

Members Present

CR McLeod, Chair	DelDOT
Ken Grant	AAA
Richard Klepner	OHS
Mark Luszcz	DelDOT
Tom Nickel	DelDOT
James Wilson	Bike Delaware

Members Absent

Lt. Tracy Condon	DSP
Amy Wilburn	Citizen

DelDOT Support Staff

Maria Andaya	DelDOT
Farzana Atique	McCormick Taylor

Guests

Marc Cote, DelDOT
Adam Weiser, WRA

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am by Mark Luszcz.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Klepner recommended to remove Smyrna Rest Area as proposed venue for today's meeting. Upon the motion of Mr. Grant and seconded by Mr. Wilson, the minutes for the December 4, 2018 meeting was approved with the recommended change.

DISCUSSION WITH MARC COTE

Marc Cote discussed Access Management and the Subdivision Manual and how Complete Streets tie in with the Subdivision Manual. All entrances are required to take into account all modes of transportation. They require sidewalks or SUPs in subdivisions and also along frontages. Similarly with commercial properties, they require modifications such as turn lanes, bike lanes, etc. If deemed necessary, they might also require transits and bus stops that are ADA compliant.

If the frontage is long, say 1000 feet, they require the developer to have pedestrian access every 330 feet.

Development Coordination Manual is a state regulation. They make updates every year. They have jurisdiction to provide access to state-maintained roads. They don't have jurisdiction over local roads.

Mr. Wilson asked if the Department has authority to deny access to principal arterials. Mr. Cote said they have authority to control the access but they are required to provide access to a parcel

or they buy them out. If there's access on the side street then they prefer that the access is on the side street. Mr. Wilson asked if DelDOT has authority to deny access to main street because a developer has access to a side street. Mr. Cote said yes. They might give a developer a right-in right-out on the main line but typically they discourage access to whatever the higher order of road is.

Mr. Nickel said there are also roads across the state that fall under the Corridor Capacity Preservation Program with limited access. There is another level of regulations associated with that program – on Route 1 from the Dover Air Force Base to the Nassau Bridge; Route 113 from Milford to the Maryland Line; Route 13 from Route 10 to the Maryland Line; a stretch in the Hockessin area along Route 48. They are up for review every couple of years where they send out letters to municipalities and counties to see if they want to do something different.

If there's a large parcel that is being proposed for subdivision, Mr. Wilson asked if the Department can deny access to the smaller individual parcels. Mr. Cote said that when there's a proposal to subdivide a parcel, they make a comment that they can only give them one access and that there will be cross access easements. Mr. Wilson asked if the parcel owners will know that ahead of time? Mr. Cote said yes, it's a condition of the subdivision. They can impose restrictions and conditions

For example, if a large parcel on Route 40 is subdivided into 5 smaller parcels, they don't want 5 access into Route 40. Maybe they will allow a right-in in the beginning and a right-out at the end. They get to see the subdivision of a parcel and also when something goes into design as to what is proposed on the parcels. They work with the county but the access is DelDOT's call.

There are endless combinations when it comes to providing access depending on their evaluation.

2007 was when they first did a major overhaul of the manual. Prior to that, there was a revision in 1983 and then 1987. But after that, it went 2 decades without a revision. Major changes were made in 2007 including stormwater, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, etc.

The old manual was the basis of the development of Kirkwood Highway. So now when Kirkwood Highway redevelops, they require pedestrian facilities.

Mr. Weiser asked that in the case of Route 13 in Dover where they are doing a pedestrian safety audit – two parcels are being redeveloped and in between them is a gap which may be 300 feet, he asked if the Department has the authority to require the developers to fill in that gap. Mr. Cote said that depending on the size of the project, they can require a traffic impact study and require the developer to go outside their frontage and fill in the gap but if the project is small, what they can require might be limited to say if there's a transit facility. The difficult part is when there's no right of way. It's easy when there's right of way.

They limit access on arterials. Their goal is to reduce and consolidate.

Mr. Weiser asked if there's a commercial development proposed across a residential

development that is likely to generate pedestrian traffic midblock, does the department have the ability to require the developer to analyze that to see if a traffic light or cross walks or hybrid beacon is required? Mr. Cote said if the project is large enough, they can require a TIS to determine that but without a TIS, they are going to rely on the experience of their plan reviewers specifically from Traffic section to determine that.

TIS is everything - bike-ped. Intersections but not midblock. Mr. Cote believes that in the latest ITE update, pedestrian component outside intersections is captured but it's very new.

Mr. Nickel said that David Racca of UD developed a model that can predict pedestrian trip generation depending on land use. Mr. Nickel asked if in the next subdivision manual update if it would make sense to include in areas like Route 40 and 13, etc to model pedestrian generation for redevelopment.

Mr. Cote said midblock crossings rely on plan reviewers especially if it's just a two-lane road. But for multi lane roads, they might consider including a language about pedestrian generation.

According to Mr. Cote, fees collected in lieu of sidewalks will be used by the sidewalk committee.

If say a developer wants to open a bar on Pulaski Highway, does DelDOT have control over that? Mr. Cote said they will look at it just like any other development as far as access is concerned. If it's say an assisted living or 55 and over development, then they take that into consideration. They don't get into impaired drivers.

Mr. Luszc said that the type of development is a land use issue. They only look at traffic generation. Mr. Wilson made a comment that it looks like this is the only mechanism DelDOT has to influence land use. Access stand point is their only control.

Mr. Weiser said the manual should have a specific language so they can look at say a proposed bar that will generate impaired drivers and pedestrians. It could influence what they can do from a transportation standpoint. They can't influence the land use but they can impose measures to make it safe.

Mr. Klepner asked if a certain type of development is enough reason for them to change the speed limit of a road. Mr. Cote said it could come up – say if a new development is in the middle of nowhere or there will be proposed lane changes, then they would look into that.

Mr Klepner asked what is required to change the limit of a road. Mr. Luszc said in developed area such as Kirkwood Highway any new development will not change the context of the road but what they struggle with is in the rural area. For example - White Hall in Middletown. It's a good downtown Middletown vision but it might take 20 years to get there. Before it happens, it's still going to be rural where cars would go 50 mph even if they put a 25 mph sign.

Two national organizations are pushing for automated speed enforcements but right now we don't have that in Delaware.

Mr. Wilson asked if Mr. Cote can come back. Mr. Cote said definitely.

DATA COMPARISON AND PEDESTRIAN ORIGIN-DESTINATION

Mr. Luszczyk looked at data in the hope of understanding why Delaware has such a high pedestrian fatality rate. They compared Delaware's 3 counties with 3000 plus counties in MD, NJ, PA, and VA. They looked at pedestrian fatalities per capita versus population density and land area but so far nothing stood out.

Mr. Weiser talked about Pedestrian Origin and Destination. These two fields were added in December 2016 and responding law enforcement officers started collecting them. Of the 48 fatal pedestrian crashes reviewed, 20 contain origin and destination. 16 contained origin only while 12 did not have any.

Of the 20 records reviewed, 7 were found to be useful while 13 were not. Some examples of useful data are those that contain specific landmarks or addresses.

Troops need to get more training about collecting this information. Mr. Weiser said that OD data was used on the Route 13 Ped Audit.

OHS role is to analyze and assess usefulness of data. They interact with DSP and DelJIS to make sure police officers are trained. OHS can take a look at quality of data. But hands-on training is through DelJIS. Training also needs to be provided with smaller law enforcement agencies. Start reaching out to TRCC and Police Chief if we want to move forward.

OTHER BUSINESS

Crosswalks – discrepancies in evaluating crosswalks and requirements for crosswalks. Where we put them and what type of facilities need to be on each side? Mr. McLeod asked to put crosswalks in the next agenda to examine policies regarding them.

ADJOURN

Next meeting will be in May.