highest priority*

At the outset I must admit that I do not fully understand TIP for Bucks County -- MPMS# 50633, AQ code S10 completely. The eight (8) mile section from Bristol Road to Sugar Bottom Road should be moved to the highest priority since this roadway is unsafe and is costing the taxpayers many dollars each month because PENNDOT is filling pot holes and putting in temporary repairs almost weekly. the condition of this road can only be compared to "dirt roads" in 3rd world countries!

A.6: *The section of road on Rt. 263 from Bristol Rd to Sugar Bottom Rd. is a safety hazard*

Rt. 263 in Jamison PA is a safety hazard to all drivers because of all the pot holes and drivers swerving into other lanes to avoid them and jeopardizing other drivers. Please repave this section of RT.263 (York Rd.) between Sugar Bottom Rd and Bristol RD in Jamison PA ASAP.

A.7: *The section of road on Rt. 263 from Bristol Rd to Sugar Bottom Rd. is in very poor condition*

The section of road on Rt 263 from Bristol Rd to Sugar Bottom rd is in very poor condition. It is unsafe and under repair very other day. It should get top priority for repaving.

MPMS# 57639 - Newtown-Yardley Road

A.8: *Expression of support for project*

I would like to state my continued support for the Newtown-Yardley Road 2011-2014 TIP improvement project (MPMS #57639). Not only would these modifications improve the current road conditions but also the overall traffic situation in Newtown Township and the Borough. Access to and safety within the township will be enhanced for the traveling public as the route from the Newtown Bypass (SR 0332) and 1-95 to the Newtown

Business Commons, the Township's major commercial area, will be improved upon and expanded.

The Newtown-Yardley Road Improvement project includes several necessary initiatives, including widening of the roadway, upgrading the existing traffic signal equipment and operations, in addition to the installation of a new traffic signal at the intersection of Newtown-Yardley Road and Friends Lane/Headley Drive and a closed loop system interconnecting traffic signals on Newtown- Yardley Road at Terry Drive/Lower Dolington Road, Friends Land and Penns Trail which would be connected to the closed loop system along the Newtown Bypass. The project creates pavement markings to provide one through lane in each direction along with protected left-turn lanes at the intersection of Newtown-Yardley Road and Terry Drive/Lower Dolington Road. Thank you for your time and consideration. I welcome the opportunity to work with you and state officials to move this project forward so it can be included in Penndot's construction schedule. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Bucks County

MPMS# 57641 - Bridgetown Pike

A.9: *Expression of opposition to project*

This project will negatively affect bicyclists and pedestrians. Widened intersections, and the addition of auxiliary lanes makes it more difficult for pedestrians to cross intersection despite the addition of sidewalks. The elimination of shoulders makes a road that is already difficult to bicycle along even more perilous.

MPMS# 64781 - Swamp Road Culvert at Penns Woods Road

A.10: *Expression of opposition to project*

I respectfully requested the removal of the Swamp Road Culvert at Penns Wood Road 2011-2014 TIP project (MPMS #64781) from the recently proposed draft for the Pennsylvania- Highway program. The construction plan to replace the bridge carrying Swamp Road (SR2036) includes 20 feet relocation to the south in addition to an expansion of the bridge and adjacent roadway through the acquisition of property from the Tyler Run State Park.

As previously stated in my Swamp Road corridor improvements letter dated April 22, 2009, I have grave concerns over any construction project that would encourage faster travel speeds. Therefore, I support the residents of the Swamp Road area in their opposition of any bridge and road expansion that does not include effective traffic calming measures and encourages lower travel speeds. Although future maintenance is necessary, the bridge itself is in good condition for transportation and does not require a hasty overhaul without the concern for community safety.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

MPMS# 72906 - Afton Avenue Streetscape HTSSRS

A.11: *Expression of support for project*

I would like to state my support for the Afton Avenue Streetscape HTSSRS 2011-2014 TIP project (MPMS #72906). The Penndot Home Town Streets/Safe Routes to School (HTSSRS) program would enhance accessibility for the residents of Yardley Borough and allow them to fully appreciate all that the town and the scenic waterways have to offer. More importantly, the HTSSRS project would promote safe traveling routes for the children of Yardley.

The streetscape improvements project will benefit the local economy of the borough, as well, providing new sidewalks and proper safety measures for those traveling along the stretch of Afton Avenue, located in Yardley's Central Business District. Pedestrians will also be able to view the natural beauty of both the Delaware River and Lake Afton while traversing this walkway. Small towns like Yardley often have accessibility problems related to parking and pedestrian mobility, but with the implementation of the HTSSRS program I hope to promote increased safe visitation and travel within our borough.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I welcome the opportunity to work with you and state officials to move this project forward so it can be included in Penndot's construction schedule. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

MPMS# 74827 - Delaware Canal Enhance

A.12: *Expression of support for project*

I would like to state my support for the Delaware Canal Enhance 2011-2014 TIP project (MPMS #74827). The proposed project includes the installation of a single span pre-stressed concrete adjacent box beam bridge for the Aqueduct and a pre-stressed concrete adjacent box beam bridge for the Tow Path.

While the canal contributes to the charm of Yardley borough, we have experienced flooding issues due to the buildup of debris reducing the hydraulic opening coupled with the low under clearance and short span of the current aqueduct system. The Delaware Canal requires some significant technical structural modifications to ensure the preservation of Main Street and the surrounding Yardley borough areas affected by the flood waters.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Bucks County

R8 Newtown Rail Line Re-activation

A.13: *There is no public transpiration whatsoever within Northampton Township of Bucks County*

At the present time, there is no public transpiration whatsoever within Northampton Township of Bucks County; although the population has grown dramatically within this area of Lower Bucks County over the past two decades. Housing developments have sprung up just about everywhere, and even in this downturn of economy, continue to go forward.

In Northampton Township, the population has grown to the point that a new high school has been built at a cost of \$80 million. This is the largest public high school building that I have ever seen. Expansions have been added to our library and other public facilities to accommodate growing needs.

It is my hope that DVRPC will take seriously the consideration of re-activation of the R8 Newtown Regional Rail Line, as we are in urgent need of relief from traffic congestion in this area of Lower Bucks County.

Also, I would like to ask for DVRPC's consideration of wasteful spending of SEPTA on electronic sign boards and undesirable parking garages. Expensive electronic sign boards are not necessary to efficiently move passengers. Elevated or below ground parking garages are not desirable for a number of reasons, including safety and security. In my opinion, SEPTA's funding would be better spent in expansion of rail service.

Chester County

MPMS# 14515 - PA 100, Shoen Road to Gordon Drive (02L)

A.14: *Uwchlan Township is appreciative of the Route 100 Widening Project (SR 0100, Section 02L - MPMS # 14515) being placed back on the TIP*

In regards to the current Draft TIP, Uwchlan Township acknowledges the inclusion and is appreciative of the Route 100 Widening Project (SR 0100, Section 02L - MPMS # 14515) being placed back on the TIP. We are thankful that this project has been recognized as a top priority for the County, the DVRPC and PennDOT, and we are working toward a PS&E Package submission by the end of this year. The Draft TIP reports that the Route 100 Project is programmed to begin payout for construction in FY20 13 and continuing through FY20 16, the total cost for construction

being \$14,575,000.00. Currently, we are in the process of obtaining the NPDES Permit while coordination is being made with utility companies in order to obtain the Utility Clearance. Final Design is underway for the noise barrier wall at the Aspenwood development and the retaining wall on Gordon Drive. Final Design is also underway for Pavement Markings and Signing as well as Traffic Signals.

As you are aware, in January of 1998, the DVRPC completed a report entitled "The P A 100 Corridor Study". In this report, the DVRPC makes the recommendation that in order to accommodate the projected traffic volumes, Rt. 100 needed to be widened to three (3) lanes in both directions from

the P A Turnpike to the Exton Bypass, and intersection improvements needed to be made to improve left turns movements. The sections to the north and south of this roadway section have already been widened to three lanes. This project is necessary to remove the bottle-neck that currently exists and to allow for a consistent roadway section.

Again, on behalf of Uwchlan Township, all the concerned taxpayers herein, and the more than 46,000 daily commuters utilizing this roadway, we want to thank you for putting the Route 100 Widening Project back on the TIP.

MPMS# 14613 - PA 41, Gap Newport Road

A.15: *Expression of support for project. Make sure bicycle traffic is accommodated at the roundabout.*

We support the conversion of intersections to roundabouts. This project is part of the Old Baltimore Pike Bikeway and care should be given to accommodate bicycle traffic at the roundabout.

MPMS# 57664 - Newark Rd.

A.16: *General inquires concerning bicycle improvements as part of project*

Is the bicycle and pedestrian checklist being used? If you are widening the intersection why not take the opportunity to provide space for bicyclists?

MPMS# 70227 - PA 29 Phase III

A.17: *Expression of opposition for right turn straight through lanes unless bicycle markings are included to guide bicyclists across intersections.*

While we applaud the addition of 5 foot shoulders we fear that they will disappear at intersections especially at right turn lanes. Yellow Springs Road is a popular recreational bike route. We suggest the left turn bike pockets at Yellow Springs and 29 and straight through bike pockets at all intersections to the left of right turn lanes. We oppose right turn straight through lanes unless bicycle markings are included to guide bicyclists across intersections.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Chester County

MPMS# 77457 - Church Street Streetscape Project

A.18: *Include bike racks in project*

This streetscape project should include inverted U or custom designed bike racks.

MPMS# 77459 - Phoenixville Streetscape Project

A.19: *Include bike racks in project*

This project should include inverted U or custom designed bike racks.

MPMS# 77470 - Operation Safe Kids - Phoenixville

A.20: *Expression of support for project*

We strongly support this project.

MPMS# 83710 - Boot Road Extension Bridge

A.21: *Project should include bike lanes*

This new bridge which offers connections to Bicycle PA Route L should include bike lanes.

MPMS# 86698 - Osborne Road Bridge (CB #30)

A.22: *This project should be limited to repairs of the bridge to keep it sufficient to 3 tons*

The justification of this project is quite poor, and the project should be limited to repairs of the bridge to keep it sufficient to 3 tons. Yes, the bridge is in bad shape, but Osborne Road shouldn't be used by anything other than passenger cars anyway. The lower part of Osborne is steep, narrow and has houses very close to the cartway. There's no need to provide incentive for heavier traffic to traverse Osborne Road. The connection from PA 340 to US 322 can be made via the US 30 by-pass or via Bondsville Road (SR4015).

The one lane aspect of the bridge serves a valuable function in reducing cross speeds for traffic entering Bondsville Road from the bridge. Because traffic entering Osborne from westbound Bondsville has to stop and let traffic off the bridge before it can proceed, it serves as a dam for other traffic, allowing those who exit the bridge to enter only having to worry about one direction, eastbound.

Railroad Bridge in Chester County

A.23: *General inquiry regarding a specific railroad bridge*

I'm not sure if your the right person to contact but I have concerns for the railroad bridge as you enter Coatesville from Parkesburg. Is this bridge safe or does it need reconstruction.

Delaware County

MPMS# 15345 - PA 252, Providence Rd.

A.24: *Issues concerning bicycle/pedestrian improvements as part of project*

The Bicycle Coalition praises this project because there is an effort here to implement the County Bicycle Plan. However the accommodations some minimal accommodation for bicycles 3' offset to the curb? However wide outside lanes on a state highway only makes the most skilled bicyclists comfortable. We would much prefer that arterial roads at least have 5' bike lanes which can also provide a very minimum accommodation for pedestrians on roads without sidewalks.

MPMS# 15468 - Concord Road (Bridge)

A.25: *Shoulders should be included in this project to accommodate bicycles*

Since this is part of the Delaware County Bicycle Plan shoulders should be included to accommodate bicycles.

MPMS# 65127 - Chester Waterfront Development/ Streetscape

A.26: *Include bike lanes or shoulders in project*

This road segment is included in the Delaware County Bicycle Plan and if there is enough room include bicycle lanes. If there is insufficient width for bike lanes then sharrows should be added.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

General highway improvements and concerns in Montgomery County

A.27: *Lower Merion Township is disappointed in the apparent lack of support for the projects sponsored by the Township*

The Township of Lower Merion has reviewed the DVRPC's draft Fiscal Year 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and is disappointed in the apparent lack of support for the projects sponsored by the Township. In addition, we would like to meet with you at your earliest convenience to better understand the quantitative and qualitative merits of the projects that were kept on the Draft 2011-2014 TIP for the region as, compared to the merits of the projects that were removed from the TIP, and relocated to the "Illustrative List of Projects." We will contact you shortly to schedule a meeting. By way of background, Lower Merion Township is a community of 60,000 residents and assorted businesses located northwest of the City of Philadelphia. The Township occupies a land area of 24 square miles with over 250 miles of public roads of which 84% are Township Roads. In addition, the Township is traversed by four (4) major rail lines. Included in this major transportation network are many of the Delaware Valley's most critical and heavily traveled transportation arteries including: Schuylkill Expressway (I-76); Mid-County Expressway (Blue Route, 1-476); City Avenue (US Route 1) Lancaster Avenue (U.S. Route 30); Montgomery Avenue; Conshohocken State Road (State Route 23); Haverford Avenue (State Route 3044); Belmont Avenue (State Route 3045); Spring Mill Road (State Route 320); AMTRAK's New York to Chicago Main Line; SEPTA's Ivy Ridge Line and Paoli Commuter Rail Lines; SEPTA's Philadelphia and Western Line ~ Red Arrow; Norfolk Southern Railroad (formerly Conrail's Main Line) Although certainly beneficial to the Township's residents, this extensive transportation network, in particular the major north/south and east/west arteries, provides significant benefit to the entire region. The costs to Township residents, however, extend far beyond the obvious financial burden and include the detrimental effects of air and noise pollution, increased stormwater runoff, traffic congestion and the associated police burden. Without the continued financial support of the state and federal governments in maintaining and upgrading the roads, bridges and mass transit facilities that are integral to this transportation network, the residents of Lower Merion Township will be subject to a disproportionate share of this burden. Given the present demands on tax revenues at all levels of government, any increase in burden at the Township level will most certainly be difficult to fund out of local taxes and may result in a deterioration of current conditions. One of the primary responsibilities of our Board of Commissioners, who are elected by the public is to oversee the responsible implementation of measures to maintain and improve the quality of life for Township residents, and to support similar improvements in adjacent municipalities throughout the region. In short, we, like many of the region's municipalities understand that:

1. The structurally deficient bridges within the Commonwealth must be addressed;
2. SEPTA continues to be a critical service that must be funded;
3. The failure to toll Interstate 80 and the subsequent reduction in Act 44 funds for highway and bridge projects, coupled with the lack of a replacement federal highway funding bill for the SAFETEA-LU legislation, has created a funding crisis resulting in the TIP being financially constrained. However, even with this understanding, the fact remains that there must be a balance with regard to providing adequate infrastructure for all users, and that past deferrals in the proper handling of bridge maintenance and rehabilitation should not now affect the safety, congestion reduction, economic development, and quality of life improvement that are the purpose of many of the projects on the TIP, which are now proposed to be deferred or eliminated. Many local municipalities, Lower Merion Township in particular, have expended substantial funds to plan and design these projects in good faith, expecting the state and federal funding support that was previously committed. We would also point out that we have completely fulfilled our obligations on previous TIP projects to bring improvements to fruition for the public in the recent past, including; Church Road Bridge Replacement; Merion Avenue Bridge Replacement; Township-wide Wayfinding Signage Program; Montgomery Avenue Traffic Signal System.

We realize that this process is a difficult one, as it requires the distribution of limited resources to address seemingly limitless needs, but rather than just defer or eliminate projects as proposed in the current draft 2011-2014 TIP, we urge the Committee to seek innovative funding mechanisms now, as the projects that are deferred will only become more expensive. We are especially concerned about the funding of two important projects which provide much needed safety and mobility improvements, and which will also enhance economic development opportunities-the Rock Hill Road/Belmont Avenue Improvement project, and the Ardmore Transit Center. The Rock Hill Road/Belmont Avenue project provides necessary improvements along a commercially developed corridor that also serves as the primary alternate route to the Schuylkill Expressway (I-76) for the region. Preliminary Engineering for the project, funded entirely by Lower Merion Township, has been substantially completed, and the Township has already acquired a critical portion of the right-of-way for the project in advance of a pending land development, thereby minimizing the expense of this facet of the project. The Ardmore Transit Center addresses parking and mass transit deficiencies in Ardmore, the municipal seat of Lower Merion Township and the location of the Township's primary SEPTA/Amtrak commuter rail station - and the only Amtrak stop in Montgomery County. Both of these projects are now shown on the "Illustrative List of Projects in the Pennsylvania Subregion," and are now completely unfunded for the FY11-FY14 TIP period. Both projects are critical to maintaining the adequacy of the Township's transportation network and would address acute and long-standing mobility issues. These projects would also contribute to stimulating economic revitalization. We have testified on behalf of these projects at the State Transportation Commission hearings, in person, in 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2008 and 2009.

In addition, there are two existing structurally-deficient bridge replacement projects currently under design (Union Avenue over SEPTA and Pennswood Road over Amtrak) that are critical elements in the Township's road network and of special concern.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

Since the demise of the Penn Central Railroad in 1970, the financial responsibility for many infrastructure components has fallen to the taxpayer. The replacement of these bridges have higher than normal costs because of special railroad insurance and construction requirements, railway electrification modifications, restrictive working conditions, and right-of-way acquisition. Steady progress has been made on the design of these bridges, and your continued support of these projects as they progress toward construction is critical to avoid traffic limitations and/or closure of the bridges. We request that the Commission reconsider their support for the following projects, and include them on the final 2011-2014 TIP with funding allocated in the first 4 years:

- Rock Hill Road/Belmont Avenue Corridor Improvements - Existing Project (MPMS 64795) This project addresses existing traffic congestion resulting from high volume, restrictive geography, and the presence of an existing narrow Norfolk Southern(NS) Railroad overpass that negatively affects the safety and efficiency of traffic flow and restricts the potential for economic revitalization through redevelopment. This heavily traveled corridor serves as a major east-west route from the Schuylkill Expressway (1-76), the Manayunk section of Philadelphia and the Township. Additionally, Rock Hill Road and Belmont Avenue serve as a primary alternate diversion route for the region during incidents on the Schuylkill Expressway, and, as such, experience even further operational deficiencies during these conditions. This project will provide the improvements necessary to resolve current infrastructure deficiencies for several roadway segments and intersections in the project area that are classified as Level of Service "D" or worse, some of which are currently operating at level of Service "F." This project includes the design and construction of roadway, traffic signal, stormwater, landscape, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation improvements in the Rock Hill Road/Belmont Avenue corridor and two (2) new bridges over Belmont Avenue. It will also provide necessary operational improvements to the current system to facilitate and support future commercial development and economic revitalization in this corridor. The project is currently on the PENNDOT Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), listed as MPMS# 64795. The Township has demonstrated a substantial funding commitment to the completion of the project by creating a Transportation Service Area for the corridor via the Act 209 Transportation Impact Fee process; funding 100% of the project's design costs (\$1,700,000); funding appraisals for the property acquisitions required for the project; and proactively purchasing a critical portion of the project's required Right-of-Way (the corner property at Rock Hill Road & Belmont Avenue, at a cost of \$1.6 million). The Township pre-emptively acquired this parcel, which was planned to be developed, in order to facilitate the project at the most advantageous and minimum cost, avoiding an increased acquisition cost later in the process once the site was developed. The Township has substantially completed the Preliminary Engineering phase of design of these improvements, and has been actively coordinating with PENNDOT and Norfolk Southern regarding project details for the past four (4) years. As part of Preliminary Engineering, required Right-of-Way areas have been defined, and preliminary cost estimates for the acquisition of the parcels necessary for the project are in excess of \$5,000,000. The current funding sources for design and Right-of-Way acquisition are 100% local. Construction is currently funded at an 80% Federal, 20% State participation level. Because of the significant increase in Right-of-Way costs, and the fact that the project's improvements will provide benefits to not only the Township, but will provide regional benefits to the thousands of commuters who travel the corridor on a daily basis, the Township previously requested participation from PennDOT for the remaining portion of the Right-of-Way funding, up to an 80% maximum share; This request was approved in December 2007 pending agreement from Montgomery County. The project was previously on the TIP, but has been removed from the FY2011-2014 Draft, and we request that this project be placed back on the TIP. We request that State/Federal sources fund \$3,500,000 of the total \$5,500,000 Right-of-Way phase in the first four (4) years of the program and that the anticipated construction funding of \$16,000,000 also be included in the first 4 years of the TIP. Pennswood Road Bridge over AMTRAK's Main Line - Existing Project: This approximately 70-year old structurally deficient bridge carries 3,500 vehicles per day across Amtrak's main line in the Haverford area of the Township. It serves as a link between Lancaster Avenue (U.S. Route 30) and Montgomery Avenue, both major arterials in the Haverford/Bryn Mawr area. The design phase of this project is underway with construction contract letting anticipated in 2011. The funding source for design is 80% state and 20% local, and 80% federal, 15% state, and 5% local for Right-of-Way and construction. The Township requests funding for the construction of the project in the amount of \$6,400,000 be allocated in the first four (4) years of the TIP, in order to maintain the project schedule. The Township has budgeted its proportional share in its Capital Improvement Program. The project is still shown on the TIP, but has not been shown in the first four years, and due to the pending completion of design and right-of-way acquisition, we request that this project be placed back on the first four years of the TIP, listed as MPMS# 16216. Union Avenue Bridge over SEPTA's Ivy Ridge Line - Existing Project: This approximately 85-year old structurally deficient bridge has deteriorated to the point where a weight restriction of 5 tons is required. Union Avenue is located near and parallel to the heavily congested City Avenue (U.S. Route 1) corridor. It is often used as an alternate route at peak rush hours. The project was previously on the TIP, but has been removed from the FY2011-2014 Draft as it was scheduled to have been started during FY2010. Due to a common delay associated with acquiring right-of-way, the final design phase of this project is nearing completion with construction contract letting anticipated in 2011. The Township requests that this project be placed back on the TIP (listed as MPMS# 16248) with construction funding of \$6,000,000 during the first four (4) years, at a contribution level of 80% federal, 15% state, and 5% local. The Township has budgeted its proportional share in its Capital Improvement Program.
- Ardmore Transit Center - Proposed Project (MPMS 73214): Significant parking and mass transit facility deficiencies have been identified in Ardmore, the municipal seat of Lower Merion Township. These deficiencies include the need for parking and new facilities for the SEPTA Amtrak train station, commuter parking, the municipal complex and the business district. In 2002, the

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

Township received a grant from the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) to undertake master planning for the development of an Ardmore Transit Center. This grant was matched with Community Development Block Grant Funds provided to the Township for planning. Since that time, the Township and Montgomery County have approved the Ardmore Redevelopment Area Plan that includes the revitalization of the train station area, commuter parking lots and pedestrian and bus linkages. In 2005, the Township received notification that funding of \$518,880 for improvements to the Anderson Avenue underpass was approved in the State's Home Town/Safe Streets budget. The Township also received a matching grant of \$300,000 from the Montgomery County Community Revitalization Program for this project. Engineering design work has been completed and the project will be bid through the PennDOT system. With the assistance of a \$300,000 grant from the County Revitalization program, the Township is now under construction with the realignment of the Lancaster Avenue and Ardmore Avenue intersection and the installation of streetscape improvements. All required Right-of-Way has been secured and transferred to PennDOT. These two related improvements were proposed in the Ardmore Transit Center Master Plan. The Township has been successful in its efforts to secure federal and state funding for a number of the proposed transportation projects. In December of 2004, SEPTA and the Township received notification of a \$5,800,000 appropriation in the Federal Transportation Administration budget in the Omnibus Appropriation Bill for the transit improvements. The Ardmore Transit Center will be a mixed-use inter-modal transit facility incorporating a new train station, platforms, pedestrian connections with bus routes, parking garage, mixed-use facilities (retail, commercial, residential, etc.) and associated public infrastructure improvements. The Center will have the added benefit of stimulating economic revitalization in the Ardmore Business District and improving the existing pedestrian, traffic, parking, and environmental conditions in Lower Merion. In 2006, SEPTA and the Township entered into a Master Agreement obligating the \$5,800,000 appropriation in the Federal Transportation Administration budget from 2006 Omnibus Appropriation Bill for the improvements. These funds are matched on an 80%/20% basis by the Township. In April 2009, the Township, as Sub-recipient to SEPTA entered into an agreement with Urban Engineers to provide design and engineering services for the Ardmore Transit Center. Engineering is now progressing to the 45% design phase with completion expected in 2011. In addition to engineering, other work completed to date to advance the project include the NEPA requirements of Environmental Assessment, Determination of Effect report, Phase One and Two Environmental reports, Phase 1 Archeological report and geotechnical testing of the track, platform and parking areas. A "No Adverse Impact" finding has been issued by the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

The Ardmore Transit Center will be a mixed-use inter-modal transit facility incorporating a new train station, ADA accessible high-level platforms, pedestrian connections with bus route connections, parking garage, mixed-use facilities (retail, commercial, residential, etc.) and associated streetscape and public infrastructure improvements. The Ardmore Transit Center will have the added benefit of stimulating economic revitalization in the Ardmore Business District and improving the existing pedestrian, traffic, parking, and environmental conditions in Lower Merion. The Township selected Philadelphia-based Dranoff Properties to be the developer of the private mixed-use project. In 2008, the Township entered into a Development Agreement with Dranoff Properties who will also be responsible for construction of the entire project.

The federally required Environmental Assessment including Section 106 and Section 4(f) reviews are completed. Currently, this project is not shown at all on the draft 2011-2014 TIP, and the Township requests the reinstatement of the project and that the TIP include funding of \$3,240,000 for final engineering, planning and design and \$28,000,000 for construction, at a funding source of 80% federal, 15% state and 5% local. The Township has budgeted and is spending its proportional share in its Capital Improvement Program and is working in partnership with both SEPTA and Amtrak. SEPTA has included the Ardmore Transit Center in their Capital Budget and also reimburses the Township for its proportional share under the Master Funding Agreement that has been extended to December 2013. The Township, through the Montgomery County Redevelopment Authority, has entered into a contract with the state of Pennsylvania that obligates a \$6,000,000 Redevelopment Assistance Capital Project grant for construction of the Ardmore Transit Center. The state Department of Community and Economic Development has also provided \$75,000 in grant funds for pre-development design costs. In addition, the Montgomery County Redevelopment Authority has committed \$250,000 in grant funds for streetscape improvements for the project. The Township is in the process of submitting a grant application for \$500,000 from the Growing Greener program for construction of a portion of the public improvements. In addition, SEPTA has submitted a request for an additional \$10,000,000 federal appropriation in 2011 for construction of the public and transit improvements. These grants and other funding efforts could be imperiled by the removal of the Ardmore Transit Center from the TIP and therefore we request that it be reinstated. The Ardmore Transit Center project is consistent with the Pennsylvania Transportation Policy Plan since it meets the goal for enhanced inter-modal connections between inner-city and regional rail lines. The project will significantly encourage the use of mass transit, thus reducing congestion on local, regional and interstate roadways and further supporting and expanding improved transit accessibility for commuters. Since the Ardmore station is the only Amtrak stop in Montgomery County, it will encourage the use of rail for both inter-state and intra-state passenger transportation. This will be a significant enhancement for riders regularly using the Northeast Corridor Amtrak system. The improvement of public transit infrastructure will contribute to increased economic development and meet State urban revitalization goals. A discreetly functional complex of pedestrian, mass transit, parking, shopping, retail, services and businesses, the Ardmore Transit Center project will enhance the community and establish growth in an organized and desirable approach significantly contributing to the revitalization of the commercial center of this major first tier suburb, thus

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

reducing pressure for suburban sprawl in the outlying areas. Conshohocken State Road/Mill Creek Road Reconstruction - Proposed Project: This project consists of the repair and reconstruction of Conshohocken State Road, (State Route 23) from Mill Creek Road to Hollow Road and of Mill Creek Road south of Conshohocken State Road to Rivet Road. Conshohocken State Road is a key alternate route and feeder to the Schuylkill Expressway (1-76) which is heavily used when severe congestion occurs on the Expressway. Mill Creek Road feeds Conshohocken State Road and serves as a connection to River Road another alternative to the Expressway, although limited to automobile traffic due to overhead clearance restrictions. Both roadways are exhibiting signs of severe distress requiring major repairs and/or reconstruction to prevent further deterioration including possible embankment failure that would severely limit or prevent their continued use. A preliminary engineering analysis identified signs of pavement and subgrade failure, pavement sliding and dipping, roadway embankment failure, retaining wall movement and inadequate drainage facilities. Design can be completed in late 2010. The Township again requests that the TIP include funding of \$150,000 for design and \$750,000 for construction of this project, at a funding source of 100% Local for design and 100% State and Federal for construction in the first four (4) years of the draft TIP. The Township has budgeted its proportional share in its Capital Improvement Program. All of the aforementioned projects provide significant benefits that transcend the boundaries of Lower Merion Township. Furthermore, the Township's projects meet a number of identified criteria for funding, including: repair of structurally deficient bridges (Union Avenue and Pennswood Road); regional congestion reduction and safety improvement measures (Rock Hill Road/Belmont Avenue); economic development and community revitalization (Rock Hill Road/Belmont Avenue and Ardmore Transit Center); and increased transit utilization (Ardmore Transit Center). Additionally, several of these projects were identified on previous TIPs, and the Township has more than fulfilled their part of the locally-sponsored transportation funding process by fully funding design and partial right-of-way costs, and has successfully advanced the project designs independent of PennDOT oversight. In the case of the Rock Hill Road and Belmont Avenue project, I would like to point to the fact that the Township has already committed almost \$3 million of our own funds to the project before a single dollar of state or federal funds have been committed to the project as proof of our dedication to the completion of TIP projects for the benefit of the region.

The Township has in the past and will continue to actively support the Twelve Year Program and its goals to improve safety, enhance mobility and the movement of goods, and the preservation of the transportation system by providing worthy candidates that provide regional as well as local benefits, and by providing the local required funding. The financial support of the Delaware Valley Regional Transportation Commission is essential to the success of the above initiatives. Therefore, we respectfully request your support.

As previously noted, we request a meeting with you at your earliest convenience to discuss the quantitative and qualitative merits of the projects that were kept on the Draft 2011-2014 TIP for the region as compared to the merits of the projects that were removed from the TIP and relocated to the "Illustrative List of Projects."

General transit improvements and concerns in Montgomery County

A.28: *Expression of opposition to project*

I do not understand the reason SEPTA wants to spend so much money on a parking garage in Jenkintown. At a cost of \$100,000 dollars a spot, SEPTA's money would be better spent fixing the bottleneck of transit lines at Wayne Junction.

A garage at Jenkintown encourages folks to drive from outlying districts instead of taking the train from their home station. The roads in the Jenkintown-Wyncote area are two lane residential roads, not commuter roads.

As a nation we are moving away from fossil fuels, why encourage more driving. Doesn't make sense to use the money to increase train service to outer stations such as Doylestown or Lansdale and keep all the traffic out of an established residential neighborhood.

I just don't see the logic of the parking garage. If service is increased to outer suburbs ridership increases, and driving decreases. Thank you.

A.29: *PA-TEC agrees that regional funding for capital projects for SEPTA is severely limited*

PA-TEC agrees that regional funding for capital projects for SEPTA is severely limited. PA-TEC recognizes that SEPTA's financial strategy is to minimize operating costs because funding formulas require strict adherence to a financially conservative operation.

PA-TEC is concerned that the projects SEPTA has chosen and DVARP has rubber-stamped will make degrade the performance, operation and fundability of the system worse. Building a parking garage that recovers less of its operating costs and serves few, if any, new passengers is the wrong strategy.

Pretending that only rail projects increase SEPTA's operating shortfall is intellectually dishonest - garages, fiber optic networks, smart stations and non-standard custom rail cars all make their own contributions to SEPTA's increased operating costs.

There's probably only one project that would break even, and that's automated fare collection. Strangely, SEPTA has chosen to sideline the fare collection upgrade project in favor of other projects that do not improve revenue collection or efficiency.

In the meantime, extending the Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor, which would recover more of its operating costs and serve thousands of new passengers is a much better choice than anything that's being seriously discussed, most notably the Jenkintown-Wyncote Parking Garage project, and the future Glenside Parking Garage project. Let's stop saying that SEPTA can't

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

afford to do expansions but they can afford to waste money on garages and unnecessary "enhancements".

General transit improvements and concerns in Various Counties

A.30: *Expression of opposition to garages*

I am not in support of garages for parking at either SEPTA station, Jenkintown or Glenside. These stations should be supported by more frequent rail service and feeder busses from business and neighborhood centers to encourage ridership. Care should be taken to support other stations along the R2/R3/R5 to increase feeder bus and TOD at these stations to increase ridership. The creation of garages at Jenkintown & Glenside do not provide an adequate return on investment for SEPTA, when the funds could be allocated to transit improvements along the entire corridor, including extension of service to Quakertown. Therefore I respectfully comment the TIP inclusion of these garage projects is not in the best interest of the neighborhoods or the rail system.

MPMS# 87938 - Bethlehem Pike Roadway Streetscape Improv. (TCSP)

A.31: *Expression of support for project*

We strongly support this project. We think that share the road signs are inadequate for bicyclists. Shared Lane Markings or Sharrows should be included, especially on the parking side of the project to encourage cyclists to ride outside the door zone and to make motorists aware that they should expect bicyclists in the travel lane.

MPMS# 57864 - Cowpath Rd./Godshall Rd./Broad St.

A.32: *Install a bike pocket to the left of right turn lanes*

We support the 4 foot minimum shoulder width, we also hope that a bike pocket be installed to the left of right turn lanes.

MPMS# 73214 - Ardmore Transit Center

A.33: *Request that the Ardmore Transportation Center (MPMS #73214) be added to DVRPC's FY 2011-2014 TIP*

GVF, a 501(c)(4) not-for-profit Transportation Management Association, requests that the Ardmore Transportation Center (MPMS #73214) be added to DVRPC's FY 2011-2014 TIP. This project, which previously appeared in the DVRPC's FY 2007 TIP and SEPTA requested to be added to DVRPC's FY 2009 TIP, is advancing rapidly through the design phase, has funding for the project obligated from various sources, and has a construction deadline set that falls within the timeframe of this TIP cycle. Moreover, removing the Ardmore Transportation Center from the TIP could endanger the project's eligibility for funding that has already been obligated and may be pursued in the future.

While GVF understands the fiscally constrained nature of the TIP, and transit-related project in particular due to the FHWA's rejection of the Commonwealth's 1-80 tolling application, we believe that several elements of the Ardmore Transportation Center qualify it for placement on the TIP. Though the project has been deferred in SEPTA's capital budget, SEPTA will continue to fund the project through design, which will continue into 2011. The funding for design comes from a roughly \$6 million FTA grant secured by Congressman Jim Gerlach's office in FY 2005. While this funding has been obligated, it has not been fully spent. Recent issues with right-of-way for Amtrak's electrical transmission wires, which delayed the design process for six to nine months, have been resolved. The engineering is now nearing the 45% design phase, and the final environmental review has been submitted to the FTA.

Funding for the project has already been obligated from several sources, and a deadline for construction has been set. In addition to the FY 2005 appropriation from Congressman Gerlach, Pennsylvania's Redevelopment Capital Assistance Grant Program and Montgomery County have committed \$6 million and \$250,000 respectively for the project. These two funding obligations could potentially be compromised if the project is removed from the TIP. SEPTA also submitted FY 2010-2011 appropriation requests to US Senators Arlen Specter and Robert Casey in the amount of \$10 million for the Ardmore Transportation Center. Dranoff Properties, Lower Merion's private development partner, has also committed to contributing funding for the private sector portion of the project. Dranoff Properties is contractually required to begin construction of the Ardmore Transportation Center by December 31, 2013, well within the boundary of this TIP cycle.

As mentioned previously, GVF understands the current fiscal realities of the TIP and SEPTA's Capital Budget. We believe that the Ardmore Transportation Center should be placed on the FY 2011-2014 TIP due to the fact that it currently has enough funding obligated, in the form of the \$6 million FTA grant, to complete the design process. GVF believes this strongly differentiates the Ardmore Transportation Center from other projects, which lack the funding to complete their design. We would request that the Ardmore Transportation Center be added to the FY 2011-2014 TIP until the project has completed design, at which point there can be a re-evaluation of the project's TIP status given the availability of funding for construction. We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

MPMS# 84642 - Jenkintown Platform and Garage Project

A.34: *A popular station pulling from a large area is a good thing, except under one condition - when it cannibalizes the other stations*

A popular station pulling from a large area is a good thing, except under one condition - when it cannibalizes the other stations. Cannibalizing riders from other stations causes a problem because it ultimately reduces ridership at those stations. That, in turn, leads to reduced service, because service is scheduled based on ridership. Reduced service causes more riders to seek stations with more frequent service. The system is in a situation they call a positive feedback loop, otherwise known as vicious cycle. The May 2009 SEPTA Parking Preferences Survey for the Jenkintown Station project confirmed that this case exists as riders from Melrose Park are reverse commuting to Jenkintown because their station lacks the same service level as Jenkintown. To remedy this situation and demagnetize Jenkintown for Melrose Park riders, service at Melrose Park should be increased to draw riders from that area back to Melrose Park Station.

A.35: *Additional parking in Jenkintown won't accomplish the objective of increased new ridership*

The 280 additional spots in Jenkintown are not likely to be filled by new riders, and hence they don't accomplish the objective of increased net new ridership.

Jenkintown is currently experiencing near zero population growth, and is not likely to change as there is no room for new development.

Therefore, in order for the 280 new parking spots at the proposed Jenkintown-Wyncote Transportation Center to translate to new riders, the riders have to come from outside the community.

The proposed Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage either produces no new riders or no new local riders. This indicates that the proposed placement of SEPTA's parking garage should be located near the demand for service instead of drawing the demand to the service.

Current and potential commuters would be more likely to utilize commuter rail if the garage was located closer to where they live instead of commuting to the garage. Placing the parking garage further from current and projected future population growth will act as a deterrent for use of the commuter rail system.

A.36: *Clarification of the project description*

The project description incorrectly states that the existing parking lot "cannot be expanded further due to physical constraints of the site. In fact many designs by professional architects for significant additional surface parking have been submitted to SEPTA for review. The latest SEPTA 30% design plans include additional surface parking for 31 cars. If some of the 403 non-local train riders that drive to and park at Jenkintown-Wyncote Station every work day were provided with better service and more parking at their home station, there would be no need for additional parking at J-W Station. The non-local train riders that drive to and park at J-W made it crystal clear in the May 2009 rider survey that they need and want better train service and more parking at their home station. The project description assumes, The additional parking between bus and rail will encourage greater usage of public transportation. It has been proven and is undisputed that 76.5% of the train riders that park at J-W Station could have and would have used a station closer to their home if their home station had better service and more parking. Therefore, additional parking at J-W Station without increased service and parking at other stations will result in a decrease of train rider miles and an increase in VMT, traffic congestion and GHG emissions. DVRPC needs to substantiate or remove the claim of greater usage of public transportation made in this project description, because the opposite will result from a continued concentration of parking and services at key transit centers. If planners are serious about decreasing VMT and GHG emissions, then they will admit that increasing transit rider miles must take precedence over just increasing transit ridership. The project description incorrectly states, Most parking spaces are filled by early morning by the commuter transit passengers, leaving little or no parking spaces for other passengers. The SEPTA survey consultant announced at the January 13, 2010 public meeting in Cheltenham Township that 600 riders board the trains at J-W Station after the time that the parking lot is claimed to be full. However, the surrounding streets are not filled with overflow parkers. This inconsistency needs to be resolved before any additional money is spent planning an unwanted and unneeded parking garage at J- W Station. The project description assumes, SEPTA's proposed construction of a parking garage and platform reconstruction work will be done in conjunction with the replacement of the Greenwood Avenue Bridge by PennDOT." However, representatives of PennDOT stated at a recent Public Works meeting in Cheltenham Township that the two projects are not coupled in any way. It has become increasingly obvious that the bridge project will be finished long before SEPTA can justify the need for a parking garage at J-W Station. DVRPC should remove the language shown above from the description of the project before the TIP is considered for funding so that the full length of time of disruption of traffic and quality of life can be understood.

A.37: *Concerns regarding the location of the parking garage*

I would like to know if anyone is looking into moving the parking garage closer to or adding access from Washington Lane to lessen the impact on the small streets and Historic Neighborhood.If not WHY ?

A.38: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at*

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

Jenkintown

Presently drive at least 7 miles to the R3 or more to the R7 line, but I live within a mile of the old Newtown rail line. It is mind boggling that we keep that line closed as waves of oil wash up on the Gulf coast.

I request that the DVRPC conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles travelled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area.

Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption, maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership, and have people drive even closer to the city. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

A.39: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

I request that the DVRPC conducts a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles travelled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area. Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

A.40: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

I request that the DVRPC conducts a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles travelled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area. Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

A.41: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

I request that the DVRPC conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles traveled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area. Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

A.42: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

I request that the DVRPC conducts a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles travelled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area. Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

A.43: *Expression of opposition to project*

I am very concerned that this project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from a wider region. Rather than adding a large number of parking spaces at one location, expansion of service such as re-opening the extension of the R-8 line, allowing bicycles on trains during peak times, and improving parking at all stations, is a better approach.
Thank you.

A.44: *Expression of opposition to project*

I believe this project is in line with the seeming policy of neglect of service on warminster, doylestown, and especially west trenton regional rail lines. These lines need proper parking at the existing stations, vs attempting to draw riders in at a station farther in from the endpoint terminals. While this one project may have short term benefits, which include employment for contractors, the long term needs of the region call for proper management of the lines from their respective terminals, proper parking at west trenton, doylestown, and safer parking with more pronounced signage at warminster will result in increased ridership, and will allow possible re-activation of the R8 line to newtown to handle this increased interest in regional rail service. The goal of SEPTA and DVRPC should be the expansion of rail lines and service, not the consolidation that will only lead to even fewer people taking an interest in becoming regular passengers. There is every reason to believe that SEPTA truly wishes to abandon its regional rail operations, based on its schedules, station conditions, lack of investment in modern rolling stock, and little or no advertising of its rail services. If this happened, the region would be far worse for it. I truly believe that if stations were repaired, given high platforms where possible, service increased, and parking expanded at outlying stations, people would flock to regional rail.

A.45: *Expression of opposition to project*

Please take this opportunity to submit a comment on their website, asking them to suspend MPMS#84642 which is the Jenkintown Commuter Parking Garage. This project, if built as proposed, will draw riders further away from their home station, and will starve the Warminster, West Trenton and Doylestown Branch lines from future investment and service improvements, and will guarantee that the R8 Newtown line remains closed!

A.46: *Expression of opposition to project*

Please do not build a parking garage at the Jenkintown station. It's a waste of taxpayer's money and it makes people drive more, not less.

A.47: *Expression of opposition to project*

As a local resident and commuter by foot + train, my concern is primarily for the well-being of my community. It is my understanding that due to the number of trains that stop in the Jenkintown station, it is already a popular location for commuters traveling by car from other areas, far and wide. Adding even more parking only compounds the problem by inviting ever more drivers to make Jenkintown their commuter station when there are much closer local options. Instead of encouraging more

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

drivers to come to our community, which is already congested with many more vehicles than our local, small-road community can reasonably and safely handle, it seems to me that public money should be invested in increasing service at the stations that are truly these commuters' "home stations." What really matters is getting commuters on SEPTA's regional rail system as far out as possible, so the goal should be to increase rider miles, not parking spots at a station that is so close to Philadelphia, itself. SEPTA should be taking service to the communities in which commuters live, not forcing people to drive from their communities to a parking garage in my town.

A.48: *Expression of opposition to project*

As a supporter of reinstated commuter rail service on SEPTA's R8 Fox Chase-Newtown Line, I am requesting that the feasibility study and alternatives analysis as part of the process for restoration of service on this corridor be included in the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's proposed Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), which is currently under consideration. I wish for my comments and support for this project to be included as a matter of public record as part of the process for the consideration of this important project in the proposed TIP.

The Newtown line meets the goals and objectives of the DVRPC, which is to improve transit connections, reduce vehicle miles travelled, air pollution and road congestion. Additionally, restoration of service on this corridor will increase the number of residents that use transit. The Jenkintown parking garage does not.

To date, neither SEPTA nor the DVRPC has considered any alternatives to building parking garages and more parking lots on other SEPTA rail lines in the region.

Please strike this project from the TIP. It will not add new riders to SEPTA and cost us millions of dollars that could otherwise be used to reinstate R8 Newtown rail service which will add riders and remove cars from the road.

A.49: *Expression of opposition to project*

The Pennsylvania Transit Expansion Coalition calls on the DVRPC to suspend MPMS#84642, the Jenkintown-Wyncote Parking Garage project in favor of a new comprehensive study that evaluates performance and deficiencies of existing SEPTA rail stations on the R2/R3/R5 and R7 regional rail lines, as well as traffic patterns along the corridors that intersect these lines, and the R8 Newtown line.

PA-TEC requests that the DVRPC conducts a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles travelled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area.

Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

Please remove MPMS#84642, the Jenkintown-Wyncote Parking garage from the proposed 2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program.

A.50: *Expression of opposition to project*

This is an incredibly wasteful and ill thought out project. The concerned citizens have proven time and again how expensive and unnecessary the parking garage is. As oft repeated, the money needs to be better spent on making more stops in more areas rather than continually curtailing stops to the outer suburbs. The DVRCP and SEPTA should be looking at having people DRIVE LESS by offering them the option of taking a train from a station closer to their own home, rather than having them drive more. I am frustrated with the DVRCP and SEPTA's lack of vision and planning and with their total unconcern about the additional pollution from automobiles this lack is and will continue to cause if they continue down this unsustainable path. And I also feel it is highly offensive of them to go for a LEED rating and as a LEED AP myself, I have every intention of letting the USGBC know what an oxymoron it is and that other things needed to be evaluated such as the overall impact this parking garage will cause.

A.51: *Expression of opposition to project*

The feasibility study cited in the project description had as its foundation a year 2000 (revised 2004) rider parking preference study which was found by experts in survey design and survey data analysis, to be seriously flawed to the point of being worthless. SEPTA representatives at public meetings in both Jenkintown Borough and Cheltenham Township agreed in front of large groups of interested citizens that the 2000/2004 survey and analysis was invalid and an entirely new survey needed to be

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

designed, administered and analyzed.

A new rider survey was designed by a SEPTA consultant with significant input from members of the community surrounding the Station who are expert in survey design and analysis. The new survey was conducted in May 2009. The results of the new survey clearly show that 76.5% of the riders that park at Jenkintown-Wyncote Station do not consider J-W to be their local station. 57% of those non-local parkers drive 3 or more miles through congested rush hour streets to park at J-W. 28% of those non-local parkers drive 5 or more miles through congested rush hour streets to park at J-W. For a better understanding of the data please review the Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens presentation of January 13, 2010 which can be viewed at the following link:

<http://www.cheltenhamtownship.com/SEPTA/CCC%20Presentation%2031%20Jan%202010%20Ver%201.4%20Revised.pdf>

Because the undisputed facts reveal that there is not a parking problem at J-W Station, but rather a driving problem caused by riders that need and want better service and more parking at their home station, planning for a parking garage at J-W Station should be stopped and those funds should be used to enhance service and parking throughout the commuter rail system in a way that will better reduce VMT and GHG emissions.

The parking garage project for Jenkintown-Wyncote Station needs to be stopped because it runs contrary to the stated need to reduce GHG emissions and to build for sustainability in our region. Both the FTA and DVRPC have targeted VMT for reduction in various reports and brochures. Parking garages in the inner suburbs will induce even more transit riders to by-pass their home station and drive to a transit center like J-W Station because of the perceived convenience of additional parking. 64 commuter rail stations have been closed in the last 32 years. Parking garages in the inner suburbs will continue the contraction and demise of our once great commuter rail system. The future of public transit will depend heavily on steel wheels rolling on steel rails because no other form of public or private transit has such high energy efficiency and such low CO2 emissions per passenger mile.

A.52: *Expression of opposition to project*

Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens, a community organization made up of members from both Jenkintown Borough and Cheltenham Township (Wyncote is located in Cheltenham Township) is supportive of DVRPC's RCC's Statement, which was adopted on May 18, 2010. For your convenience, the statement is copied below:

The RCC is the Regional Citizens' Committee for the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC)
STATEMENT/RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON 5/18/10

We believe that the DVRPC Board should seek to avoid concentration of capital expenditures, facilities, service levels, and station-area automobile traffic at a few locations. A larger number of much-lower-cost, interrelated infrastructure and service improvements at diverse locations will sooner bring us a more capable and efficient transportation system.

In the meantime, we urge a moratorium on construction of regional rail parking garages in favor of return to just-in-time incremental and economical expansion of the current parking stock.

RCC welcomes DVRPC's participation in the Jenkintown-Wyncote Region Commute Preferences and Parking Needs Study.

Beginning in that neighborhood, discussions have expanded concerning how our rail system and its parking should best develop and expand to meet our needs at a time of difficult energy and environmental issues.

Data from that study in conjunction with other data show that:

1. Jenkintown and Glenside stations, which have much higher service levels than surrounding stations, have diverted some 400 passengers from those other "home stations".
2. The largest diversion is from stations of the Warminster line, about 134. Since 1976, Warminster line service levels have been reduced from 50 weekday trains to only 43, despite large increases in tributary population. This reduction matches the 14% average cut on all regional rail lines which were operated then and now. As we know, only one line (to the Airport) has been added while five others have been partly or completely discontinued.
3. Peak service levels in several cases do not meet the minimal requirements of SEPTA's service standards, every 30 minutes in the peak traffic direction during peak travel hours.
4. A projected parking garage near the present Jenkintown-Wyncote station would increase the parking supply there to further divert passengers from nearby stations. The cost would approximate \$100,000 per added parking space. Currently, extensions of existing parking lots can cost about \$5000 per space. In fact, some surrounding stations with low service levels have a total of 200 vacant paved spaces which are now available for use.
5. The average number of parking spaces added yearly on four nearby lines has declined, according to a map from the Montgomery County Planning Commission. In the 1993-2009 period, an average of 163 spaces was added annually. Over the last four years, that average has declined to 44 new spaces yearly.

A.53: *Expression of opposition to project*

THE GARAGE IS ILLEGAL

We have laws demanding we clean the air and cut energy waste.

The garage in Jenkintown will foul the air and increase energy consumption. It is therefore illegal de facto, if not de jure.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

People farther north driving to Jenkintown will increase road congestion and contribute more to air pollution. It will also reduce SEPTA fare revenue on the R2, R3 AND R5 requiring more subsidy for for SEPTA. Garages do not pay for themselves, especially at the artificially low rates that SEPTA will charge. The garages will not qualify for additional operating subsidy under Section 9 of SAFETEA-LU. That means the operating shortfall will come from reduced service on the railroad. Increasing parking as a means of expanding ridership very bad planning. Some people walk to the station if there is one. Some people are one-car families and need that car for another family member mid-day. Then there is energy conservation. We send hundreds of BILLIONS of dollars out of the country every year to enemy nations to use against us. We must stop that. Cities with good rail transit save about 270 gallons of motor fuel every year per capita. If 35,000 people live along the Newtown Line beyond the R-2 or R-3, that will save \$28 million worth of gasoline a year. It will shorten the drive to the station for sure and keep more autos out of the most congested areas where slow speeds waste fuel.

A.54: *Expression of opposition to project*

I do not oppose compliance with ADA regulations. I do oppose the spending of millions of dollars for the building of a parking garage to produce a net gain of approximately 250 spaces at a cost of \$108,000 per added parking space. This is a waste of my tax dollars and is immoral. SEPTA and DVRPC have not thoroughly explored alternatives to increase ridership, such as described in a letter written by Mr. John Pawson, a member of DVRPC's RCC.

A.55: *Expression of opposition to project*

SEPTA's proposed project for the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station is not a good use of my tax dollars. I support public transportation and our Pennsylvania tax dollars need to be spent on projects to benefit thousands of transit riders - not only a mere 250. A \$27M parking garage to gain 250 additional spaces is robbery, a waste of our tax dollars and is immoral. SEPTA needs oversight of their spending, planning and the daily operation of our public transportation system here in South Eastern Pennsylvania

A.56: *Expression of opposition to project*

My concern is that this project will have a negative impact on the Jenkintown/Wyncote residential community, causing increased traffic congestion on narrow residential streets, by commuters rushing to catch their train, jeopardizing the safety of our children walking to school bus stops, and for the elderly residents, who have lived in these neighborhoods for many years. There are already major safety concerns at the intersections of Heacock Lane, Webster Ave. and Glenside Ave., where commuters routinely speed around narrow curved portions of Glenside Ave. Another concern is a decrease in property values. Families residing in this community are currently planning to relocate due to the anticipated detrimental impact of this project, on the safety of our children and the quality of life in this neighborhood.

I find it difficult to understand why the quality of life in Jenkintown/Wyncote areas is being sacrificed for the benefit of the residents of Warminster, West Trenton, Lansdale and Doylestown, when parking expansion projects within their own communities would be a more sensible solution.

A.57: *Expression of opposition to project*

I am writing to ask that this parking garage project be removed from the TIP. I am also writing in support of the positions laid out in the following two documents (copied here for convenience): The RCC statement from 5/19/2010 calling on SEPTA to suspend their pursuit of parking garages and the 5/12/2010 email from John Pawson to RCC, DVARP and SEPTA CAC.

1)DCRPC RCC Statement

At their 5/19/2010 meeting, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's Regional Citizens Committee adopted a statement calling on SEPTA to suspend their pursuit of parking garages across the regional rail system. The statement: We believe that the DVRPC Board should seek to avoid concentration of capital expenditures, facilities, service levels, and station-area automobile traffic at a few locations. A larger number of much-lower-cost, interrelated infrastructure and service improvements at diverse locations will sooner bring us a more capable and efficient transportation system.

In the meantime, we urge a moratorium on construction of regional rail parking garages in favor of return to just-in-time incremental and economical expansion of the current parking stock.

Data from that study in conjunction with other data show that:

1. Jenkintown and Glenside stations, which have much higher service levels than surrounding stations, have diverted some 400 passengers from those other "home stations".
2. The largest diversion is from stations of the Warminster line, about 134. Since 1976, Warminster line service levels have been reduced from 50 weekday trains to only 43, despite large increases in tributary population. This reduction matches the 14% average cut on all regional rail lines which were operated then and now. As we know, only one line (to the Airport) has been added while five others have been partly or completely discontinued.
3. Peak service levels in several cases do not meet the minimal requirements of SEPTA's service standards, every 30 minutes in the peak traffic direction during peak travel hours.
4. A projected parking garage near the present Jenkintown-Wyncote station would increase the parking supply there to further divert passengers from nearby stations. The cost would approximate \$100,000 per added parking space. Currently, extensions of

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

existing parking lots can cost about \$5000 per space. In fact, some surrounding stations with low service levels have a total of 200 vacant paved spaces which are now available for use.

5. The average number of parking spaces added yearly on four nearby lines has declined, according to a map from the Montgomery County Planning Commission. In the 1993-2009 period, an average of 163 spaces was added annually. Over the last four years, that average has declined to 44 new spaces yearly.

2)Email from John Pawson to RCC, DVARP, SEPTA CAC

From: JohnPawson Pawson [mailto:dvrails@yahoo.com]

Sent:Wednesday, May 12, 2010 4:34 PM

Subject: Better than Parking Garages: Improve Parking and Train Service All Around

From: JohnPawson Pawson <dvrails@yahoo.com>

Subject: Better than Parking Garages: Improve Parking and Train Service All Around

To: "RCC" <rcc_transportation@yahoogroups.com>, "DVARP" <core@dvarp.org>, "SEPTA Citizen Advisory Committee" <septacac@comcast.net>

Cc: "Candace Snyder" <csnyder@dvrpc.org>, "Jane Meconi" <jmeconi@dvrpc.org>, "Joseph Hacker" <jhacker@dvrpc.org>, cheltenhamchamberofcitizens@gmail.com

Date: Wednesday, May 12, 2010, 10:02 AM

The Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens has done northern suburbanites a favor by opposing the construction of an aerial garage at Jenkintown-Wyncote train station. They have shown us that concentration of commuters and parking to "magnet" locations with energy-intensive parking garages is neither cost-effective nor environmentally responsible. It would increase energy use and vehicle miles traveled and reduce passenger miles on public transportation.

While some commuters may be persuaded to live within walking distance of a station, many will need to drive there. This drive should be as short as possible; so passengers should get on a train as close to home as possible. Incremental amounts of new parking and added train service should be added inexpensively and environmentally responsibly where and when needed.

There are a number of important factors in optimizing the existing train services to attract passengers at "home" stations:

(1) Parking at each station should be kept adequate to the demands of its natural catchment area.

(2) Numbers of trains during the 2-1/2-hour traffic peaks (6:30-9 am inbound and 3:30-6 pm outbound) should be at least five in order to meet SEPTA's Service Standards which call for peak service at least every 30 minutes at all stations,

(3) The stopping times should be spread evenly with minimum spread occurring at the demand peak.

(4) Because inner stations and their catchment areas are the easiest places to begin a drive to center city, consideration should be given to somewhat more frequent stops there.

(5) The few persons who transfer among the three rail lines need a common transfer point. Fern Rock Transportation Center best meets that need because it also is the terminus of SEPTA's Broad Street subway line. Most trains should stop there.

These principles need to be better observed in practice on the Doylestown, Warminster, and West Trenton rail lines. The 40 stations of the northern three rail lines may be geographically divided into 11 groups. Given first below are the number of inbound morning peak trains now stopping at each station or group of stations. Next are the ranges of intervals between trains (measured at Suburban Station), which can be seen to vary widely. An asterisk indicates an interval which exceeds the Service Standards.

(1) Fern Rock Transportation Center: 13 station stops, intervals vary.

(2) Melrose Park: 8 stops, intervals 15-31* minutes.

(3) Elkins Park: 7 stops, 15-31* minutes.

(4) Jenkintown: 14 stops, 3-22 minutes.

(5) Glenside: 14 stops, 3-25 minutes.

(6) North Hills, Oreland, Penllyn: 5 stops, 27-30 minutes.

(7) Six other stations Fort Washington-Lansdale: 7 stops, 10-30 minutes.

(8) Seven stations beyond Lansdale to Doylestown: 4 stops, 26-83* minutes (the last is at the end of the morning peak).

(9) Six stations on the branch to Warminster: 5 stops, 28-35* minutes (only one of the intervals is less than 30 minutes).

(10) Noble, Rydal, Meadowbrook on line to West Trenton: 5 stops, 18-42* minutes.

(11) Other stations of West Trenton branch: 8 stops, 11-23 minutes.

Similar data can be found for the 2-1/2-hour 4-6:30 pm afternoon peak, leading to similar issues.

Areas around the nearby low-service stations generate most of the non-neighborhood patrons who drive to Jenkintown and Glenside stations, according to Jenkintown-Wyncote Station Region Commuter Preferences and Parking Needs Study.

A total of about 398 persons drive from other neighborhoods to the two stations, dividing approximately as follows:

(1) Among some 61 from the inner Lansdale line, 30 live near North Hills and 4 near Oreland. These could easily be accommodated in existing spaces.

(2) Among some 134 from the Warminster line, 23 live near Ardsley, 35 near Roslyn, 40 near Willow Grove, and 22 near Warminster. Sufficient vacant spaces and SEPTA-owned or other vacant land exists among these locations to accommodate present and future parking demand.

(3) Among some 90 from the inner West Trenton line, 23 live near Noble, 41 near Rydal or Meadowbrook, and 14 near

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

Bethayres. Here too, more-than-sufficient paved or unpaved space exists near the stations.

(4) About 30 drive outward from Elkins Park or Melrose Park. Sufficient unused parking spaces exist at Melrose Park to serve these patrons.

(5) About 51 live near the outer stations of the Chestnut Hill East line, with many unused spaces, including SEPTA-owned space for 120 cars at Chestnut Hill East itself.

(6) About 35 live near the Fox Chase line, which has more-than-sufficient parking potential around its last three stations. The above-cited report states (page 12) that "(a)lterations in service, if feasible, could dramatically shift patron commuting choices". The initiatives that are needed to equalize and improve services to the 40 stations are relatively simple and quickly implemented:

(1) Add stops at North Hills, Oreland, Penllyn, Noble, Rydal, and Meadowbrook to the trains which now bypass them. While the current "EXPRESS" label on the timetables may impress the new commuter, the reality is that these trains often bog down behind stopping trains in the express areas, reducing the advantage of long non-stop runs.

(2) Emphasize Fern Rock as a regional transportation center by scheduling more trains to stop there.

(3) Provide 8 quality-spaced stops (about three per hour) at inner stations Melrose Park and Elkins Park.

(4) Make the number of peak-period stops at Jenkintown the same as the off-peak frequency, approximately every 15 minutes, or 10 peak-period stops in total.

(5) Similarly, schedule 10 peak stops at Glenside.

(6) Insert one train each on the Doylestown and Warminster branches to meet the 30-minute Service Standards requirement.

(7) As part of the rescheduling process and insofar as possible, make intervals more even.

(8) Spruce up parking areas, remove vegetation, etc. at stations where more parking is expected. At just the six stations now bypassed, over a hundred excess parking spaces now exist or can be quickly provided on SEPTA property.

(9) Make appropriate, right-sized expenditures to support more frequencies on single-track segments, provide more overnight train storage space, and further expand parking. For instance, the hazardous right of way of Old Valley Road through the present Meadowbrook parking lot should be vacated, turned over to SEPTA, and reconfigured to add more parking spaces. In another example, excess property of PECO at Warminster can be converted to parking use to benefit PECO's best customer for electricity, SEPTA.

There is no reason why the easier of these changes could not get under way very shortly, to be in effect within months. The uncertainties of capital funding make it even more urgent to begin operational reforms and minor capital investments at once.

John Pawson

dvrails@yahoo.com

I am in full support of making the Jenkintown station ADA compliant, but believe strongly that alternative ways to accomplish these necessary upgrades without the construction of a parking garage have not been explored by SEPTA.

Thank you,

A.58: *Expression of opposition to project*

Representative Markosek: I understand that the State Transportation Committee is not aware of the calls by several civic groups and township governments requesting that SEPTA and the DVRPC re-evaluate its current plans for parking expansion at the Jenkintown and Glenside regional rail stations. I have emailed your office more than once about various aspects of this issue, as I know many others have done. So I hope the person who intercepts your emails is put on the red carpet for not alerting you to these. And I hope you will give this matter your undivided attention right now because the DVRPC's TIP is under scrutiny by the public and comments are being made about it in the thousands. I favor an impartial new regional study that evaluates the reactivation of service on SEPTA's Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor the need for more frequent service to train stations in the outer suburbs (the suburb in which I live is the first one out from the city of Phila. and has plenty of service)2. The need for more buses to take people from the outer suburban neighborhoods to their local train stations, the need for more parking at the outer suburban train stations, and the need to have rails that have been removed, which have resulted in curtailment of service, be replaced 3. We need a comprehensive study that evaluates other alternatives that would be more beneficial and cost effective, including route expansion on existing SEPTA owned lines. Many of us believe SEPTA is not being forthright in its current evaluation of the Newtown corridor a the need for constructing a parking complex at Jenkintown and Glenside stations. To clarify: Past studies for reactivated rail service were favorable in terms of cost and ridership SEPTA's parking garage proposals will cost more per rider, yield few new riders, compound current traffic problems and magnify environmental issues such as greenhouse gas and fine particulate emissions: A parking garage at the Jenkintown station would accommodate just 250-270 additional cars at a cost of about \$100,000 per parking space, an outrageous expenditure of tax dollars that makes no sense economically, and goes in the opposite direction of the way the rest of the world is moving in terms of reducing car traffic and vehicle miles traveled (VMTs). SEPTA's proposed Jenkintown parking garage complex will attract riders from as far away as 19 miles because closer stations lack service, parking, or are closed. Over 50% of all riders who park at the Jenkintown station come from distances greater than a few miles because of poor service and parking at their local stations, and because trains stop too frequently at the Jenkintown station (the neighbors are willing to have the trains stop less frequently in order to equalize service to the outer stations!). SEPTA has stated (it's in writing) that the additional parking would be needed just 3 days a week: Tuesday,

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

Wednesday, and Thursday. In fact it would not be needed at all if the outer stations received the service they need. Most of SEPTA's existing rail stations that are near the dormant Newtown line are at capacity, and the rail lines themselves are incapable of running more service because of track constraints. The areas that would benefit from reactivated Newtown service have grown at rates as high as 500% since the line was closed in 1983. Several municipalities in the area have unanimously passed resolutions calling for the reinstatement of Newtown rail service. In the long run, reactivating Newtown train service will cost less than expanding parking at all of the currently constrained stations, and will add at least 4 times as many new riders. Recently built parking garages by SEPTA have failed to rectify the problems they sought to address, such as on-street parking, leaving the garages underutilized. We believe that SEPTA's parking expansion programs will have long term damaging ramifications to the Regional Rail system, the environment, the economy and the quality of life for residents in this region. We are asking for a moratorium on the Jenkintown parking garage until a comprehensive analysis is completed which weighs the cost/benefit of restoring Newtown rail service from a regional perspective. This study must identify current deficiencies in terms of service and capacity on all lines in Philadelphia, Bucks, Chester and Montgomery Counties, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies, including restored Newtown service, which will reduce automobile traffic and increase rider miles on SEPTA trains. This study MUST be done by an outside, totally unbiased entity that has no ties to SEPTA, DVRPC, its subsidiaries, allies, and detractors alike. Finally - SEPTA has no official body overseeing their work and controlling them so they do what they please, wasting money and harming the environment with impunity. And now SEPTA wants FEMA to realign the floodplain, as if it were a gameboard and you can move the pieces wherever you wish!! I am not alone in saying that we want to see close scrutiny of SEPTA's actions and proposals to rein in their poor policies and waste of hard-to-come-by public money. Even better would be to have SEPTA replaced by a governmental agency that has a budget with dedicated funding for all aspects of a public transit's needs. Thank you for your consideration. Suzanne Zak

A.59: *Expression of opposition to project*

A recent independent study conducted by Univ. of Pennsylvania indicated there was likely no need for increased parking at this station. Instead, increasing the price of parking and making improvements focused on walkability and access are preferable. Specifically, a bike path from station along Glenside Ave. to Church Rd. and improving pedestrian safety at surrounding intersections are warranted. Conversion of station to useful commercial property (e.g. convenience store, coffee shop, sandwich shop, produce stand) would be wonderful for surrounding neighborhood. In addition, significant improvements to current parking lot--which itself is an eyesore and environmental problem for the watershed--are warranted. And even if one were to assume that a parking garage is necessary, which I don't, the cost of the project per parking space is outrageous. My tax dollars would be better invested in many, many other ways.

A.60: *Expression of opposition to project*

I am a resident of Wyncote, PA, who strongly objects to the building of a proposed SEPTA 700 car garage on a 75,000 square foot piece of land. The sole purpose being easy and increasing access to automobiles. The use of our tax dollars to build garages is unacceptable. In Cheltenham township we already pay high local taxes. If the garage is built the cost of security (studies have shown parking garages are a sight for increased criminal activity), upkeep and repair of roads will obviously go up. Money should be spent on providing better services and expanding rail lines. As a country we should be more creative in our thinking about mass transportation, cutting down on greenhouse gases and the stress of dealing with traffic. We as a nation are spoiled. We want to jump in our cars all too much, while the rest of the developed world already has better mass transit systems. Instead of pushing cars as a major mode of transportation, we should be taking the lead in innovation of alternate forms of transportation. SEPTA already has a network of rail lines and stations with which they can work. Imagine how great our rail system could be if they dared to actually listen and enact some of our citizens' ideas. Where are their priorities? Sincerely,

A.61: *Expression of opposition to project*

I have lived in this neighborhood and used this facility for more than twenty years. Over the last two years, while commuting to work in Center City, I never wanted to use the parking lot - I always walked to the station. The studies submitted that report unmet neighborhood demand for parking are grossly inaccurate. Constructing a large parking garage in this built-out inner suburb that is already suffering from heavy traffic through narrow streets will result in more vehicle miles traveled throughout the region, increased demand for oil, and increased levels of greenhouse gas emissions. I urge you to use our tax dollars be used for projects that will expand rail lines and increase commuter rail service at local stations in the outer suburbs. I enjoy taking the train out to Ambler or Doylestown to enjoy restaurants, theaters and museums. Service to stations outside of the inner suburbs should be increased. This is the kind of development that will benefit our region in the long-term.

A.62: *Expression of opposition to project*

Hello, my name is David Loeb and I reside on Summit Avenue, Jenkintown. I appreciate the chance to comment on the Septa Jenkintown Station Garage Project. I wish to express my opposition to the construction of a garage at the site of what is now a

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

parking lot on the grounds of cost, necessity and the environmental impact on the immediate community as well as the role the garage construction plays in the renovation of the transit system. I have no objection to necessary repairs and upgrades to the station such as the replacement of the bridge carrying Greenwood Avenue over the train line but the construction of a five story garage encourages trends that I find to be negative, both for our community and the transit system.

I understand that the estimated cost of the garage is approximately \$27,000,000. That amounts to an amazing amount per parking space-I think the amount averages out to \$200,000 per space, an amount that would be difficult to recover. I have visited other Septa stations in the system such as Wayne Junction or Cheltenham Avenue on the R8 line, and feel that these facilities are in a state of serious disrepair and there are serious safety issues confronting patrons at these stations among others. Would it not be a better investment of public funds to bring these stations up to a more reasonable state of repair and safety in order to encourage more people to use them?

Septa contends that passengers using the Jenkintown station are going begging for parking but I feel that an equally compelling argument can be made that if service was more frequent at outlying stations, more of those passengers might park and ride to and from them. Over the years, the system has gradually cut back and closed many stations, forcing people to drive further to a few transportation centers and larger stations like Jenkintown, Norristown or Paoli. This may save the system a little money in terms of station staff or operating staff on trains but actually adds to traffic congestion and the overall environmental impact on the community.

There are questions about the need for more parking; the study commissioned by Septa assumed that people who currently walk or cycle to the Jenkintown station will want to park at the Garage. I for one walk or cycle to the station with a few exceptions and do not need or want parking at the Garage. There are a growing number of cyclists currently using the inexpensive and simple inverted "u" shaped stands at the station now. More space could be allotted to those stands. It would take us more time and trouble to park at a garage. I value the exercise that I get from walking to and from the station and don't wish to drive and park at the proposed garage. There are many people walking to and from the station who reside nearby and don't insist on being able to drive and park there. My impression is that most of the demand for additional parking will come from people who live at a much greater distance from the station. Why can't there be more service closer to where they live?

The analysis commissioned by the Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens found that additional parking spaces could be found in areas adjacent to the station and current parking lots and the additional number of spaces needed is much less than 200. A study done by a University of Pennsylvania professor who specializes in transit parking issues found that no further parking spaces are needed and fewer spaces might be desirable in terms of encouraging the use of outlying stations, shared transportation to and from the station and people walking to and from it. Speaking as a pedestrian and cyclist, I feel that if anything, the same number or fewer motorists would be preferable and make my travel to and from the station safer than adding to the number of motorists accessing it.

I do share the goal of encouraging people in our region to use public transit more. I do support necessary repairs and improvements of the Jenkintown and other stations of the Regional Rail System but oppose the Septa Garage at Jenkintown train station.

A.63: *Expression of opposition to project*

I request that MPMS#84642, the Jenkintown Parking Garage be removed from the DVRPC's TIP, and that funding be redirected towards a real study that looks at where the deficiencies are in SEPTA's service, and where expansion and remedies are needed. MPMS#84642 is a gross waste of tax money which we cannot afford.

Projects such as the Newtown commuter line should be a priority for this region to meet the population growth along this line. There is zero growth in Jenkintown and Wyncote. A more suitable location would be the Newtown Bypass park-and-ride station which is situated on a major highway, and less than 3 miles from interstate 95. Please retool this project for a broader study on the Newtown line.

A.64: *Expression of opposition to project*

As a regular commuter on the R8 Fox Chase Line, I support the efforts of PA-TECH to restore commuter rail service to Newtown and oppose the construction of the proposed parking garage in Jenkintown which will not reduce traffic congestion. Please consider supporting resolutions that will restore rail service in areas that are in need of rail services. Thank You.

A.65: *Expression of opposition to project*

Funding public transportation is imperative for the sustainability of our region, State and Nation. However, money must be spent wisely for projects which will benefit the most citizens and not be wasted on projects which will benefit a narrow and limited group of riders.

A.66: *Expression of opposition to project*

Please discontinue support for this unnecessary and costly project. The original "study" that served as the basis for this proposal was seriously flawed. SEPTA's recent passenger preference survey indicated that drivers travel from a 19 mile radius to come to the J-W station due to less frequent service at their local stations. Rather than waste taxpayer money on a garage that is not

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

needed, particularly when funding is scarce, money can be spent more appropriately to reduce vehicle miles traveled by increasing frequency of service at outlying stations. More frequent service would not only eliminate the need for more parking at the J-W station, but would be reduce greenhouse gases since riders could use their local stations.

A.67: *Expression of opposition to project*

SEPTA's Regional Rail Policy is Bad Policy for Our Region
(Learn more at <http://www.cheltenhamchamberofcitizens.com>)

Cheltenham Chamber of Citizens (CCC), a nonprofit member-based organization, supports national energy and environmental policies for commuter transit with the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, we strongly oppose SEPTA's plans for multi-story parking garages at the Jenkintown-Wyncote (J-W) and Glenside commuter rail stations. The essence of sound regional rail policy is to promote increased passenger miles, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). SEPTA's policy, however, does the opposite.

Constructing large parking garages in mature, built-out inner suburbs, to house vehicles away from their home stations, results in more VMT throughout the region, increased levels of greenhouse gas emissions, and is not consistent with progressive public transportation, environmental and energy goals. Such a policy, of which the proposed garages at J-W and Glenside stations are a part, is a misappropriation of our tax revenue and will only further encourage rail riders to drive away from their local stations. It is imperative that our tax dollars be used for projects that will increase use of public transit – expanding rail lines and increasing commuter rail service at local stations.

The proposed parking expansion at J-W currently consists of a multi-story garage/station complex; however, there are plans to construct the facility to accommodate additional parking decks. At a minimum, 300-350 additional vehicles are expected to be driven to the J-W station by riders, who, instead of being offered the opportunity to commute or perhaps walk a much shorter distance to a station close to home, are forced to drive even further to a new J-W hub.

SEPTA has budgeted approximately \$53 million for the project: \$6M for planning; \$25-27M for the parking garage; and the remainder for access reconfiguration, including two 600 foot long, high-level platforms. Eighty percent of the budget will be funded through federal tax revenue, the remainder from state and local sources. This elaborate plan will net approximately 250 additional parking spaces – at a cost of \$108,000 per new space added. The J-W station community is built-out and has not experienced growth for many years. We believe the \$53 million could and should be spent to expand the rail lines and improve access and service at all local stations, especially where the population has been growing: the outer suburbs.

Some important facts to consider:

Regional population and rail ridership growth in the last 15 to 20 years has been concentrated in the distant suburbs.

SEPTA has not sufficiently expanded parking and improved service at outlying stations serving this growth.

SEPTA has closed many stations where riders could park or walk, forcing them to drive farther.

To transport distant riders to the city a few minutes faster, many SEPTA rush hour trains now bypass several stations where there are empty parking spaces, again forcing more people to drive elsewhere.

SEPTA claims the garage is needed to support high-level platforms; however, CCC has shown SEPTA how ADA-compliant platforms can be incorporated into the existing J-W station without a parking garage.

Currently, many rail riders drive from the far suburbs, such as Lansdale and Warminster, to the J-W Station through miles of dense, polluting, rush-hour traffic. The latest data show that nearly 80% of those currently parking at J-W drive away from their local stations because trains no longer stop frequently enough, the station has been closed, or there isn't enough local parking.

SEPTA's present policy limits choices. If there were adequate parking and better service closer to home, those riders, as well as new riders, would be able to use a local station. Instead, SEPTA chooses to build a large parking garage, forcing even more people to funnel through very old two-lane roads that wind through historical residential areas.

The CCC supports regional rail as a way to take cars off ever-crowded streets, reduce air pollution and greenhouse gases, and lessen our dependence on imported non-renewable oil. However, each of these concerns will be exacerbated by SEPTA's current policy. New markets of ridership are not being captured, rather, SEPTA's outdated policy results in shifting existing riders from one ridershed to another. Using tens of millions of tax dollars to facilitate such is not a good use of our nation's infrastructure investments. SEPTA's policy is bad for our community and region and is being enabled by a flood of federal money. It is critical that those dollars be service-focused and in keeping with our national goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

A.68: *Expression of opposition to project*

I support efforts to provide more public transportation opportunities from the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority. I can not support projects that, once again, provide more opportunities for car use. Why take up more space for more cars when we could be using precious funding to create more transportation for the public that does not private cars? Please do not build yet, one more, parking lot.

A.69: *Expression of opposition to project*

The Jenkintown parking garage will redistribute fare revenue unfavorably by encouraging shorter rides.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

That will also burn more motor fuel and make more congestion.

SEPTA is not being thoughtful about this at all. Newtown Rail service will help with major objectives of our national policy.

A Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage short hauls the R-2, R-3 AND R-5 lines, reducing revenue from stations farther out to get lower fares at Jenkintown. Not good. DVRPC should drop this project.

A.70: *Expression of opposition to project*

I am opposed to inclusion in the TIP of some \$27 million in funding for a planned parking garage at the SEPTA's Jenkintown-Wyncote regional rail station. This large expenditure is unneeded and unwise. Quite the contrary to overall policy goals, it will increase vehicle miles traveled in the region, rather than helping reduce pollution in any way. There is no need for a new garage to increase parking in an area where there is little population growth. Instead, there is a need to improve service up and down the line so that people can catch the train near where they live. Already too many people are driving too far to catch the train at Jenkintown-Wyncote because schedules are arranged so that very frequent service at J-W contrasts with less-frequent service at riders' local stations farther up the line. Rather than spend tens of millions in taxpayer dollars on an unneeded parking structure in a residential area, SEPTA should even out schedules up the line to encourage riders to use local stations and reduce vehicle miles traveled. Parking could be increased in small increments, as needed, up and down the line. Accessibility at stations, including Jenkintown-Wyncote, could be achieved without building a huge parking structure, and at considerably less cost. A new train station is included in the garage structure, and that is unneeded and unwanted, too. We have a lovely, historic train station that fits in with the scale of the neighborhood, and is desirable to keep as a station.

A.71: *Expression of opposition to project*

The region's 130 year old commuter rail system has not been expanded for rider needs of the 21st century. SEPTA's interest in parking garages is an acknowledgement that there are gaps in the current regional system in both capacity and coverage: Either it doesn't extend far enough, it doesn't have enough stations, or it doesn't have lines or stations in the right places.

This is supported by the results of the May 2009 SEPTA rider survey which showed that 67% of Jenkintown-Wyncote resident riders walked to, or were dropped off to the station. 83% of those who drive to Jenkintown bypass their home station because it lacks frequency of service and available parking. In the ideal situation, all passengers would be walk-ups and parking would be unnecessary. Adding parking spaces takes us FURTHER away from this ideal situation. Adding or extending lines and opening stations on existing lines brings us CLOSER to the ideal situation.

SEPTA's proposed placement of new garages in such close proximity to the dormant Newtown Corridor is a further acknowledgement of its failure to satisfy rider demand for local service that was once met by the Newtown line itself.

The 'master' here should be VMT reduction, quite simply. This is the only reliable measure of SEPTA's benefit. Ridership is not a good measure of benefit because creating large park and rides like Cornwells Heights or Jenkintown-Wyncote distort these figures by forcing riders to drive greater distances to access transit.

The Newtown corridor will meet the goals of VMT reduction and increase transit ridership. Additionally, property values will rise, which will help counties fund the transit service, and keep more residents' money in the state instead of sending it to foreign oil companies, such as BP.

DVRPC needs to refocus on expansion of existing rail routes, such as Newtown, Quakertown and Reading. Simply stating that the organization is 'Green', is not a quantifiable goal, similar to customer service projects.

A.72: *Expression of opposition to project*

The Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage project should be suspended immediately pending the following actions and alternatives:

1. Parking rate adjustments.

SEPTA's study has not indicated what garage demand would be at post-construction prices, and none of the garages built have exceeded 70% utilization, suggesting SEPTA has little data on true demand. We would like SEPTA to raise parking rates at constrained stations to determine the TRUE demand at that location, before commencing construction. We would also like SEPTA to incentivize parking at under-utilized stations by lowering rates to align demand with supply.

2. Service/Schedule adjustments:

Several stations below Jenkintown-Wyncote on the trunk carry the same trains that go through Jenkintown-Wyncote but are not scheduled as stops. Some have available parking. Other stations above Jenkintown-Wyncote could support slightly improved frequency, off-peak scheduling, or parking with little or minor investment. We would like options studied at all points above Wayne Junction, in a holistic manner, before investments are made in any one location. There are more convenient locations such as Noble that may be able to satisfy much of the parking demand with little additional service or infrastructure.

3. Off-site parking: There are an abundance of empty parking lots in the vicinity of the R2/R3/R5 lines. We would like SEPTA to attempt to utilize these, for the benefit of the riders, the SEPTA taxpayers, and the local communities, before building parking capacity in the area. We would like SEPTA and local townships to coordinate all parking needs before construction.

4. Coverage expansion:

The Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor runs through several areas contributing to the Jenkintown-Wyncote parking demand,

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

directly or indirectly. The Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor will cost less per passenger served than the garage projects. PA-TEC would like these options studied. The former Felwick station sits near the junction of 309 and the turnpike and would work better as a collector point than Jenkintown-Wyncote or Glenside. We would like this option studied.

5. Infrastructure improvements. SEPTA has routinely stated that existing infrastructure and rolling stock limits their ability to increase service beyond Jenkintown-Wyncote. We would like alternatives to parking garages studied. We would like garage demand studied after possible infrastructure changes are considered. We would like demand adjusted for new rolling stock which may improve bottleneck conditions.

A.73: *Expression of opposition to project*

Please do not move the Wyncote Station from its historic building.

Septa's May 2009 survey shows that there is no need for additional parking spaces at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. Both Jenkintown and Wyncote have little room for additional growth. There is no reason to spend money on a parking facility to encourage out of the area drivers to park at this station. It is better to spend the money where new population growth is occurring. We need to encourage people to take the train from their existing stations. Replacing outdated track and switching equipment is a priority. It is old and the safety of riders depends on our keeping the system sound. Most of the infrastructure is reaching the century mark. Do not encourage more car traffic - make it easy for people to use the rails in a rational way.

A.74: *Expression of opposition to project*

I am a Wyncote resident. I feel funds would be much better spent improving parking and train and bus service in newer, more distant (from Philly) suburbs rather than building a large garage in Wyncote/Jenkintown where the extra parking is really not needed by residents in the area. Wyncote and Jenkintown are old suburbs and not experiencing the growth of outlying areas which may need more attention. Increasing train service to some of the outlying suburbs would be a better solution. In order to best fit with a regional goal of less dependence on fossil fuels ideally people should try to reach train stations by other means than a 20 to 30 minute car ride...walkable and bikeable stations should be a goal. Also, plans for this station and "improvements" may also exacerbate the flooding problem in this area. As a frequent walker in the area I worry about how increased car traffic will effect my safety and the safety of others. □As to the ADA platform, I understand that the Jenkintown station could be brought into compliance and serve the handicapped just as effectively with a pre formed platforms as is used in Landsdale and Doylestown. I think this money be spent to improve access and parking and to expand rail lines in the outer suburbs rather than to build a structure which is not in keeping with the historic nature of the area and is really not needed by residents of this community.

A.75: *Expression of opposition to project*

The main part is an overall objection to this project as a colossal waste of funds. There are underserved areas and there are existing locations that would be better suited for large numbers of park and ride type commuters (stations on streets that can actually handle increased traffic). I am not fundamentally opposed to changes to the Wyncote/Jenkintown station, even including a parking garage, but SEPTA's own studies have shown no real value in creating such. The fact remains that there are simple things they could do to prove the worth of such an investment that they refuse to do (like increase the price of parking to what it would be expected to be with the garage) does not indicate that SEPTA has any confidence that this project is worthwhile. Fare reduction would do more to increase ridership on a cost per rider basis. Improvement of stations further out, or better suited to park and riders would promote more riders. Improvement in the service/scheduling would do more to improve ridership. The Wyncote/Jenkintown parking garage project is a waste of taxpayer dollars that will have a minimal affect on the number of people riding SEPTA. Sincerely, Dr. Jacob Ketter

A.76: *Expression of opposition to project*

SEPTA's May 2009 survey does not show a need for additional parking spaces at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. The survey does show riders want better service and more parking at their local stations. Don't build a parking garage at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. Remove this project from the TIP. Adjust the schedule to make service more equitable thereby allowing riders to use stations closest to their homes.

A.77: *Expression of opposition to project*

DVRPC has a publication entitled Classic Towns. On the cover you have the following description:

Throughout the region, there are communities that have preserved their history, their □character, and their main street charm. Each is unique, yet all are wonderful places to live, work, and play. **

In the section entitled About Classic Towns is the following:

****These are timeless communities where everyone can feel at home. Places where every day necessities are all easily accessible; where neighbors know and look out for each other; and most important where community is a way of life, not simply a place to live.

Close to Philadelphia, and accessible to New York and Washington, DC via public transportation, The Classic Towns of Greater Philadelphia are communities with rich histories where everyone can build a promising future. *****

DVRPC description of Classic Towns is what both Jenkintown and Wyncote are rich with history since our land was part of

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

William Penn's original holdings. Many books have been written about the local history and we take care to preserve our historic assets. Revolutionary skirmishes were fought here and troops marched through here to and from battles in Germantown and Trenton, and then to camp for the winter in Valley Forge. Many homes are on the National Historic Register as is our local Jenkintown-Wyncote train station. We can walk to do shopping to get to schools and to our rail stations.

We are community centered with a great deal of resident involvement in our local government and civic organizations. We help each other and look out for each other. We do not consider this area as a housing development, but, rather a walkable/bikeable community with a diverse population linked together through common interests and goals.

SEPTA conducted a rider survey in May 2009. The data from the survey does not show a need for additional parking spaces at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. The survey does show riders want better service and more parking at their local stations. To build this multi-million dollar parking garage and transportation project in the midst of our historic residential area, when the data shows there is no need, is a travesty and will forever change the character of this community and waste our tax dollars.

Building a large multi-level parking garage in a mature, built-out inner suburb with narrow winding roads in order to entice hundreds of riders, from the outer suburbs, to drive away from their communities and home stations is bad planning policy and just plain wrong. Furthermore, it is immoral and a misappropriation of my tax funds to spend approximately \$108,000 per added parking space. This project will result in more than just the destruction of a community's character. It will result in more Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) throughout the region and increased levels of greenhouse gas emissions. This type of outdated planning policy is not consistent with progressive thinking about public transportation, environmental and energy goals. It is imperative that our tax dollars be used for projects that will increase the use of public transit expanding rail lines and increasing commuter rail service at local stations.

While I fully support compliance with ADA regulations, other less expensive ways must be found to meet ADA requirements for "level boarding", which does not necessarily mean installing high platforms, such as at the Roslyn, Doylestown and Lansdale stations. Many transportation projects have been deferred because of the Pennsylvania transportation funding crisis. I believe that federal funding will be curtailed in future years due to the large national deficit. Both SEPTA and DVRPC must seek out alternatives to the building of massive parking garages in order to increase ridership.

Do not move the "station" from the current historic Jenkintown-Wyncote Station building into the proposed parking garage. ADA compliance can be met without a parking garage.

Save the money! Remove this project from the TIP.

A.78: *Expression of opposition to project*

Attention to whom it may concern: DVRPC comments regarding SEPTA planned garage at Jenkintown-Wyncote.

SEPTA's May 2009 survey does not show a need for additional parking spaces at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. The survey does show riders want better service and more parking at their local stations.

Both Jenkintown and Wyncote are mature suburbs with very little to no growth in population. Do not spend millions of dollars to build a parking garage when it is not needed. Spend the money to expand the parking and public transportation in the outer suburbs where the population is growing.

Do not move the "station" from the current historic Jenkintown-Wyncote Station building into a parking garage. Save the money! ADA compliance can be met with a pre-formed platform as used at the Roslyn, Lansdale and Doylestown Stations. ADA compliance can also be met by utilizing the existing platform areas in front of the current station building. Save the millions of dollars by NOT building a parking garage. Use the money to expand the rail lines to the outer suburbs.

Don't build a parking garage at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. Remove this project from the TIP. Adjust the schedule to make service more equitable thereby allowing riders to use stations closest to their homes.

Most elected officials realize that we, as a Nation, must lessen our dependency on oil. We must stop wasting energy for the sake of our own National security and our environment. A parking garage will encourage more miles driven by those who are not being adequately served by SEPTA. Instead of using stations closer to their homes, riders will use more gas driving more miles, add to congested roads and create more greenhouse gases. Additionally, riders who do not use their local stations in the outer suburbs will spend money on a lower fare price at Jenkintown-Wyncote, thereby reducing potential revenues for SEPTA. Reduced revenues will necessitate an increase in subsidies from government to maintain the existing rail lines.

Thank You,

A.79: *Expression of opposition to project*

1. Don't build a parking garage at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. Remove this project from the TIP. Adjust the schedule to make service more equitable for people living in the outer suburbs so the riders will use stations closest to their homes. Parking garages are a thing of the past and a waste of money. We need better bus, jitney and van service to the outer suburbs so residents can get to their local train stations without using their cars.

2. SEPTA's May 2009 survey does not show a need for additional parking spaces at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. The survey does show riders want better service and parking at their local stations in the outer suburbs. To add the proposed (unneeded) 250 to 270 spaces at Jenkintown-Wyncote Station, the cost would come to at least \$100,000 per parking space, a poor use of money. SEPTA said that these additional spaces would be needed 3 days a week, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

Get rid of permit parking to increase available spaces in the current lots.

3. Do not move the "station" from the current historic Jenkintown-Wyncote Station building into a parking garage. SEPTA brags that it has saved the "historic" ticket office at the N. Wales station; it's a crummy little building. The building at the Jenkintown station is a historic Horace Trumbauer structure. He's the architect who designed Arcadia University's Grey Towers, the family court and main library, is one of the designers of the Phila. Art Museum, architect of the Elms in Newport Rhode Island, and many others. On the other hand, the platform arrangement at the N. Wales station would work for the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station in that you exit the ticket building and can walk up the steps or a ramp to the platform. The historic station building at the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station is amenable to this configuration.
4. Have SEPTA use the Ft. Washington train station underground passage connecting both sides as a model for the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station. The proposed towers for the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station are a colossal waste of money, and we know from many years of experience that SEPTA's elevators will be out of service and unavailable many days, thus making it impossible for handicapped people to use it, whereas a tunnel with a ramp will always be reliable.
5. Save tens of millions of dollars by NOT building a parking garage. Use the money to expand the rail lines to the outer suburbs.
6. Most elected officials realize that we, as a Nation, must lessen our dependency on oil. We must stop wasting energy for the sake of our own National security and our environment. A parking garage encourages more miles driven by those who are not being adequately served by SEPTA. Instead of using stations closer to their homes, riders use more gas driving more miles, add to congested roads and create more greenhouse gases & fine particulate pollution. Garages do not increase the number of riders.
7. The DVRPC must scrutinize schedules and see that service once an hour from the outer suburbs is forcing people to drive many more miles than benefits anyone. (Miss the 7:03 a.m. from Doylestown and wait until 8:19 for the next train, or drive 17 miles straight down Rt. 611 to the Jenkintown station. Guess which choice these commuters make?)
8. Trains stop too often at the Jenkintown station. Reduce this inequity in order to add more service to outer stations.
9. Express trains have no place (in most instances) to pass local trains until they get to Phila. because SEPTA has removed tracks. Tracks need to be returned to make the rail lines run properly.
10. Finally - GET RID OF SEPTA. SEPTA HAS POOR POLICIES AND NO ONE TO REIN THEM IN!!!!!!!!!!!! REPLACE IT WITH A RESPONSIBLE, SENSIBLE, LEANER TRANSIT ORGANIZATION THAT HAS AN EXTERNAL, IMPARTIAL, UNPAID BOARD TO PROVIDE OVERSIGHT.

A.80: *Expression of opposition to project*

My property extends along Township Line, near the intersection of Greenwood and Summit. Obviously, construction at the station, and the Greenwood ave, Bridge by PennDot, will present an immediate inconvenience for my family and neighbors. However, while I am fine with the bridge project, because of the bridge's clear need for renovation, I am dismayed at the Septa garage project. I have attended many local meetings, read as many reports available, and served as a memeber in a Jenkintown-Wyncote focus group that was organized by a consultant hired by SEPTA. To me, a scientist, the non acceptance of what appears to me to be clear data showing the LACK of need for a 700-car garage in Jenkintown-Wyncote, along with the convincing evidence for the more economical/effective/environment-friendly improvements in facilities and service at other stops along the lines running through Jenkintown-Wyncote, is inexplicable. I urge you to make the right choice for this community, and all communities served by the SEPTA lines impacted. Not only is taxpayer money at stake. It would be tragic to not use the funds to make a more significant positive impact on the entire set of communities through which these train lines run. There is a chance to make a dramatic statement about rail use for public transportation in all of our communities, a forward-thinking plan that could be a national model of how to enhance and encourage the use of public transportation - rather than a simplistic, very expensive, and community-degrading plan to focus efforts on a transportation hub in Jenkintown-Wyncote. Thank you for your willingness to listen to our concerns and suggestions. Again, I urge that you consider the invaluable contribution you can make to so many communities by removing the focus from Jenkintown-Wyncote and building up the transportation for all within their own communities.

A.81: *Expression of opposition to project*

SEPTA is our public transportation modality in this area and Jenkintown/Wyncote is our local stop. Our neighborhood is an older, settled and charming close-in suburb of Philadelphia. SEPTA has announced plans to build a new station and garage here to accommodate 620 cars. We already have adequate parking for about 400 cars but SEPTA wants to attract new riders from the far-out suburbs. One far-out suburb, Newtown, has been begging SEPTA to extend tracks out to Newtown which has a quickly growing population and once had a station there. SEPTA says it does not have the funds to accommodate Newtown, yet it insists upon building an unwanted and unneeded station here at Jenkintown/Wyncote. This new monstrosity will be primarily funded by taxpayer state and federal monies and will cost a ridiculous \$100,000 per parking space. SEPTA has curtailed stops at other towns along our R lines, which still have adequate parking, in order to encourage people to drive to Jenkintown/Wyncote. How can SEPTA justify this? Clean, efficient, reliable public transportation is SEPTA's stated goal. Yet they deny riders the ability to take the train from their own localities where free parking now exists. This is senseless.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

A.82: *Expression of opposition to project*

Hello, my name is Timothy Clifton. I live at 431 Greenwood Avenue in Wyncote, approximately a 10-minute walk from the train station. My wife and I recently moved to this area in the hopes of settling here after our military careers, but we have been seriously reconsidering our choice due to the inordinate amount of dangerous traffic directly in front of our home. We've made several complaints to our local police department, and they performed a study to determine if traffic truly is an issue at our location. It is. There are thousands of vehicles that travel this road each day, and the vast majority of them do so at speeds greatly in excess of the posted 25 MPH limit. This explains why we have had several vehicles depart the road at our corner and come into our yard, and why my neighbor across the street is nervous to pull into or out of his driveway since he has been almost t-boned many times (I've witnessed several instances in the past few weeks where a vehicle slammed on their brakes and screeched towards him as he was pulling in). Now, SEPTA wants to dramatically increase the rush-hour traffic flow of people outside our community by building a parking garage. These people have demonstrated a reckless disregard for the safety of our neighborhood, and increasing their numbers travelling from 309, down Greenwood Avenue, to the train station will only serve to exacerbate an already unsafe situation. In addition, there are several times a day when the traffic backs up from the light at Church and Greenwood past my home, making it exceptionally difficult for those of us who live here to use our neighborhood roads and streets. Frankly, I didn't care about this project for some time after moving into this neighborhood. It seemed to be a non-issue. I was wrong. Having lived here for a year now, I see that this is going to make our neighborhood less livable. I strongly suspect there will be a severe accident of some sort in our neighborhood if we continue to overuse our roads at unsafe speeds, and if this happens, the culpability will be shared by both the unsafe driver and also the SEPTA and county commissioners who are pushing this project without regard for the local community. I strongly suspect there will be a lawsuit alleging criminal negligence on the part of the planners if a severe accident occurs, and I hope for the sake of my family that we are not plaintiffs in that suit. I trust you will take these issues into consideration. I would be happy to speak with anyone who may have further questions.

A.83: *General inquiry on the Jenkintown Garage and Platform Project*

The Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage will cost roughly \$100,000 per parking spot, and according to SEPTA's May 2009 parking preference survey, will not add new riders to regional rail. The study stated that riders who currently walk will be converted to parkers, and riders who are dropped off will now drive. As most stations along the R2 and R3 lines are operating at capacity, it would appear that the Jenkintown parking garage will not adequately satisfy the unmet demand for access to commuter rail, and will cause an increase in vehicle miles travelled and carbon emissions, which counter the goals of the DVRPC long range plan.

1. Has the DVRPC or SEPTA evaluated alternatives to parking expansion at Jenkintown Station and ranked them according to VMT reduction per dollar of investment?
2. (If they haven't ranked by that) What yardstick was then used to rank the priority of the Jenkintown Parking garage as a means of improving accessibility to regional rail, and at this location versus other constrained stations such as Warminster?
3. How will the Jenkintown Parking garage project solve the problem of Single Occupancy Vehicles?
4. What are the cost-benefit measurements on the Jenkintown-Wyncote garage project?

A.84: *Jenkintown garage study*

According to SEPTA's study, the overall demand at The overall demand at Jenkintown-Wyncote is 940 parkers. This includes:

1. All current parkers (approx 540)
 2. A portion of all walkers, bikers, and drop offs.
 3. ANYBODY at any of the other 7 stations studied that said they WANTED to park at Jenkintown-Wyncote.
 4. A portion of the wait-listed parkers, who may or may not be already parking at Jenkintown-Wyncote.
 5. All of the permit parkers, some of whom are clearly NOT parking at JW.
- For future demand and garage efficiency, they added the following:
6. A growth rate multiplier based on the riders above.
 7. A capacity multiplier so that the garage had a spare 5%.

EVERY SINGLE PARKER included in their existing demand estimate is already using the train, and a good portion of the estimate is questionable, because we don't really know if the walkers would drive if there were spots or how many wait-list were actually already parking.

SEPTA's study has not located the source of the demand, let alone building at or closer to that source. For these reasons, this study must be reconstituted as a broader study that analyzes current deficiencies in terms of capacity and service across the region, and a list of remedies for these deficiencies, which could include parking or service expansion at Warminster, service changes along the R3 West Trenton Line, and reactivation of the R8 Newtown Line.

It appears that SEPTA's garage, as proposed, will generate few, if any new riders, and would only enhance or improve access for existing riders. On these grounds, this study should be terminated. PA-TEC analysis of the Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

project studies have revealed that the planning and studies have been done in a vacuum - that while it is true there is high demand for parking, it was not clear whether it was higher anywhere else, nor was it clear that Jenkintown-Wyncote was the cheapest place to meet the demand.

SEPTA's own study showed a sizable percentage of non-local riders. SEPTA's own statistics also showed higher demand for parking at places like Warminster, despite far lower frequency of service.

SEPTA has not completed, or attempted to complete a regional parking and commuter rail demand analysis. There is no planning for past, current and future population growth in Bucks County. There is only a poorly executed study in Jenkintown which basically asked existing drivers there on ONE day, "If we add parking, will you still park here?"

Then there is the conclusion that all the people using Jenkintown-Wyncote instead of their home station use it because of frequency of service, use it every day, and will continue to use it, regardless of how high gas or parking prices go.

PA-TEC challenges these assumptions until SEPTA has compiled better data. PA-TEC has concluded that data from a true regional study will ultimately point to reactivation of the R8 Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor as a solution, just PA-TEC's studies have indicated.

SEPTA and the DVRPC need to independently come to these conclusions through a better executed study and planning process, and is a much better way to spend taxpayer money.

A.85: *Jenkintown is NOT overflowing in terms of parking capacity*

Jenkintown is NOT overflowing in terms of parking capacity, because Jenkintown and Wyncote residents do not park there, nor do Bucks County residents. If it was, we would see Jenkintown residents at Elkins or Melrose Park.

Warminster Station IS overflowing and has become the park-and-ride for central Bucks County. This overflow travels down the R2 and 611. All of it is absorbed by Jenkintown-Wyncote. Finally, considerably more of the 3+ milers at Jenkintown-Wyncote are R2 Warminster/R5Doylestown riders, with fewer coming from the R3 West Trenton or the R5 Lansdale, partly dispelling the myth that Jenkintown-Wyncote demand is all based on frequency of service.

This data suggests that the proposed parking garage is in the wrong place - it should be somewhere on the R2 Warminster line, not the trunk.

Jenkintown does NOT have the parking problem, but SEPTA does have a driving problem. If Jenkintown-Wyncote did, nobody would go. Nobody would cite "bad parking at home stations" and then go to Jenkintown-Wyncote where it's supposedly worse.

A.86: *Restoration of an electrified R-8 Newtown line would be a far better choice and serve a larger number of the community than constructing a garage*

I believe the proposed construction of a garage is a poor idea. Restoration of an electrified R-8 Newtown line would be a far better choice and serve a larger number of the community.

As gas prices rise, persons will drive less and as long as efficient and safe rail transport is available along the currently closed R-8 route, this choice would be far more rewarding than a garage that only promotes more automobile traffic and further congestion in the already congested Jenkintown area.

A.87: *Suspend project until a feasibility study for restoration of R8 Newtown Line service is conducted*

As a supporter of reinstated commuter rail service on SEPTA's R8 Fox Chase-Newtown Line, I am requesting that the feasibility study and alternatives analysis as part of the process for restoration of service on this corridor be included in the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's proposed Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), which is currently under consideration and that project MPMS#84642 be suspended until this study is completed. I wish for my comments and support for this project to be included as a matter of public record as part of the process for the consideration of this important project in the proposed TIP.

The Newtown line meets the goals and objectives of the DVRPC, which is to improve transit connections, reduce vehicle miles travelled, air pollution and road congestion. Project MPMS#84642 does not meet these requirements as is, and must be removed from the TIP.

A.88: *This project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from a wider region*

I am very concerned that this project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from a wider region. Rather than adding a large number of parking spaces at one location, expansion of service such as re-opening the extension of the R-8 line, allowing bicycles on trains during peak times, and improving parking at all stations, is a better approach. Thank you.

A.89: *This project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from all over the region*

I feel strongly that this project will cause severe traffic congestion by drawing commuters from all over the region. Rather than adding a large number of parking spaces at one location, leading to traffic jams and commuter backlogs, why not consider re-opening the extension of the R-8 lines and let people bring bikes on trains to encourage bicycling? I strongly feel that we should work on improving parking at all the stations we already have. It's a better approach for less impact on the environment, and the stress levels of commuters too!

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Montgomery County

MPMS# 89715 - Sanatoga Interchange Project

A.90: *Request for the reinstatement of the Sanatoga Interchange project (MPMS# 89715) on the FY 2011 TIP*

On behalf of the residents of Limerick Township, I am writing during the DVRPC's public comment period to request the reinstatement of the Sanatoga Interchange project (MPMS# 89715) on the FY 2011 TIP. This project was recently added to the current TIP in January, yet does not appear on the recently released Draft FY 2011 TIP. The scope of the project includes improvements to the existing ramps of the Sanatoga Interchange at the intersection of U.S. 422 and Evergreen Road in Limerick Township, Montgomery County. The current TIP includes local funding in the amounts of \$150,000 in FY 2010 and \$250,000 in FY 2011 for preliminary engineering. A Point-of-Access study that is locally funded is currently underway and is being completed by the Township's Traffic Engineer in coordination with PennDOT District 6-0 staff. This project is Limerick Township's highest transportation, infrastructure priority, and we are committed to completing these improvements to improve traffic circulation and create new and meaningful employment opportunities in Limerick Township and Montgomery County. The Township respectfully requests the reinstatement of MPMS #89715 onto the FY 2011 TIP. The Commission's assistance in this regard would be greatly appreciated.

R8 Newtown Rail Line Re-activation

A.91: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

As a supporter of reinstated commuter rail service on SEPTA's R8 Fox Chase-Newtown Line, I am requesting that the feasibility study and alternatives analysis as part of the process for restoration of service on this corridor be included in the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission's proposed Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), which is currently under consideration. I wish for my comments and support for this project to be included as a matter of public record as part of the process for the consideration of this important project in the proposed TIP.

The Newtown line meets the goals and objectives of the DVRPC, which is to improve transit connections, reduce vehicle miles travelled, air pollution and road congestion. Additionally, restoration of service on this corridor will increase the number of residents that use transit.

This is sound, long term planning.

To that end, I request that MPMS#84642, the Jenkintown Parking Garage be removed from the DVRPC's TIP, and that funding be redirected towards a real study that looks at where the deficiencies are in SEPTA's service, and where expansion and remedies are needed. MPMS#84642 is a gross waste of tax money which we cannot afford.

I ask that my elected officials contact the DVRPC and request the inclusion of the Newtown project on the DVRPC TIP as part of a broad comprehensive study of ways to fix our transportation and congestion problems. To date, neither SEPTA nor the DVRPC has considered any alternatives to building parking garages and more parking lots on other SEPTA rail lines in the region.

I also ask that my elected officials, and their staff, inform us as to their plan to address the Newtown/Jenkintown problem, and when we can expect action on the Newtown corridor.

Please do not blindly fund bad projects without having considered alternatives first that meet the DVRPC goals in the 2035 Connections plan. Newtown rail service meets these goals, the Jenkintown and Glenside garage plans do not.

Philadelphia County

MPMS# 61712 - N Del Riverfront Greenway/Heritage Trail/K&T - Line Item

A.92: *General inquiry concerning TIGER funding as part of this project*

I don't understand why this description lists \$8 million TIGER funding. There is only \$1.5 million of TIGER money for this project. Where is the source of the \$6.5 million?

MPMS# 87107 - Philadelphia School District's Safe Routes to School

A.93: *General inquires regarding project*

Since project was funded in May of 2009. What's the status of the project? Has it been started and if not, when is the start date? Will funding expire if the project hasn't started and will funding be returned to PENNDOT if project doesn't move forward or be reprogrammed?

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Philadelphia County

General highway improvements and concerns in Philadelphia County

A.94: *One problem related to promoting good traffic mobility in Philadelphia is the frequency with which the City does things that worsen the problem*

One problem related to promoting good traffic mobility in Philadelphia is the frequency with which the City does things that worsen the problem. Examples: closing streets to favor developers by removing alternative routes for traffic, like was done for Liberty Place, failing to add lanes for expected increased traffic, like they did in front of the new Target at City Line and Monument, and failing to widen a main thoroughfare in conjunction with putting up a shopping center, like happened on 52nd Street at West Park. These are not the DVRPC's doings, but a requirement that the city consider the impact on traffic on development and be forced to work to mitigate it would be helpful.

General transit improvements and concerns in Philadelphia County

A.95: *Northeast Philadelphia would really benefit from either an extension of the existing subway lines, or a completely new one*

I feel like Northeast Philadelphia would really benefit from either an extension of the existing subway lines, or a completely new one. Frankford Ave, Bustleton Ave, Roosevelt Boulevard- wherever it would be placed, I think the area needs more than buses. I personally would rather drive places than spend an equal amount of time on a bus or two, but if there was a subway, I'd take that over driving any day.

MPMS# 17460 - 40th Street (Bridge)

A.96: *Recommendation to expedite project*

As a long time resident of Belmont, I am dismayed at how long it has taken to repair this bridge. I would strongly recommend expediting this project to improve emergency response from fire and police, allow residents to access amenities in Fairmount Park, reduce congestion on Girard Avenue, reduce congestion on exits from I-76 and speed up SEPTA's Route 15 trolley.

MPMS# 17697 - Island Ave. (Signals)

A.97: *Include a bike box to accommodate straight and left turning bicyclists*

Island Avenue is not bike friendly as it approaches the intersection with the multiple turn lanes at Bartram Ave. There needs to be a bike box to accommodate straight and left turning bicyclists.

MPMS# 17813 - North Broad St./Avenue of the Arts and MPMS# 87937 - Avenue of the Arts Revital

A.98: *Expression of support for projects/recommendation of a comprehensive corridor study that examines how to link the diverse populations and institutions along the corridor*

I am in support of streetscape improvements along the Avenue of the Arts, however, would like to recommend a comprehensive corridor study that examines how to link the diverse populations and institutions along the corridor. The corridor along N. Broad between Kennedy Blvd. and Somerset is linked by location but not identity. There is no business association for the corridor; there are no coordinated activities in the entire corridor or programs that provide services to advocate for corridor improvements. A planning process will help identify strengths in the corridor and create recommendations to build on those strengths, like a business association or corridor district that can provide existing businesses with services and create marketing and outreach plans to encourage new businesses to locate on the corridor. Once the corridor is strengthened, linkages can be made to bordering corridors like Temple University Main Campus, on the south, as well as Temple University Health Sciences Campus, Germantown, Mount Airy and West Oaklane, in the north, to help create corridor identities through murals on regional rail and Amtrak bridges that link the City to the Northeast Corridor...Washington, DC, Baltimore, New York and Boston. Corridor planning will create development projects for the target area that can be included in citywide comprehensive planning for Philadelphia 2035 that is driven by stakeholders who have a vested interest in improving the corridor, will encourage sustainable community development and take into account smart growth for the target area and region.

MPMS# 46956 - North Delaware Ave. Extension

A.99: *Expression of support for project*

We support this project.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Philadelphia County

MPMS# 56768 - 41st Street (Bridge)

A.100: *Recommendation to expedite project*

As a long time resident of Belmont, I am dismayed at how long it has taken to repair this bridge. By 2015, when the last construction dollars have been programmed in the TIP, the bridge will have been closed for 23 years. I would strongly recommend expediting this project to improve emergency response from fire and police, allow residents to allow to access amenities in Fairmount Park, reduce congestion on Girard Avenue, reduce congestion on exits from I-76 and speed up SEPTA's Route 15 trolley.

MPMS# 57893 - Lehigh Ave. East (Signals)

A.101: *Include bike boxes at major intersections of project*

Since Lehigh has bike lanes intersection improvements should include bike boxes at the major intersections such as Broad, Frankford and Aramingo Ave

MPMS# 57898 - Lancaster Ave. (Signals)

A.102: *Expression of support for project*

I am in support of signal improvements in this corridor and would like to recommend additional streetscape improvements between 52nd and 39th on Lancaster Avenue. This corridor is badly in need of sidewalk repairs at intersections along the corridor. In many intersections sidewalks are missing or so badly cracked residents are forced to walk in the street (41st and Lancaster on the Northeast corner in particular).

MPMS# 64844 - 30th Street Bridges - 6 Structures

A.103: *Expression of support for project*

We support this project.

MPMS# 69913 - Grays Ferry Ave. (Bridge)

A.104: *Include bicycle improvements in project*

This bridge is heavily used by bicyclists, additionally it is the best way to access Bartrams Garden and may be the final choice for alignment of the East Coast Greenway. The current bicycle facilities are in poor condition. Debris gathers at the drains and cars routinely travel well over the speed limit. This creates a very uncomfortable bicycling environment. The Bicycle Coalition would like to see a physically separated bike lanes or a multi-use path on this bridge.

MPMS# 87937 - Avenue of the Arts Revitalization & Stscape (TCSP)

A.105: *Expression of support for project*

I am in support of streetscape improvements along the Avenue of the Arts, however, as streetscape improvements have already been done closer to Center City, I would like to recommend that the project be phased by starting at Glenwood Avenue and move south toward City Hall. I am concerned that funding constraints will delay or defer this project and installation of new lighting and greening will occur in Center City only and not reach North Philadelphia where improvements are needed most.

Wayne Junction Substation Replacement

A.106: *General inquiry on the Wayne Junction Substation Replacement*

SEPTA General Manager Joe Casey testified on 6/4/10 that the Wayne Jet substation was in danger of imminent failure due to its age. We have found that this project is not included on the proposed TIP. Why was this critical piece of infrastructure not included on the proposed TIP?

If NO MONEY: How much will the replacement substation cost? Is every single TIP item more important for continued reliable operation and State of Good Repair than the Wayne Junction Substation? Examples we found in the current TIP are: \$58 million for station facility improvements,

\$98 million· new 60' articulated buses, \$23 million· fiber optics & PA modernization

**Summary of Public and Agency Comments
On the
DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
for Pennsylvania**

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

Comments on the FY2011 Draft TIP for Pennsylvania

A.107: *Location of FY2011 Draft TIP projects do not endanger known sites of interest to the Seneca Cayuga Tribe*

The Seneca Cayuga Tribe received a letter regarding the above referenced Transportation Improvement program for Pennsylvania. The Seneca Cayuga Tribe is committed to protecting sites important to Tribal Heritage, Culture and Religion. Furthermore the Tribe is particularly concerned with historical sites that may contain but not limited to the burial(s) of human remains and associated funerary objects. As described in your correspondence, and upon research of our database(s) and files, we find our people occupied these areas historically and/or prehistorically. However, the location of the project does not endanger known sites of interest to the Seneca Cayuga Tribe. Please continue project as planned. However, should this project inadvertently discover an archeological site or object(s) we request that you immediately contact the Seneca Cayuga Tribe of Oklahoma, as well as the appropriate state agencies (within 24 hours). We also ask that all construction and ground disturbing activity stop

until the Tribe and State agencies are consulted. Thank you, for contacting the Seneca Cayuga Tribe, we appreciate your cooperation. Should you have any further questions or comments please contact myself, Paul Barton; Culture/Historical Preservation Officer.

A.108: *The Delaware Nation cannot submit comments to your office by June 30th, 2010*

The Delaware Nation has received correspondence on June 11th, 2010 regarding the DVRPC Draft FY2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania. The information was not received in a timely manner to submit comments on the project within the 30 day period and the Cultural Preservation Office has 15 to 18 other projects that are under review ahead of the DVRPC project. So the Delaware Nation cannot submit comments to your office by June 30th, 2010. The packet would have to be submitted a month prior in order to submit within 30 days. Should be able to submit by July 11th, 2010.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

General bicycle and pedestrian improvements and concerns in Various Counties

A.109: *Overall, we are disappointed that the TIP does do more to advance bicycle/pedestrian facilities and that it does not reflect an adherence to PA's Complete Streets check list*

On behalf of the 1.5 million persons who ride bicycles in the Delaware Valley Region, we submit these comments on the 2011-2014 Pennsylvania Transportation Improvement Program (heretofore called, the TIP).

Overall, we are disappointed that the TIP does do more to advance bicycle/pedestrian facilities and that it does not reflect an adherence to PA's Complete Streets check list. We urge the DVRPC to address these two deficiencies in its final draft.

1. The 2011-2014 TIP does not adequately reflecting comprehensive compliance with federal and state Complete Streets policies.

a. Several projects unnecessarily negatively impact bicycle/pedestrian transportation

13727 - Bristol Road - This is both a lost opportunity and a negative impact project. Two foot shoulders are totally inadequate. New turn lanes will squeeze out bicyclists and right turn lanes encourage drivers to not yield to pedestrians. This project needs pedestrian refuges, a stop phase for right turning vehicles when the pedestrian signal button is pushed for pedestrians and four foot shoulders plus bike pockets at intersections to the left of the right turn lane.

57641 - Bridgetown Pike A shoulder will be eliminated for an auxiliary lane, we disapprove of marked right turn-straight through lanes as they force cyclists to make difficult choices for proper lane position, less experienced cyclists will opt to stay to the far right, leaving them vulnerable to a right hook crash.

70227 Route 29 Improvements - While we applaud the addition of 5 foot shoulders, we are concerned that they will disappear at intersections with channelized turn lanes. Yellow Springs Road is a popular recreational bike route. We suggest the left turn bike pockets on southbound 29 at Yellow Springs straight through bike pockets at all intersections with right turn lanes.
17821 -- I-95 Shackomaxon Street to Ann Street.

There appears to be excess width on Delaware Avenue south of Girard. We recommend that more space be allocated to the bike lane to provide a buffer for cyclists. The intersection at Girard is very tricky, especially turning left from Delaware to Girard. We recommend a left turn pocket or bike box. There appears to be room for bike lanes on Girard from Delaware Ave over to the near Fletcher St and can be achieved by added bike lane markings in the shoulder and a bike left turn pocket at the Delaware Ave intersection and a green crossover bike lane at Ramp D. Where the I-95 goes over Richmond Street, there needs to be adequate lighting and other measures to make the Richmond St. sidewalk safe and attractive.

b. Numerous projects do not incorporate bicycle/pedestrian facilities and are missed opportunities Montgomery and Delaware Counties have TIP projects that have road segments that are included in their respective bicycle plans but do not include any bicycle/pedestrian facilities. Some Delaware County road projects refer to the bicycle plan, but don't include any facilities that would implement the plan. If road construction is not the right time to implement a bike plan, when is? Each road project should have been evaluated with the PennDOT check list and the County Bicycle Plan and the project description should indicate the results of that evaluation. Most of the streetscape projects in the TIP do not include provisions for bicycle parking.

c. The TIP should more clearly describe how well the projects meet the requirements of the Pennsylvania's Bicycle and Pedestrian Checklist.

Although not a full blown Complete Streets policy, Pennsylvania's bicycle and pedestrian checklist serves in its place and was issued by PennDOT almost ten years ago. The effectiveness of the checklist is impossible to measure on a project by project basis because the outcomes are not evaluated or listed in the project description. DVRPC should play a more pro-active role in ensuring that the check list was used to ensure that each project is "passed" the checklist as much as possible. We believe that DVRPC should have a Complete Streets policy itself, or some kind of set of principles that it uses to evaluate projects. For example, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission of California adopted Resolution 3765 in 2006, which is essentially a check list to determine if local jurisdictions considered complete streets principles.

While DVRPC has good bicycle-pedestrian goals in its 2035 Connections Plan (p. 87-90), it is not a policy. We urge DVRPC to take the next step and adopt an enforceable and transparent complete streets policy that generates measurable results to track how transportation funding in the TIP is meeting the goals laid out in its plan. The TIP should reflect DVRPC's implementation of FHWA's March 2010 Policy Statement (<http://www.dot.gov/affairs/2010/bicycle-ped.html>): "The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide—including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life—transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes." The USDOT goes on to recommend to state agencies, MPO's etc, that they adopt similar policies on bike/ped accommodation and take the following actions:

Recommended Actions:

Treat walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes.

Ensure convenient access for people of all ages and abilities.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

Go beyond minimum design standards.

Collect data on walking and biking trips.

Set a mode share target for walking and bicycling.

Protect sidewalks and shared-use paths the same way roadways are protected (for example, snow removal)

Improve nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects.

2. The 2011-2014 TIP

should allocate a greater percentage of funding to bicycle/pedestrian facilities.

Table 1 2011-2014 TIP (\$000) Bucks County Subtotal2257Chester County Subtotal25190Delaware County

Subtotal6115Montgomery County Subtotal22390Philadelphia Subtotal33919Total County bike/ped projects89871Total

TIGER16940Total Other13400Total TIP1652000% of TIP dedicated to bike/ped by counties5.44%% of TIP dedicated to bike/ped

from TIGER1.03%% of TIP dedicated to bike/ped from other0.81%Total % of TIP dedicated to bike/peds7.28%

a. By our calculation, 7.28% of the TIP is devoted to bicycle/pedestrian projects. While this percentage is good in comparison to the national average (2%), it does not reflect the true nature of how DVRPC's Board prioritizes bike/ped projects. Of the 7.28%, nearly \$17 million is from federal TIGER grant, which reflects a local initiative to apply for a competitive federal grant, and \$13.4 million in funds that are available from MPMS# 64984 (the "other" row) but not yet allocated to a specific year. It also includes many earmarks, which reflects Congressional priorities, not county priorities. For example, the North Delaware Riverfront Greenway/Heritage Trail/K&T project has \$9.931 million from several earmarks. We estimate that the DVRPC counties have only directed 5.44% or less of its transportation funds toward bike/ped projects. In particular, Bucks and Delaware County stand out as having allocated the least amount of funds to bike/ped projects (\$2 million and \$6 million respectively), as compared to Montgomery and Chester, which directed in the range of \$22-25 million and Philadelphia, which has directed nearly \$34 million over a three year period.

b. We believe that the counties and DVRPC should allocate more transportation dollars for bicycle/pedestrian projects to increase safety for bicyclists and pedestrians. Based on information provided by DVRPC staff to the Bicycle Coalition (see attached Table 2), 15% of region's traffic crashes that result in injuries involve bikes and peds and 23% of all traffic fatalities are pedestrians and bicyclists. Our interpretation of these data is that although bicyclists and pedestrians are involved in 15% of the traffic crashes and account for over 20% of the fatalities, the counties are only allocating 5.44% of their transportation dollars to facilities that will directly improve bike/ped safety. This is an inequity that should be directly addressed by DVRPC.

c. DVRPC's suburban counties compare well against the national walking mode share, but have to do more to catch up to the national bicycle mode share average. While higher population density in Philadelphia helps generate more bicycle trips to work, the other counties should invest more to improve its roads (especially by adding shoulders) so that its bicycle mode shares could rise and be comparable to the rest of the nation.

This table shows American Community Survey 2006-2008 Means of Transportation to Work for each of the DVRPC counties in PA.

Table 3

Counties	Bike	
Walk		
Philadelphia	1.32%	8.17%
Chester	0.15%	2.33%
Bucks	0.16%	1.81%
Montgomery	0.27%	3.11%
Delaware	0.30%	3.97%
National Average	.49%	2.85%

d. A number of projects in the TIP that are considered a bike or ped project are so old that they should be reallocated to make room for new projects. We found 4 projects that have been allocated funds since before 2002. These projects (MPMS#61712, 61695, 50520, 61690) are tying up funding and should be re-assigned to other projects so that new projects can apply for TE funding. Overall, a new TE round is needed and we urge DVRPC to aggressively reallocate the bike/ped projects that are eight years old or older and make more funding available for TE projects so that the bike/ped component of the TIP can increase. We strongly urge DVRPC to open a new TE round as soon as possible during 2010.

3. We continue to support DVRPC's initiatives that are helping build our regional trail network, and have already submitted comments separately on those projects. Not everyone lives or works near a rail trail and the recently completed bike routes on Old Baltimore Pike, Susquehanna Rd and Bicyclists Baltimore Pike are great examples of creating relative low cost ways to improve bicycle mobility and to bring together a true regional network. We also support innovative projects such as the roundabout at Old Baltimore Pike and PA 41 which is on the newly finished Old Baltimore Pike bike route.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

General highway improvements and concerns in Various Counties

A.110: *Transportation plans must reduce the need for transportation*

Transportation in both this region and throughout the country suffers from two major issues. The first is dependence on fossil fuel, especially oil. Among the problems of oil use are air pollution and, now, ocean pollution. Perhaps even more serious is the devaluation of the dollar as the country continually imports oil without sufficient exports of value to other countries. The second major transportation issue is a lack of funds to sustain the infrastructure already in place. To address these two issues, transportation planning must concentrate on reducing fossil fuel use. To do this plans must try to reduce the need for transportation. This is a fundamental change from the past where plans sought to induce and then to provide for ever increasing automobile use. For decades the typical daily work trip commute time has remained similar. This suggests that people are willing to devote limited time to that effort at first the time was spent walking to work nearby. Then street railways extended the distance that could be traveled. Next automobiles, then superhighways further extended the distance within the allotted time. The difficulty is that increasing distance requires increasing fuel consumption, and increasing the infrastructure that must be maintained. Now is the time to begin to reverse the trend. Now is the time to begin to reduce the infrastructure to that which can be afforded. To begin, no new roads should be constructed. This includes both arterial and local roads. No more new green field development. Instead, build again on former sites, both industrial and residential. The list of public transportation service that has been abandoned in this region is long. It includes Pottsville, Bethlehem, Newtown, West Chester, Ivy Ridge, Jenkintown to Newark, and Several rail lines in New Jersey. Much research would be required to list all the abandoned bus routes. What about the list of abandoned highways? Because funds are insufficient, we need a similar list of major highway abandonments. Public transportation is evaluated every year for cost effectiveness. The ratio of fares to cost is calculated for every line. Those at the bottom of the list are discontinued. A similar process is needed for roads. Each road segment should have a gas tax to cost ratio. And, as in transit, those at the bottom of the list should be closed.

A related issue is the need to confine transportation funding to actual transportation projects. Trees, benches, main street redevelopments, and other such items may be nice, but they contribute nothing to the capability of the transportation system, for either people or goods. They need to be removed from the transportation program. While the TIP includes several projects intended to revitalize older centers, it contains others to destroy them. This is highly counterproductive, because in the future they will then require funds for revitalization. Prominent among these projects are parking garages in Paoli, Jenkintown, and Ardmore. Paoli already suffers from traffic congestion at peak times. Buses intended to carry commuters from the station are blocked for several minutes by the unending traffic. Adding 1200 more cars is not a solution. To the east, there is a station about every mile. Therefore, traffic to this garage is likely to come from the west. Instead of bringing all the traffic into Paoli, move the garage to the west. With Comwells Heights as an example, the garage could be built at highway 202 with direct access. Then none of the garage traffic would impact a local community. In Paoli, the land should be used for transit oriented residential development. The residents could walk both to Paoli station and to patronize the local businesses. Jenkintown, with service in four directions to West Trenton, Center City, Warminster, and Doylestown, is ideally suited for transit oriented development instead of a parking garage. Another issue to be addressed is the differences in planning and funding requirements for transit and highway projects. The TIP contains numerous projects to fund the repairs necessary to reopen closed bridges. Some of these bridges have been closed for years. There appears to be no requirement for any studies, environmental impact evaluations, or competition for limited new facility funds. In contrast, restoration of a closed transit facility is treated as an entirely new facility. It is required to undergo scrutiny as if nothing had ever existed, discarding perhaps a century of use.

Finally, non-automobile transportation is missing from many projects that could easily incorporate such transportation. Sidewalks are deliberately not included on Hulmeville Avenue because policy only includes them where adjacent sidewalks exist. Such a self-defeating policy is unlikely to produce any sidewalks. Instead all projects should include sidewalks in order to encourage development of adjacent sidewalks, and to provide for a fuel-short future. Several traffic signal projects on roads with public transit fail to include signal priority for transit vehicles. This oversight should be corrected. We recognize that some of the policy issues may be outside the direct scope of this TIP or of the DVRPC. However, with its official interaction with other agencies and departments, the DVRPC is the logical body to carry these issues to the higher level authorities.

To summarize we list some representative projects that can be removed from the TIP to alleviate problems discussed above.

Removing these, and other similar projects, frees funds for projects that at present remain unfunded.

Additional roads:

16438 (\$3,986,000, p190), 57858 (\$8,744,000, p200), 79863 (\$10,960,000, p224), 79864 (\$0 in 2011-2014, p225), 87392 (\$3,478,000, p231), 46956 (\$17,061,000, p241)

Expansion of capacity:

13347 (\$1,189,000,000, p85), 13440 (\$2,737,000, p86), 13576 (\$14,276,000, p87), 13635 (\$5,528,000, p90), 13727 (\$7,012,000, p92), 50633 (\$23,251,000, p95) 57624 (\$2,814,000, p97), 64779 (\$4,350,000, P 102), 14484 (\$3,385,000, p117), 14515 (\$6,293,000, p118), 14532 (\$2,490,000, p119), 14541 (\$4,985,000, p119), 15385 (\$1,093,000, p122), 64494 (\$109,989,000, p129), 64498 (\$56,506,000, p130), 70227 (\$5,430,000, p134), 15345 (\$4,110,000, p156), 69815 (\$7,699,000, p169), 69816 (\$5,793,000, p170), 69817 (\$11,380,000, p171), 16688 (\$6,365,000, p194), 16703 (\$7,997,000, p195 - 1 of several for this work), 16755

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

(\$1,250,000, p196), 57864 (\$6,896,000, p201), 63486 (\$2,122,000, p203), 63490 (\$940,000, p204), 63491 (\$319,000, p205), 80222 (\$6,753,000, p226), 17821 (\$25,220,000, p240),

Non-transportation:

77468 (P109), 77459 (P141), 77460 (P177), 65910 (P209), 74817 (P220), 61714 (P251), 70243 (P260), 77452 (p267), 84649 (P276), 85059 (P276), 87124 (P277), 87937 (P278)

Harmful to established centers:

47979 (\$3,000,000, p123), 85062 (\$1,500,000, p147), 60574 (\$1,311,000, p315), 73214 (in unfunded list)

Omission of provision for non-automobile transportation:

13606 (P88), 13727 (P92), 47994 (P160), 48168 (P160), 57750 (P161), 64790 (P165), 57893 (P246), 57897 (P247), 57898 (P247)

A.111: *Whereas the region does not meet current Clean Air Standards; and whereas the Federal Office of Transportation is encouraging implementation of Complete Streets policy*

Whereas the region does not meet current Clean Air Standards; and whereas the Federal Office of Transportation is encouraging implementation of Complete Streets policy, the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission should do the following: Delete all TIP projects that have not assessed transit service, bike/ped facilities and bike/ped access to transit stops/stations. Delete all TIP projects that do not meet a Transit LOS, Bicycle LOS and Pedestrian LOS = A before considering widening or any parking expansion including parking expansion and parking garages at Regional Rail stations. TIP projects should demonstrate that they are increasing safe and comfortable bike/ped/wheelchair access to transit stops/stations; increasing frequency of transit service; improving transit connections; improving routes (start/end at RR stations); add new routes or extend; add feeder bus service to RR stations and improve transit facilities (bus shelters, benches and bus stop areas with lighting) and improve complete, extensive accessible transit travel information across communities. Tip projects should meet the recommendations given in DVRPC corridor studies. EG the following MPMS # 84642, 17928, 17900, 48199, 77463, 74817, 16197, 16214, 72992, 16334, 72994, 72992, 74808 s; should meet the recommendations in the corridor study of Routes 263/611 conducted by DVRPC.

General transit improvements and concerns in Various Counties

A.112: *Clean, efficient, reliable public transit is the only truly sensible transportation for the future*

It is increasingly apparent that clean, efficient, reliable public transit is the only truly sensible transportation for the future. The future begins today. SEPTA is our public transportation modality in this area. Specifically, Jenkintown/Wyncote is my local stop. SEPTA plans to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of state and federal monies to build a huge parking garage here to accommodate cars from areas fifteen miles away. Yet they will not spend any money to eliminate the "bottleneck" that prevents trains from making additional stops further down the track. Substantial parking is available at those stops, but SEPTA riders must drive to Jenkintown/Wyncote to take their trains. This stubbornness and blindness of SEPTA to continue with this costly and unnecessary spending of millions to fund this unwanted garage is criminal. Other outlying suburbs, specifically Newtown, are begging SEPTA to provide service to their areas. That is where potential riders are, in newly built towns with populations that increase daily. The close-in suburbs are not growing. We have adequate parking. The monies encumbered from the federal and state governments would be much better spent providing ridership for SEPTA in the far-lying suburbs.

A.113: *Expansion of SEPTA transit service and sustainability of our transit system*

DVRPC needs to ENCOURAGE people to drive much less than they are by demanding that SEPTA expand its service, not contract it as they have been doing since they took over Conrail. They closed 62 stations and removed track just when the further out suburbs began to be developed. Here are a few ways to get our region to be more sustainable and off the oil addiction. Tell SEPTA they must:

1. increase service to the outer suburban rail stations and reduce the number of times trains stop at the Jenkintown station to once every 15 or 20 minutes.
2. make it easier for commuters to use their local stations so they don't drive beyond them; rail commuters will want to use their local stations when there is service to them more than once an hour or once every 45 minutes as it is now; they will also need adequate parking at their local stations.
3. remove the plan for the reckless expenditure of tax payer money and environmentally backwards proposal for a parking garage at the Jenkintown station; \$108,000 per parking space to add 250 spaces is an obscene waste of money and WILL NOT INCREASE RIDERSHIP. Unless there is adequate parking and service to the outer suburbs, there will never be enough parking at the Jenkintown station. And over 50% of the people who park there are not from nearby, but have bypassed their station and several others to drive 5, 10, 20 miles for the frequent service they don't get at their home station. More frequent trains and better parking in the outer suburbs WILL INCREASE RIDERSHIP. "Provide the trains and they will come."
4. reinstate the R8 train line from Fox Chase to Newtown!!! There are plenty of tracks still in place, and other tracks in storage near Wayne Junction, so the steel is not the big expense.
5. stop using cost/benefit analysis as their answer to every project. They have not factored in the cost to the environment and the

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

benefit to the
commuters.

DVRPC needs to work with the state government to get dedicated funding for public transit.

Thank you.

A.114: *Expansion of the Broad Street Subway to South Jersey and Northeast Philadelphia*

SEPTA and the City of Philadelphia has been planning to expand the Broad Street Subway Line to the Navy Yard, which is a good idea. But they should think about expanding it farther into New Jersey. The Navy Yard is about 7 miles away from Gloucester City, NJ. This extension would benefit both the citizens of Southeastern Pennsylvania and Southern New Jersey. This would allow citizens of Southern New Jersey to have better access to the Sports Complex and Center City Philadelphia without driving. The citizens of Southern New Jersey has been demanding better transportation to Philadelphia and this is a good answer. New Jersey can transform Gloucester City into a transportation hub, that will create multiple transfers between other New Jersey bus routes that travels through the state. This extension can also help New Jersey with its plan to create a Glassboro-Camden Light Rail Line, which will also have a stop in Gloucester City. This can be the answer to solving the Broad Street Line's declining ridership. This extension would improve SEPTA chances of gaining a federal grant for the project since it involves more than one state.

Another good idea is to expand the Broad Street Subway Line through Northeast Philadelphia. Thousands of people, including myself travel through the Northeast daily by bus, which takes along time. A subway line on the Theodore Roosevelt Blvd, with stops at the Franklin Mills Mall and terminating at the Parx Casino in Bensalem, Pa. The Boulevard is one of the most dangerous streets in America. A subway line would help reduce traffic and can save lives. Philadelphia can create a special tax zone along the Boulevard to help generate jobs and economic development to help cover the cost.

A.115: *More funding being made available for improved mass transit and bicycle transit availability*

I would much appreciate funding be made available for improved mass transit (more SEPTA trains/stations, improved park and ride, particularly in the further suburbs lessening congestion, more trolley lines, like the one in Chestnut Hill that has been dead for a while). I would also like funding available for improving bicycle transit availability. I would like to be able to bike to work (~9.5 mi) but the roads are dangerous and in poor condition. I do not expect that this will change, but any improvement, even if it does not directly affect me, is good. I am also opposed to the funding of the Wyncote/Jenkintown parking garage, but that's another comment. Sincerely, Dr. Jacob Ketter

A.116: *Please carefully review how you use your funding for transportation services in the Delaware Valley Region*

Please carefully review how you use your funding for transportation services in the Delaware Valley Region. In particular, SEPTA refuses to consider reinstating the R8 Newtown Line, which would expand availability of rail travel to outlying Philadelphia suburbs, reducing the reliance on cars for travel. Instead, SEPTA is proposing to build an unnecessary garage at the Jenkintown Train Station. Instead of using stations closer to their homes, SEPTA is actually encouraging riders to drive more miles, add to congested roads and create more greenhouse gases.

Please stop this environmentally and fiscally wasteful use of funding immediately. Review the recent data from the Rider Preference Study conducted by Septa, indicating that 97% of drivers who come to the J-W station who bypass their local station would prefer to drive to their local station if there were more available service. Do not take the biased and flawed conclusions of the study proposed by their hired consultant as fact. Review the data yourselves. Or read the outside review from Rachel Weinberger, Ph.D. from U. of Penn, who was hired to review the data by the Board of Commissioners from Cheltenham Township. Consider the enormous taxpayer burden, the wasteful use of resources, and the fact that other transportation centers that SEPTA has constructed recently at Norristown and Frankford are often half empty. It is fiscally, regionally and environmentally responsible to expand service to outlying suburbs and bring ridership to commuters who need it.

A.117: *Priority must be given to those projects and elements within projects that maintain the operations of buses, trolleys, and trains; attract passenger miles; and reduce motor vehicle miles*

While the Regional Citizens Committee is not providing its own input to the TIP this year, its members such as myself are doing so individually.

My Comments:

Many projects already have been deferred because of the Pennsylvania transportation funding crisis. More important, I think, is the likelihood that federal funding, which provides the bulk of the money for public and road transportation, will in future years also be somewhat reduced because of the effects of nation's on-going balance-of-payments and debt crises.

This means that priority must be given to those projects and elements within projects that maintain the operations of buses, trolleys, and trains; attract passenger miles; and reduce motor vehicle miles. The state-of-good-repair, renewal, and similar projects would seem to fall most obviously in this category. However, the minimal detail given for these projects and the possibility that more urgent and less urgent items may be mixed makes judgment next to impossible. The average reader will be tempted to give a blank check.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

However, that is not so much the case in station projects. As far as I have seen lately, most RRD train stations at least are functionally adequate and after many years of upgrades seem in good condition. The main productivity questions can be raised about the high-cost new-station projects (apparently including 20130 (Paoli), 50655 (Levittown), 84642 (Jenkintown), and 90509 (East Falls, Roslyn, and Secane). These projects do not in a critical way preserve or improve operations or attract new passengers. RCC has stated its opposition to parking garages, in particular the Jenkintown project, while favoring just-in-time incremental parking expansion at outlying stations. These principles also may be applied elsewhere where new customers can be attracted at much lower unit cost than with the mega-station projects proposed. A common thread in these new stations projects is replacement of existing station platforms and station buildings, which usually are in good condition. with high station platforms (i.e., 48" above the rails), elevators, and skywalks connecting the platforms. It has been claimed that ADA regulations will require all these things. However if one does the math by multiplying the average stated cost of these projects by the number of station platforms yet to be raised (about 238 throughout the system), the eventual cost will total over one billion dollars. That is simply unaffordable. Moreover, it is highly non-productive in the practical sense of producing ipso facto no train-miles for passengers, regular or handicapped, to ride.

Other less expensive ways must be found to meet ADA requirements for "level boarding", which does not necessarily mean installing high platforms. Chicago and the new commuter rail systems in the West and the South appear to have no plans to replace their present stations with high platforms to meet ADA requirements. Their rolling stock has either lift devices (Chicago's METRA diesel lines) or is designed with partial low floors with low-level access doors which handicap passengers can enter and leave easily.

Adaptation of these ideas to the Regional Rail system can obviate that one billion dollar expenditure. Construction of new stations with high platforms, etc. should be suspended while system standards for compatible station platform design and railcar design are developed. Otherwise we will be essentially unable to afford to develop the present RRD system and to expand it.

A.118: *Replace the Chestnut Hill Lines (R7&R8) with light rail or subway lines*

Finally I think SEPTA should replace the Chestnut Hill Lines (R7&R8) with light rail or subway lines. It is a hassle trying to get to Germantown or Chestnut Hill by the 23 bus route. A subway line or light rail line replacing the R7 and R8 would save SEPTA money in the long-term and increase ridership. SEPTA can create a spur from the Broad Street Subway Line at the North Philadelphia Station. This transformation can create the opportunity for SEPTA to expand the new route(s) to Plymouth Meeting and other Montgomery County areas.

A.119: *Transit Oriented Development*

Transit Oriented Development is a brilliant concept. Communities built near rail lines are already TODs. So why is SEPTA closing stations? Why are they selling railway right-of-ways for walking trails when the lines clearly go to heavily developed areas. SEPTA has closed 62 stations since it took over. Most of them were in existing TOD locations and in areas in which development was happening the fastest. The DVRPC needs to either tightly oversee/regulate SEPTA or get out of the way. SEPTA has consistently acted in ways contrary to what the public needs when it comes to its railroad. The train schedules for the outer suburbs are a great example. Trains run so infrequently that people are driving to distant stations, leaping over others along the way. This is TOTALLY CONTRARY to what the DVRPC says it wants for our region. An example: Miss the 7:02 train from Doylestown and you have to wait until 8:19 for the next train. There are many, many fixes that would take little money as compared with building garages that serve as magnets for cars. Pay attention to your own ideas that you have put on paper and how they say one thing but support the opposite when it comes to SEPTA. I am requesting a response to this letter so that I know someone in the decision-making level has read it. It's time to stop brushing off the concerned citizens who have excellent ideas based on their observations and research.

A.120: *We must stop wasting energy for the sake of our own National security and our environment*

Most elected officials realize that we, as a Nation, must lesson our dependency on oil. We must stop wasting energy for the sake of our own National security and our environment. Parking garages will encourage more miles driven by those who are not being adequately served by SEPTA. Instead of using stations closer to their homes, riders will use more gas driving more miles, add to congested roads and create more greenhouse gases. Additionally, riders who do not use their local stations in the outer suburbs will spend less money for their tickets by purchasing them at stations closer to their destination, thereby reducing potential revenues for SEPTA. Reduced revenues will necessitate an increase in subsidies from government to maintain the existing rail lines.

A.121: *We need to move faster before it's too late*

We need to move faster before it's too late. Specifically, we need to complete commuter bike trails ASAP and start new ones. We need to have a commuter train line from King of Prussia area to Reading.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

Improving the TIP document and process

A.122: *Indicate what modes a project reflects*

Please provide icons which indicate what modes a project reflects. Take the Wilmaco TIP (http://www.wilmaco.org/tip/fy2011/FY2011-14%20TIP_NCC.pdf) Next to each project it has icons of the modes the project is working on. Having that here would make the document infinitely more readable and would be very helpful. Thanks

MPMS# 14675 - Chester Valley Trail, Phase 2 (Sec 2/3)

A.123: *Expression of support for project*

Completely in favor of this project.

MPMS# 59966 - Capital Asset Lease Program

A.124: *Amount of funding SEPTA pays to lease Amtrak tracks*

Finally, we would appreciate a better understanding of the amount of money that SEPTA pays to lease Amtrak tracks (MPMS 59966). We want to ensure that Amtrak is not overcharging SEPTA for the lines. With SEPTA having to pinch pennies as much as it does, the authority does not need to be overcharged.

MPMS# 60255 - Regional Rail Signal Modernization Program

A.125: *Concerns regarding SEPTA's recent rail signal projects*

We have had concerns over SEPTA's recent rail signal projects: both on transit lines and on the commuter rail lines (MPMS 60255). From what we can tell, systems have been designed in an overly cautious manner, resulting in serious reductions in capacity and in service speeds. For example, the Wayne Junction-Glenside cab signal system enforces a northward speed reduction much farther in advance of Jenkintown station than is necessary under normal circumstances, in order to ensure that a train can stop short of the interlocking under adverse conditions. Trains creep the last quarter mile into Jenkintown. Expanding this signaling philosophy to the rest of the system will increase running times, making train service less efficient and less attractive to commuters. From a system perspective, that lessens the safety benefits of the new signal system.

MPMS# 60286 - SEPTA Bus Purchase Program - 40`

A.126: *Expression of support for project*

The Bicycle Coalition supports this project.

MPMS# 60574 - Paoli Transportation Center

A.127: *Expression of support for project*

We support the redevelopment of the Paoli station area and encourage Chester County and its townships to expedite permitting (MPMS 60574). The train station and commuter parking component of the project should move forward even if the private commercial development must be delayed due to difficulty in finding tenants or bank credit for construction. The parking facility should include spaces for Amtrak riders as well as SEPTA commuters.

MPMS# 60611 - Fare Collection System/New Payment Technologies

A.128: *Support for advancing project*

While we recognize the funding problems, we urge SEPTA to find a way to advance the New Payment Technologies project sooner than the present schedule, where much of the project is deferred to 2015 and beyond (MPMS 60611). One way to reduce capital costs would be to avoid the use of faregates in the Center City stations. Installing gates would add costs not only for the gates themselves but also for installing communications and power wiring in the stations. The latter may actually cost more than the former, and the necessary construction will certainly cause a lot of disruption for riders.

Meanwhile, the gates do not fit into a viable long range plan for fully self-service fare collection on SEPTA's railroad. We continue to believe that a properly-managed 'proof of payment' fare collection system would be most cost-effective in the long run. DVRPC should ensure that no final decisions are made on this system or funds released until a long-range fare collection plan (time horizon 15-30 years) is completed and made available for public comment.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

MPMS# 84642 - Jenkintown Platform and Garage Project

A.129: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

I request that the DVRPC conducts a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion and as a means to reduce vehicle miles travelled, carbon emissions, and its potential for expanding transit use in this region. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area. Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

Thank you for your time.

A.130: *Expression of opposition to project*

I just viewed once again the "CONNECTIONS: Toward a More Sustainable Future" PowerPoint presentation that was shown in Wayne, PA on the evening of June 9, 2010. It is chock full of reasons why a large parking garage is a terrible project for the Jenkintown-Wyncote Station, and make it clear why a parking garage is inconsistent with developing and achieving a vision for the future.

Statements in the presentation include:

- Decrease Vehicle Miles of Travel
- Decrease Vehicle Hours of Delay
- More Jobs and Households with Transit Access
- More Walking and Biking Trips
- Decrease CO2 Emissions
- Modernize the Transportation System
- Build an Energy-Efficient Economy

Many concerned citizens of our region want to be sure that when money is spent on public transit, it be spent on projects that provide the greatest reduction of VMT and GHG emissions. Large parking garages, leading toward reduced use of commuter rail, are exactly the wrong direction for SEPTA to be taking. Garages are not green!

A.131: *Expression of support for project*

We continue to support the proposed park/ride facility and station reconstruction at Jenkintown (MPMS 84642). Ridership at this station has stagnated for close to a decade because the existing parking lot is at capacity, which also causes passengers driving to the station after about 8:30 am to cruise residential streets looking for parking. Some project opponents have argued the garage is not necessary. SEPTA and Montgomery County have gone to great lengths to try and address the opponents' concerns, but ultimately, the opponents simply want area commuters sent to somebody else's neighborhood, not theirs, and no amount of reasoning will change their minds. We do agree that the Fox Chase-Newtown line should be restored to service and will divert some riders away from Jenkintown, but it won't eliminate the need for the garage, either in the short term or the long term. The bottom line is that if the facility is not built, the primary losers are the residents of Jenkintown, Cheltenham, and Abington for whom the station will be less and less useful to them as parking fills up sooner and sooner in the morning.

A.132: *Restore the Newtown Rail Corridor as an alternative to the Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage project*

The Newtown Rail Corridor must be restored to the TIP in place of the Jenkintown-Wyncote parking garage project. This project is cost effective and will save SEPTA money.

INVESTMENT REQUIRED FOR NEWTOWN RAIL RESTORATION

Having electrified Fox Chase Line in 1966 I suggest it should	
not require a \$ 300 million investment to restore Newtown Service as R-4.	
Lay new continuous welded rail, salvage old rail =	\$ 36,000,000
Hang catenary	24,000,000
Passing siding where needed	1,500,000
Two substantial stations	6,000,000
Six bus stop type stations	3,000,000

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Received from the General Public

Various Counties

Parking for 800 autos	3,200,000
Engineering and project management:	\$9,000,000
Contingencies:	\$12,000,000
Safe overnight layover protection	\$300,000
Crossing signals:	\$4,000,000
TOTAL	\$99,000,000

MPMS#s 60286/90512 - SEPTA Bus Purchase Program - 40` & 60`

A.133: *Expression of support for project*

We support the bus purchase program, including both 40- and 60-foot vehicles, though we would like for SEPTA to develop and publish a fleet management program for buses of all types and for all its vehicle fleets (MPMS 60286 and 111111). We continue to encourage SEPTA to consider overhauling buses and extending their service lives instead of replacing them with new buses if the condition of the vehicles is suitable. Conversely, if improved fuel economy or reduced maintenance costs can justify early replacement of older buses, SEPTA should do so. The 12-year service life is an artificial economic construct unrelated to the actual mechanical state of the vehicles. We agree with the decision to purchase hybrid buses. As SEPTA gains more experience with these vehicles and expands the fleet, overhead costs of maintaining them should decrease. We join other advocacy and community groups in asking SEPTA to apply some of the funds in this project to purchase new trackless trolleys for South Philadelphia.

R8 Newtown Rail Line Re-activation

A.134: *Conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown*

I request that the DVRPC conduct a new feasibility study on the viability of the Newtown rail corridor as an alternative to parking expansion at Jenkintown. This study must evaluate conditions on all ex-Reading commuter rail lines, identify current deficiencies in terms of service and access, the effect of these deficiencies, and a list of remedies that increases the use of commuter rail, reduces vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and improves local economies. Studies show that the reinstatement of Newtown rail service will be the best solution for driving long term sustainability, reduced VMT, and creating new transit riders on all regional rail lines in the study area. It's important to bring rail service to the expanding suburbs. Bring back the R-8 Newtown line or at least consider improving conditions and service on the current lines in the greater Newtown corridor. Because of our severely limited funding for capital projects, this region cannot afford to squander what little funding that is available on projects that do not effectively increase rider miles on mass transit. \$27 million dollars for 280 additional riders, many of which will not be new riders, is an immoral use of public money. The Jenkintown Garage goes against all directives as outlined in the DVRPC's Long Range plan. The garage will increase carbon emissions, oil consumption and maintain current dependencies on automobile ownership. DVRPC's sanctioning of this project indicates a lack of commitment to the goals set forth in the long range plan, and endorses the continual contraction of our regional rail system. We cannot afford this waste in any economy.

A.135: *The reactivation of the Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor must be included in long-term planning*

The DVRPC must add the Newtown Commuter rail corridor back to the region's TIP. The Newtown line meets the goals and objectives of the DVRPC, which is to improve transit connections, reduce vehicle miles travelled, air pollution and road congestion. Additionally, restoration of service on this corridor will increase the number of residents that use transit. The Newtown Commuter Rail Corridor would produce the second highest passenger-mile per car per year of any SEPTA line. R-5 to North Penn is the highest. SEPTA's 316 scheduled cars average 1,544,214 passenger-miles per car-year, the Newtown line average of 1,883,260, which would be 22 % more efficient. SEPTA nor the DVRPC have studied this corridor with recent data. The most recent data is 1995, before the housing boom in Bucks County. Currently, most SEPTA stations along the Newtown corridor are maxed out and have no room for growth, except for up. This corridor must be included in the long term plan for the region. SEPTA's own studies indicate the line would operate with an acceptable ratio, and add new riders to all lines. Eliminating wasteful and non-essential projects will help fund this line. Examples include: replacement of the Callowhill bus facility, restoration of trolley Routes 23 and 56, which SEPTA has no intention of restoring, and reprioritizing funding to projects that increase ridership and revenue, instead of enhancements.

**Summary of Public and Agency Comments
On the
DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
for Pennsylvania**

Comments Recieved from the General Public

Various Counties

SEPTA Substation Upgrades

A.136: *Priority of RRD substation upgrades*

I'm very concerned about the lower priority for the RRD substation upgrades and the delay in building a redundant SFC to supplement the single point of failure at Wayne Jct.

In the mid-80's the old rotary converters failed and the Reading side was down for nearly a month.

I view the second SFC as a piece of critical non-redundant infrastructure.

Summary of Public and Agency Comments On the DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Pennsylvania

Comments Recieved from the Regional Citizens Committee

Various Counties

Improving the TIP document and process

B.1: *The RCC seeks complete transparency at all stages of the planning process*

The RCC seeks complete transparency at all stages of the planning process. The first phase is the submission of a project for the TIP by an interested party. Each project should therefore identify that party and include the supporting political entities. Every TIP project should also include an "audit" of public input and project advocates by name and organization. In addition, TIP project descriptions should include a more complete summary of data from planning studies including: Multi-modal level of service (LOS); Transit frequency and hours of service; Bicycle LOS and pedestrian LOS; Condition of transit facilities; Average people counts on transit vehicles; Percentage of impervious service around a transportation project; and References to relevant GIS data, such as topographical maps, FEMA maps and census/DVRPC Degrees of Disadvantage maps.

Transportation projects can then be discussed in a comprehensive manner, with highway and transit components together, and with the sustainable goals of DVRPC's Implementing Connections: A Guide for Municipalities in mind.

**Summary of Public and Agency Comments
On the
DVRPC Draft FY2011-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
for Pennsylvania**

Comments Received from the DVRPC Planning Partners & Agencies

Bucks County

Technical Corrections

C.1: *Modify the project details of various projects in Bucks County*

Modify various project descriptions.

C.2: *Modify the project details of various projects in the DVRPC Region*

Modify various project descriptions, funding amounts, and phase schedules.

Chester County

Technical Corrections

C.3: *Modify the project details of various projects in Chester County*

Modify various project descriptions, funding amounts, and phase schedules.

Delaware County

Technical Corrections

C.4: *Modify the project details of various projects in Delaware County*

Modify various project descriptions, funding amounts, and phase schedules.

Montgomery County

Technical Corrections

C.5: *Modify the project details of various projects in Montgomery County*

Modify various project descriptions and phase schedules.