

**Members Present**

Rich Vetter	Dover/Kent MPO
John Sisson	WILMAPCO/DTC
Janelle Cornwell	Sussex County
Susan Moerschel	DNREC
William Payne	Citizen Representative
Adam Weiser	DelDOT
Tom Nickel	DelDOT
John McNeal	DelDOT
Todd Webb	DelDOT
Paul Moser	DelDOT
Linda Osiecki	DelDOT

**DelDOT Support Staff**

Sarah Coakley	DelDOT
Drew Boyce	DelDOT
Mark Luszcz	DelDOT

**Members Absent**

Barbara Monaghan	DDDC
Debra Young	Empower Ability LLC

**Guests**

Tigist Zegeye	WILMAPCO
Jaime Vargas	Wallace Montgomery
Chris Sylvester	Century Engineering
Mir Wahed	JMT
Frank Warnock	Citizen advocate
Angela Connolly	Citizen advocate
Amy Wilburn	Citizen advocate
Beverly Suarez-Beard	Citizen advocate
Marc Cote	DelDOT

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 9:08 am by Chair John Sisson.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

All members, staff, and guests introduced themselves.

**III. ACTION ITEM- APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Mr. Sisson reviewed the agenda and asked to move the Review of Complete Streets Implementation Plan and Review of DelDOT Planning prioritization process to be first after the meeting minutes review. Ms. Susan Moerschel made a motion to approve the agenda as modified. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adam Weiser and approved by all members present.

**IV. ACTION ITEM- APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 18, 2016 MEETING MINUTES**



Mr. Sisson asked if there were any changes needed to the minutes. Mr. Weiser made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. John McNeal seconded the motion and it was approved by all subcommittee members present.

**V. ASSIST DELDOT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE PEDESTRIAN ACTION PLAN AND PRIORITIZATION OF PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS**

**Review of Complete Streets Implementation Plan**

Mr. Sisson asked Mr. Drew Boyce to begin his presentation on the Complete Streets Implementation Plan. Mr. Boyce shared the history of Complete Streets in Delaware, including the relevant Delaware Code section, the Executive Order in 2006, the Complete Streets Policy enacted in 2010, and the development of design resources and the implementation plan. Title 17, Chapter 1, Section 132(f) of the Delaware Code was adopted in 1972 and reads “Whenever the Department of Transportation widens, constructs or reconstructs any major arterial, minor arterial, collector road or proposed road in an urbanized area of this State, the Department shall incorporate within such plans, layout, widening, construction or reconstruction the construction of sidewalks, provided there is a need for sidewalks or that it can be reasonably anticipated that the need for sidewalks will exist. The Department shall have the responsibility for determining whether such need for sidewalks does or will exist for all or any part of any such project and, before arriving at a decision as to the need of such sidewalk construction, shall consult with the county department of planning, the State Planning Office, the Department of Education and the local school district in which the proposed new road construction or road widening construction is to take place. The cost of such sidewalk construction shall be included in the total cost of the new road construction or road widening project. This subsection shall apply only to projects funded pursuant to acts authorizing the State to borrow money and issue bonds and notes for capital improvements, enacted after January 1, 1973.” Executive Order #6 was signed on April 24, 2009 and directed DelDOT to develop and implement a Complete Streets Policy. Policy implement O-6 became effective in January 2010 and states that DelDOT shall consider multi-modal amenities on all projects and create an implementation plan. He gave examples of the design resources used by DelDOT, including the AASHTO Green Book, the AASHTO design guides for bicycle and pedestrian facilities; the DelDOT Road Design Manual, Project Development Manual, Pedestrian Accessibility Standards, Subdivision Manual, and Traffic Calming Manual; and the Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares publication.

Ms. Linda Osiecki asked for clarification if the Subdivision Manual ties the provision of new sidewalks into the Strategies for State Policies and Spending Investment Levels. Mr. Boyce responded that this is correct and that other factors are considered also, such as traffic volumes generated by the proposed development, and whether or not the development is adjacent to existing or planned facilities. Mr. William Payne stated that Sussex County is growing, with school districts getting more students and he asked if DelDOT considers the County water and sewer districts as growth indicators. Mr. Boyce affirmed that DelDOT is engaging with Sussex County as they are updating their Comprehensive Plan, with a completion date of 2018. Mr. Payne said that there seems to be a disconnect between pavement maintenance projects and the ability to add bike lanes. Mr. Boyce said that if it is feasible to do so, we will, but that the regulatory process precludes the use of maintenance contracts for projects with utility relocations or environmental permitting. Mr. Mark Luszc said that all projects are evaluated for what is possible. Mr. Sisson stated that this subcommittee is here to talk about pedestrian facilities and asked to move on to the implementation plan.

Mr. Boyce shared that the implementation plan has been vetted by the Delaware Bicycle Council, ADA, and internal stakeholders, and was almost approved, but then the Executive Order was issued establishing the Pedestrian Council, so it's important for this subcommittee to review and comment on it. He said that the first five or six pages outline the process of developing the plan. On page 8 begins a listing of the various project types, including CTP category, work performed, and the Complete Streets Application Type. Implementation approach by application type begins on page 12.

Mr. Sisson gave a scenario of a bridge that is a choke point along a pedestrian corridor and asked how decisions are made to improve it to complete the network. He asked what is the Department's current strategy. Mr. Boyce said that the missing link would be advocated for during the project scoping process. Mr. Sisson said that the existing response is sometimes that the work is outside of the project scope and funding is not available to add it. Mr. Weiser said that there is a difference between minor structural maintenance and major bridge repair or replacement. Mr. Sisson acknowledged that adding pedestrian facilities along rural roads may not be a wise investment of limited resources, however if it's breaking connectivity, the need to complete the network should drive the scope and budget, not the funding driving the scope of the project. Mr. Luszczyk commented on the desire to be aware of the possibility of sacrificing the good for the perfect. He said consideration should be given to what can be done now, with weighing the costs and benefits of delaying a project for years. One possibility is to move forward with an initial phase immediately and come back later to address more difficult challenges. Mr. Boyce said that the bicycle and pedestrian section still has to push a little bit to have pedestrian facilities included, but it's a lot better now than previously.

Mr. Boyce went over the Design Guidance and Approach in the implementation plan, including the Functional Classifications/Street Types in each Investment Level, the Hierarchy of need based on streets types, and the typical sections by road type. Mr. Sisson asked if there is anything about using physical deterrents in the medians. Mr. Boyce stated that this is not a design guide, but a high level plan on how to implement the policy. He showed examples of recent projects where bicycle and pedestrian facilities have been included. He shared the next steps of continuing to change the culture from a highway department to including all modes, educating customers, continuing to update manuals, and evaluation of performance measures. He asked for comments from the subcommittee.

Mr. Boyce acknowledged Mr. Frank Warnock in the audience. Mr. Warnock stated that he attended a public workshop in 2005 for the Elkton Rd. project and that this project included a 16' wide two-way center turn lane, and 12' travel lanes, along a 30 mph section. Mr. Boyce shared that the Department would do things differently today, using design flexibility resources. Mr. Sisson responded that 10' travel lanes are tight for buses. Mr. Weiser asked how does the implementation plan address coordination with land use agencies and how do we get the counties to do better land use planning. Mr. Sisson acknowledged Ms. Amy Wilburn in the audience. Ms. Wilburn said that for developer projects, DelDOT is able to get them to add sidewalk along their frontage, but what about providing facilities for pedestrian crossing. Ms. Sarah Coakley advised that the next presentation on prioritization should provide information on how improvements may be implemented and advised Mr. Sisson to move forward on the agenda topics.

### **Review of DelDOT Planning prioritization process**

Mr. Sisson asked Mr. Boyce to begin the presentation on the prioritization process. Mr. Boyce shared about how projects are prioritized within the Capital Transportation Program. He shared projects are included first based on priority order of maintaining facilities in a state of good repair, using dedicated funding sources, projects that are required by law, and then other prioritized

projects. The prioritization criteria include system operating effectiveness, safety, environmental impact, revenue generation, multi-modal factors, impact on the public, and system preservation. He clarified that this process is for the overall transportation system. The Department also has standalone pots of funding for specific projects, such as Transportation Alternatives, Safe Routes to School, Byways, trails and pathways, and bicycle and pedestrian that are managed by the Local Systems Improvement section of Planning. Mr. Boyce shared the criteria for the prioritization of standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects, which has not been used yet, which includes the State Strategies, connectivity, transit access, recreation opportunities, access to public schools, ADA compliance, population served, and environment and transportation justice areas. Mr. Todd Webb asked if the environment and transportation justice areas being included is a strategy towards Title 6 compliance. Mr. Boyce affirmed that it is part of it. He shared that \$4-5 million a year is budgeted for the Bike/Pedestrian/other line in the CTP and that these projects are independent of individual CTP projects. There is also an ADA line item in the CTP that is managed by Tom Nickel. Mr. Boyce asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Weiser asked to clarify that the bike and pedestrian prioritization criteria has not been used yet. Mr. Boyce clarified that it is serving as broad guidance, but has not been implemented yet to formally prioritize projects. Mr. Warnock commented that he has noticed an improvement in curb ramps installed recently. Ms. Wilburn noted that the environment and transportation justice criteria is weighted lower. Mr. Boyce clarified that there is some double counting, because these areas also receive more points for the state strategies, connectivity, and population criteria. Ms. Moerschel commented that the questioned criteria act as a bonus and give extra points to projects in those areas. Mr. Weiser asked if the criteria and weighting of the criteria may be adjusted. Mr. Boyce answered positively. Ms. Wilburn said it is good that it may be tweaked as necessary. She asked when DelDOT would allow for a reduction in bike or pedestrian facilities. Mr. Boyce mentioned road widening potentially, but the department would have to mitigate it and consider alternative facilities. Ms. Wilburn asked about developers making crossing improvements. Mr. Boyce stated that DelDOT has regulations to follow and we get push back from developers, but they do their part. He said we cannot expect developers to do everything.

## **VI. PROVIDE ADVICE REGARDING DESIGN STANDARDS FOR CROSSWALKS, SIDEWALKS, AND PATHWAYS ENSURING ADA COMPLIANCE**

### **Review and discussion of DelDOT Lighting Policy**

Mr. Luszcz gave a presentation on the DelDOT Lighting Policy (see separate presentation PDF document). He referenced the footnote 1 on page 19 of the Complete Streets Implementation Plan, which says that pedestrian scale lighting will not be included in a project unless another entity agrees to own, maintain, and operate it. He said DelDOT considers lighting as a strategy to reduce crashes, both vehicular and pedestrian. Mr. Sisson asked if and how we light crosswalks. Mr. Luszcz shared that there is not separate criteria for lighting of crosswalks, sidewalks, or paths, but that the "may" section of the manual allows for engineering judgement. He shared that when DelDOT is looking at the pedestrian high crash corridors, we are looking at adding lighting. This is not for lighting crosswalks specifically. The explicit criteria is vehicle based and there is not a lot of national guidance regarding lighting for pedestrian facilities. Mr. Luszcz said that in focusing on the pedestrian crash locations, the crashes are not at intersections, so DelDOT is focusing on a corridor level approach, to light it up so that drivers can see pedestrians even if they are crossing at mid-block locations. He said he is not aware of lighting criteria specifically for crosswalks. Ms. Janelle Cornwell had to leave the meeting at 10:30 am.

It was asked if it is possible to have lighting triggered by pedestrians. Mr. Luszcz stated that we do not have that now in Delaware but it could be looked into. Mr. Weiser pointed out that the light

would still need to be charging in between activations. Mr. Warnock asked about the potential for solar lighting, such as that used in New Jersey. Mr. Luszczyk stated that for roadway lighting, it is not feasible, and that New Jersey is probably using solar to supplement electric, based on receiving grant funding for a project. Mr. Sisson said that DART has used limited solar lighting at some bus stops. Ms. Moerschel asked if there is a design limitation on what can go on poles. Mr. Luszczyk responded yes, that each utility company has its own standards and specifications. Mr. Luszczyk shared that LED lighting used to be considered not feasible for roadway lighting, but technology is advancing so rapidly that it may be feasible soon.

### **Discussion of Marked Crosswalks on all intersection legs**

Mr. Luszczyk shared the factors that are considered when making decisions on crosswalk locations, particularly at signalized locations. These include pedestrian usage data and demand, including desire lines; vehicular traffic volumes; signal phasing; queue lengths; and level of service. He said that if adding a 4<sup>th</sup> marked crossing will cause severe delay, we don't include it. He said DelDOT also considers the feasibility of a two-phase pedestrian crossing. There are also sometimes physical constraints that prevent the 4<sup>th</sup> crossing from being included. Mr. Payne asked about trail crossings, such as the Junction Breakwater trail near the Lewes library. Mr. Luszczyk stated that trail crossings were part of the recent Georgetown to Lewes Phase I, rail with trail, project. He said that he is not aware of any regulation that specifically requires marked crossings at trail crossings, but that crossing improvements are evaluated as part of projects.

Mr. Luszczyk shared that decisions are much more complex regarding locations of uncontrolled crossings. He said he does not believe a change in policies is needed. He gave an example of a project to design a new trail and said it is preferred to funnel the trail and its users to a traffic signal for crossing if possible. Factors such as length of crossing, location of crossing, pedestrian and bicycle demand, vehicular traffic volumes and speeds are used to make decisions regarding crossings.

Mr. Sisson stated that developing trails is newer to the department relatively speaking and asked if more guidance needs to be provided to designers. Should pushing trails to signalized crossings be a policy? Mr. Luszczyk suggested medians could be a strategy to consider for mid-block, uncontrolled crossing locations. Mr. Weiser asked for care to be taken in making recommendations. He said there is a big difference between guidance that maintains engineering judgement and a regulation or law that might tie the Department's hands so to speak.

### **VII. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA**

Mr. Sisson asked that recommendations be on the agenda for the next meeting.

### **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Sisson opened the floor to public comment. Ms. Wilburn commented about intersection locations where there are only two marked crossings, and people may become stuck at a corner. Ms. Angela Connolly commented about the need for more members of the public to attend these meetings.

### **IX. ADJOURN**

Mr. Weiser made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Paul Moser seconded the motion. All subcommittee members present were in favor of the motion, no members were opposed, the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.



Meeting Minutes reported by:  
Sarah Coakley, AICP

Revised version transmitted October 14, 2016