

Members Present

Jim Lardear	AAA
James Wilson	Bike DE
Richard Klepner	OHS
Bill Thatcher	DTC
Adam Weiser	DelDOT
Matthew Cox	DSP
Jamie Wolfe	SCPD

DelDOT Support Staff

Sarah Coakley	DelDOT
---------------	--------

Members Absent

Nicole Majeski	Deputy Secretary
Amy Wilburn	Bike and Pedestrian Advocate
Tom Nickel	DelDOT

Guests

William Payne	Citizen caregiver
Elizabeth Suarez	SCPD
David Racca	University of Delaware

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:55 am by Co-chair Jim Lardear. Mr. Lardear welcomed Ms. Jamie Wolfe as a new member to both the subcommittee and Pedestrian Council. He thanked Mr. Kyle Hodges for his service.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

All members, staff, and guests introduced themselves.

III. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE MAY 18 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Lardear asked for a review of the minutes. Mr. James Wilson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Richard Klepner, to approve the minutes. The motion was approved by all members in attendance.

IV. ANNUAL REPORT: DEADLINE FOR SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Lardear reviewed the subcommittee goals:

- Review traffic rules to help support a safe pedestrian environment
- Provide advice regarding implementation of DelDOT's Sidewalk and Multi-Use Path Maintenance Policy
- Assist DelDOT with re-evaluation, implementation, and recommendations regarding the Statewide Pedestrian Action Plan

He stated that the subcommittee wants to handle the pedestrian safety problem comprehensively and through a data-driven approach, to come up with recommendations to the Pedestrian Council. Mr. Adam Weiser asked when the recommendations are due. Mr. Lardear answered that solid recommendations are due to council in December and that the subcommittee needs to begin ironing out specific recommendations in early fall. Mr. Klepner shared that the Education and

Enforcement Subcommittee is using the same approach, voting on recommendations to be sent to the full Pedestrian Council. Ms. Sarah Coakley reminded that recommendation votes must take place at the properly-noticed subcommittee public meetings.

V. **BUS STOP POLICY DISCUSSION**

Mr. Lardear stated the next agenda item is bus stop policy discussion. Mr. Weiser shared that there is interest in updating the DTC policy through the subcommittee and DTC also has a process. Mr. Weiser has reviewed and submitted comments to Mr. Bill Thatcher, to add a pedestrian safety component. Service changes are implemented twice a year after undergoing a public review period that takes place every six months. Before the public review period, Mr. Weiser and his staff review the proposed changes. DTC looks from user demand perspective and Mr. Weiser looks from a safety perspective. Mr. Thatcher shared that service changes go through a thorough public meeting process and get Secretary level approvals. He said the overall policy is also being looked at, with someone else assigned to it. There are a lot of mid-block locations and DTC looks for opportunities to consolidate. The service change process is the opportunity for changes. Ongoing maintenance of existing stops is handled throughout the year. Mr. Weiser reminded that Traffic's Pedestrian Safety Audits look at bus stops and access to them. Mr. Thatcher stated new construction plans are also reviewed for opportunities to improve bus stops. Mr. Weiser said they are still discussing full updates to the overall bus stop policy. He said regarding the subcommittee's recommendation, it could be something like incorporate pedestrian safety considerations into DTC bus stop policies.

Mr. Lardear asked how audits or rider counts are done. Mr. Thatcher responded that ridership counts are conducted and Trapeze software is used for tracking. He said they get counts at the mall and park and rides, there has also been interest in access to hospitals. He said DTC evaluates ridership constantly. They also get legislator requests. Mr. Lardear stated that along Foulk Rd. there is a bus stop on one side and a park 'n ride on the other. If counts were done and showed demand, could the routes be altered? Mr. Thatcher shared that some routes are loop routes that go only in one direction. Mr. Weiser stated that the pedestrian crash problem is on multi-lane divided corridors and Traffic is working on signage at bus stops to show riders where the closest crossing is located. Automated verbal messaging for when riders are disembarking has also been discussed. Mr. Thatcher said they have bus routes that pick up at mid-block locations but return trip drops off at the intersection. Mr. Klepner shared that the OHS Pedestrian Survey Report indicated people are generally only willing to walk 50 to 100 feet and asked if there are any distances from intersections in the bus stop policy. Both Mr. Weiser and Mr. Thatcher replied no. Mr. Weiser said the policy references three placements, far side, near side, and mid-block and says far side is preferred. Sometimes bus pull-offs are considered but they can pose a challenge for drivers getting back in the travel lane. Mr. Wilson asked if the policy spells out preference for intersection locations. Both Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Weiser responded yes and Mr. Weiser quoted the language from the policy. Ms. Jamie Wolfe asked if the disability factor is considered. Walking 50 to 100 feet is fine for an able-bodied person but what about people with disabilities, especially those who use manual wheelchairs. Mr. Wilson responded that no one is willing to walk far so this is an issue for all pedestrians. Ms. Wolfe shared that people with disabilities often use paratransit because fixed-route transit requires moving too far between stops or crossing the street.

Mr. Wilson asked who at DTC is in charge of the overall policy. Mr. Thatcher shared that the person is currently on leave. Mr. Wilson said that DelDOT Deputy Secretary Nicole Majeski had mentioned the need for a DelDOT policy, not just a DTC policy and asked about situations where a mid-block bus stop is needed. Mr. Weiser commented that he asked the same question in his comments. Ms. Wolfe stated she wanted to make sure the disability factor is considered. By law people who use wheelchairs for mobility are considered pedestrians but people who use manual

wheelchairs have difficulty getting across wide, busy streets in order to access bus stops. She asked if people with disabilities are included in the field reviews. Mr. Weiser answered that during signal retrofits for Accessible Pedestrian Signals people with visual disabilities are consulted. Ms. Wolfe asked about people with physical disabilities and shared that Delaware is the only place where she uses paratransit because she feels the fixed-route system is too dangerous. She said lots of people with disabilities would like to fixed-route transit if it was safe and accessible to do so.

Mr. William Payne mentioned a bus stop along Rt. 1 in Sussex County was recently relocated 500 feet away from an intersection. Mr. Wilson stated we need to improve coordination so things like this do not happen again. Mr. Payne stated that it is difficult to cross the roadway at mid-block locations, especially for people with disabilities. Mr. Wilson asked if revised language was being contemplated for the bus stop policy and if Mr. Weiser is reviewing every single bus stop location. He said he thought looking at every location is a waste of resources and that the focus needs to be on improving access along multi-lane divided highways. He suggested this should be a DelDOT policy, not just DTC. Mr. Thatcher stated it is currently at DTC policy and is being reviewed as such. Mr. Wilson asked if it was a DelDOT policy would it be able to specify coordination requirements. He asked about HAWK and other mid-block signal treatments. Mr. Weiser stated that there are specific warrants for each treatment and the infrastructure reviews consider them.

Mr. Wilson asked if it was common to have unpaired bus stops. Mr. Thatcher said it is more common to have them now than in the past, especially for rural roads in Sussex County, where meeting ADA requirements is sometimes physically impossible. He said they have zones where people may flag down the bus but on the returning trip it drops them off at an intersection. Mr. Wilson asked if there was a term for this scenario. Mr. Thatcher replied there is not and that it's impossible to think that there will be no mid-block crossings, but we need to make them safe. Mr. Wilson said the review and coordination process is good as long as Mr. Weiser is Safety Programs Manager but will the process be clearer if it is in a policy. Mr. Weiser said he needs to have a conversation with DelDOT Deputy Secretary Nicole Majeski. Mr. Wilson said it would be good to back up the coordination with a policy. Mr. Weiser shared he has worked on the new policy for workzones and will have a discussion with Ms. Majeski.

Mr. Wilson asked what is the timeframe for the current DTC policy revision and asked if the person responsible could attend the next subcommittee meeting. Mr. Thatcher shared the person is on leave and the draft needs to be cleaned up and reviewed internally first. Ms. Wolfe asked about public comment opportunities. Mr. Weiser responded that it is an internal policy but this subcommittee's review is public. Ms. Wolfe suggested that the policy be brought to a State Council for Persons with Disabilities meeting for review.

Mr. Payne asked about reducing speeding along Rt. 1 in Sussex. Mr. Wilson stated that this is an important concern but not on the agenda for today.

VI. E-CRASH REPORTING DISCUSSION

Mr. Lardear introduced the topic of e-crash reporting and handed it off to Lt. Matt Cox. Lt. Cox shared that the conversation on reporting also came up at the Strategic Highway Safety Plan update meetings, identifying gaps in the data. Delaware is meeting the MMUCC criteria for reporting but the existing menu options are not really helping in terms of pedestrian crash analysis. A handout was provided outlining the existing fields and their menu options (see Appendix A). He said he does not think that adding more menu options would be helpful. Already multiple menu options may fit a crash and in order to get better information, an enormous number of new menus would be needed. He said he looked at the option of adding new fields for origin and destination but would need to know what the menu options should be and this would be difficult to get the correct information. He said he believes training officers on the existing system and explaining that every

detail in the narrative matters is the best approach. Mr. Weiser shared that he is already working on tool tips to guide officers and would work with Peggy to develop pedestrian-oriented tool tips to clarify what information is being looked for. Lt. Cox added that when officers click non-motorized for type of crash, it cues the system with pop-up boxes requesting information for the narrative.

Mr. Wilson asked about the possibility of adding new form fields for origination and destination. Lt. Cox said that there are barriers to adding a new form field and officers would wonder what they are supposed to put in, for example specific address, name of business, or general location. He said good information may not be provided. If information was put in the existing narrative however, it would be in sentence form and officers would provide more detailed information. Mr. Wilson asked a guest, David Racca, from University of Delaware, to give his input. Mr. Racca said that drop down, menu fields are nice because it enables consistency in the data. Mr. Klepner stated that from looking at the existing crash information, complete information is not available. Mr. Weiser asked if officers can choose more than one option from a menu field and that he pulled up MMUCC and it has subsets of menus, not only individual menu fields. Lt. Cox answered that they can only choose one option, and asked if adding options would really get the information that is needed. He said putting it in the narrative is best. Mr. Weiser said that crash data can be evaluated in different ways, such as developing crash summaries based on type of first harmful event, weather, etc. or searching the narratives. He said if the information is in the narrative, he will be able to find it. Mr. Racca shared that a form field can receive all kinds of answers, so guidance would be needed to tell officers what is being looked for. Lt. Cox said that if it is in the narrative, it would be in the pedestrian interview section or fatal section or witness interview section. Mr. Klepner stated he would not mind it in the narrative but sometimes the narrative can be difficult to follow, such as when punctuation is not used. Mr. Weiser said that a new form field would not be searchable and that if someone is doing a study they better be reading the narrative. Ms. Wolfe excused herself from the meeting at 10:30 am. Mr. Racca mentioned a separate form field for each piece of information, origin and destination. Lt. Cox said that Peggy Bell would need to know how long the form field needs to be and if it would be mandatory. He said he has concerns with getting enough detailed information from two additional separate boxes and asked what the intent is for the usage of the information. Mr. Weiser shared that it would be used to target outreach. Mr. Klepner gave the example of if data shows school children involved, targeted outreach regarding the Safe Routes to School program could take place. Mr. Weiser said it could also show pedestrian desire lines, to show where people want to cross. Lt. Cox said that regarding more menu options, some might scroll down and some may not. He said right now they hover over and select the field answer. Any changes would also require changes to the receiving database. Mr. Weiser said that he and Lt. Cox should meet with Ms. Bell to discuss further. Mr. Wilson asked that adding 2 new form fields still remain on the table as an option.

Mr. Payne asked about bicyclists hitting pedestrians in the beach areas. Mr. Weiser responded that the data shows it's not a problem. Mr. Wilson said that the location of the pedestrian safety problem is a small number of high-speed roads. Lt. Cox said that troops target issues in their own areas and pedestrian safety is being addressed. Mr. Klepner said that there have been no pedestrian fatalities along Rt.1 in the beach area in 2 years. Mr. Klepner said he would distribute to the subcommittee members an example of the tip sheet that Office of Highway Safety gives to officers for enforcement efforts.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Lardear opened the floor to public comment. Mr. Wilson read the problem statement for a FY17 research program submittal (see Appendix B). Mr. Dave Racca explained it and that it is to

look closer at pedestrian crashes in relation to elements of the built environment. Ms. Coakley advised that this needs to be an agenda item for a future meeting if the subcommittee wants to review it. Mr. Weiser said it would be nice to have more information such as the history of where it came from before putting it on an agenda. Ms. Coakley said she will coordinate with Mike DuRoss in DelDOT Planning to get more information for the subcommittee chairs.

Mr. Lardear read the public comments submitted via email by Frank Warnock and Amy Wilburn (see appendix C) regarding their proposed pedestrian legislation. Mr. Weiser stated that at some point the subcommittee should discuss the subject. Mr. Wilson asked if they had been reminded of the Council's letter regarding not endorsing the legislation. Ms. Coakley advised that this subject could be placed on the agenda of a future meeting if the subcommittee wants to discuss further or provide a response.

Lt. Cox stated that Delaware needs laws that are enforceable. For the pedestrian safety problem specifically, a concern is that people do not have money to pay tickets. Mr. Klepner shared that the Education and Encouragement Subcommittee is considering some recommendations to address this concern and these recommendations may need to be reviewed by this subcommittee as well.

VIII. ADJOURN

Mr. Weiser made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Thatcher seconded the motion. All subcommittee members present were in favor of the motion, no members were opposed, the motion passed. The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Meeting Minutes reported by:
Sarah Coakley, AICP

Draft version transmitted August 18, 2016

I will call between 10 and 11. I have a meeting at 9, which may just last an hour, but I am not 100% sure.

In E-Crash, when a person involved is listed as a pedestrian, bicyclist or other non-motorist, there is a "non-motorist" tab that appears. In that tab there are five fields, four have drop down menus:

Action Prior to Crash

- Adjacent to Roadway (e.g. Shoulder, Median)
- Crossing Roadway
- Going to or From School
- In Roadway – Other (Working, Playing, Etc.)
- None
- Other
- Unknown
- Waiting to Cross Roadway
- Walking/Cycling Along Roadway Against Traffic (In or Adjacent to Travel Lane)
- Walking/Cycling Along Roadway With Traffic (In or Adjacent to Travel Lane)
- Walking/Cycling on Sidewalk
- Working in Trafficway (Incident Response)

- Pedestrian Trip Origin
- Pedestrian ~~Destination~~

Struck by Vehicle – Officer types in which vehicle number struck the pedestrian.

Action at Time of Crash

- Dart/Dash
- Disabled Vehicle Related (Working on, Pushing, Leaving/Approaching)
- Entering/Exiting Parked/Standing Vehicle
- Failure to Obey Traffic Signs, Signals or Officer
- Failure to Yield Right of Way
- Improper Passing
- Improper Turn/Merge
- In Roadway Improperly (Standing, Lying, Working, Playing)
- Inattentive (Talking, Eating, Etc.)
- No Improper Action
- Not Visible (Dark Clothing, No Lighting, Etc.)
- Other
- Unknown
- Wrong Way Riding or Walking

Location Prior to Crash

- Bicycle Lane



- Driveway Access
- Intersection – Marked Crosswalk
- Intersection – Other
- Intersection – Unmarked Crosswalk
- Median/Crossing Island
- Midblock – Marked Crosswalk
- Non-Trafficway Area
- Other
- Shared-use Path or Trail
- Shoulder/Roadside
- Sidewalk
- Travel Lane – Other Location
- Unknown

Safety Equipment

- Helmet
- Lighting
- None
- Not Applicable
- Other
- Protective Pads Used (elbows, knees, shins, etc.)
- Reflective Clothing (jacket, backpack, etc.)
- Unknown

Hopefully we can make some sense of this in our conversation tomorrow. I know I have been in a whirlwind the past several weeks, and from the fact that Outlook shows you not logged in when I have sent you emails recently, I am sure you have been too.

Matt

From: Weiser, Adam (DeIDOT)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 11:47 AM
To: Cox, Matthew E (DSP)
Cc: Weiser, Adam (DeIDOT)

Delaware Center for Transportation 2017 Research Program

The 2017 research program for the Delaware Center for Transportation (DCT) is currently being developed. One of the research problems that has been proposed is

"Are there Correlative Elements Among Delaware's Multimodal Transportation Systems, Geometric Inventories and Demand Levels Regarding Pedestrian and Bike Safety, from a Statistical Perspective?"

In this form, the problem statement seems to be soliciting research that would be largely duplicative of research already produced by DelDOT's Traffic section (which was presented at the 2nd meeting of the Council). A small modification of this problem statement, however, would ensure that the research goes beyond and builds on the work that has already been done by Traffic:

"Are there Correlative Elements Among Delaware's Multimodal Transportation Systems, Geometric Inventories, Zoning and Demand Levels Regarding Pedestrian Safety, from a Statistical Perspective?"

Greetings, Jonathan.

I received the meeting notice for tomorrow. Given my FT schedule, however, I am unable to attend. But I would still like to submit the following comment for the Public Comment section of the agenda.

- On behalf of myself, Amy Wilburn and Angela Connolly, please put this on the Council's active agenda by the last quarter of 2016, at the latest: A bill to revise DE's Pedestrian Code, considered for introduction during the 2017 Legislative Session.
- The draft language has already been completed, pending comments from the Council and other relevant stakeholders.
- The draft language is a "best of" version based on the code found in other progressive States (i.e. OR, WA, MA, etc).

Thank you so much!

Sincerely,

Frank Warnock
Walking, Bicycling, and Conservation Advocate

From Amy Wilburn:

- What is the status of obtaining the data that you believe is necessary to evaluate the pedestrian code?
- What data are you collecting/accessing in order to determine what changes should be made to the pedestrian code?
- Why have you chosen this particular data to provide guidance? If you are only considering data on fatalities and serious crashes, why have you chosen this approach, and why do you believe that it will enable you to take a comprehensive approach to changing the code?
- What efforts are being made to address quality of life in addition to crashes in terms of your comprehensive approach to updating the code? Considering that quality of life is important to current and future residents of this state and to increasing active transportation and mode share, it is an area that needs to be addressed in any comprehensive approach.