



**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

Newark Transportation Improvement District Committee Meeting

Date/Time: Wednesday, February 19, 2020, 1:30 p.m.
Location: WILMAPCO – STAR Tower, 8th floor

Attendees

<u>Committee Members</u>	
Newark Planning and Development	Mary Ellen Gray, AICP
Newark Planning and Development	Mike Fortner, AICP
Newark Public Works and Water Resources	Tim Filasky, PE
DeIDOT	Sarah Coakley, AICP
WILMAPCO	Heather Dunigan
University of Delaware	Sheeree Barnett
Newark Planning Commission	Alan Silverman
Newark Design Committee	Joe Charma, PE
BikeNewark	Bob McBride
District 5 Representative	Jim Jones
<u>Other Attendees</u>	
University of Delaware	Caitlin Olsen
DeIDOT	Cooper Bowers
<u>Committee Support</u>	
AECOM	David Athey, PE
AECOM	Mayuresh Khare, PE, AICP, PP
AECOM	Savannah Edwards

Meeting Minutes

- The meeting started at 1:30 pm. All attendees introduced themselves.
- Minutes from the January 8, 2020 meeting were approved without exception.
- Mike Fortner presented a recap of his January 8 land use presentation by consolidating the six planning areas into one exhibit. Multiple “hot spots” or larger projects either in the pipeline or being projected with a reasonable degree of certainty were identified. The Committee accepted the exhibit as is. Mike will provide the summary information to DeIDOT (identifying developments that are currently in pipeline separately) who in turn will use this information for initiating future condition analysis.
- Sarah Coakley continued her presentation on service standards by summarizing those that are mandatory and those that are optional [See Powerpoint presentation for details]. Sarah provided further explanation for each before discussing on a one-by-one basis. Mayuresh Khare suggested

that standards may be specified by location similar to other TID examples shown by Sarah in earlier committee meetings. Heather Dunigan noted that this may result in conflicting objectives. Joe Charma suggested noting trouble spots that likely will not improve.

- Beginning with the optional standards, the Committee felt the draft language for drainage was generally alright. Mayuresh thought the use of term “adequate” may be too vague and Joe asked if differentiation was needed between State and City streets. Tim Filasky said the applicable standards (DeIDOT or City) would be followed.
- The Committee felt the draft language for geometrics was generally alright and that State standards would apply to State roads and City standards would apply to City roads. Alan Silverman asked if the TID precludes a developer from going above and beyond requirements and was told it does not. Sarah said such a situation may result in an offset or credit which Mayuresh noted would need to be defined identifying eligible improvements that can qualify for such an offset or credit.
- The Committee felt the draft language for speed limits was acceptable as is.
- The Committee felt the draft language for sidewalks and shared use paths was generally alright and that State standards would apply to State roads and City standards would apply to City roads. Alan thought visuals would help explain this standard. Joe referenced a recent City Council action which required a six-foot wide clear width in the Central Business District and questioned if five-feet was enough. Sarah indicated she would draft language specifying that City standards would be followed.
- The Committee did not think inclusion of historic district standards was appropriate.
- The Committee felt the draft language regarding traffic signal types was generally alright. Tim noted that DeIDOT is using galvanized posts on South College Avenue and fancy street signs on Main Street and suggested these should be determined by City Council.
- Joe asked about burying utilities which others believed was prohibitively expensive. Savannah Edwards inquired about brick sidewalks. Alan noted that they can be difficult for people riding carts.
- The Committee at first thought that references to roundabouts should be removed, but Tim suggested leaving them in which the Committee agreed with.
- The Committee felt the draft language for pedestrian and bicycle facilities was generally alright. It was suggested that references to the Newark Bike Plan be included. Mayuresh also suggested that previously-identified gaps be included.
- For capacity and level of service, Alan said seasonal variations were important for Newark. Savannah asked how on-street parking would be factored in and was told that that would be addressed in cross sections. Alan said traffic counts should be performed every three years use of procedures in current HCM instead of referring to specific version. The Committee at first felt that level of service standards would not be appropriate for Newark but then reconsidered their use in periphery areas. Mayuresh noted that travel time is an appropriate alternate to level of service and Sarah indicated DeIDOT would be open to it. Mayuresh also suggested consideration of signal optimization using technological improvements and a travel time incremental delay standard. Sarah indicated a more in-depth assessment of travel times would be presented at the March meeting that would include 95th percentile standards and consideration of emergency response times.
- Continuing with the mandatory standards, the Committee felt the draft language for lane and shoulder widths was generally alright although there was some discussion about 11-foot and 10-foot-wide lanes and between State and City roads. Alan stressed the importance of emergency response times. The Committee felt that 10-foot lanes should be the minimum. Tim indicated that is what the City would recommend.

- The Committee felt the draft language for transit was generally alright, but UniCity and University bus services should be included. Alan asked if TID dollars could be spent on transit and was told they could for capital improvements. Recommendations could be based on the Newark TriP report.
- Sarah said she would prepare draft service standards language for inclusion in the TID Agreement based on today's discussion and distribute for the March meeting.
- An exhibit referenced in the draft agreement was revised slightly. Approval of the agreement is now with DeIDOT.
- The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.