



**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

Newark Transportation Improvement District Committee Meeting

Date/Time: Wednesday, July 8, 2020, 1:30 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting

Attendees

<u>Committee Members</u>	
Newark Planning and Development	Mary Ellen Gray, AICP
Newark Planning and Development	Mike Fortner, AICP
DeIDOT	Sarah Coakley, AICP
WILMAPCO	Heather Dunigan
University of Delaware	Jenni Sparks
Newark Planning Commission	Alan Silverman
Newark Design Committee	Joe Charma, PE
BikeNewark	Bob McBride
Mayor's Appointee	David Levandoski
District 5 Representative	Jim Jones
<u>Other Attendees</u>	
University of Delaware	Caitlin Olsen
University of Delaware	Evan Park
University of Delaware	A Barnett
WILMAPCO	Tigist Zegeye
Unknown	Anonymous attendee by phone
<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. Since the meeting was being held virtually, David Athey read the names of the attendees.
- David provided details for how the virtual meeting would be held. Attendees were asked to mute their phones to minimize background noise and to unmute them only when speaking. He also said the presentations would be paused at the end of each slide so attendees could comment or ask questions.
- Minutes from the May 13, 2020 meeting were approved without exception.

- Sarah Coakley continued her presentation on service standards (see PowerPoint presentation). She indicated DelDOT's preference was to use changes in total travel times as the standard. Mayuresh Khare asked her to explain if the impact of background traffic growth was included in the 10% travel time increase threshold. Sarah explained the increase was measured between existing and future including background conditions. She further explained existing condition was based on traffic counts and future included an assumed 1% annual background traffic growth along with projected development related traffic related to the planning area. Mayuresh asked what portion of the 10% increase in travel time threshold is contributed by 1% annual background traffic growth until 2045. Sarah explained that significant portion of the anticipated travel time increase was due to background traffic growth and the proportion would be taken into consideration when TID fee % would be determined such that the entire burden of improvement costs would not be on the TID.
- Sarah provided an update on the Existing Condition Synchro modeling which included current signal timings along with planned signal improvements, peak hour factors, and heavy vehicle percentages among other aspects. She discussed future travel time results which were based on the 2045 land use forecast as well as Synchro signal optimization. Mayuresh asked if signal optimization considered changes to current cycle lengths. Sarah replied that future optimization focused only on optimizing signal splits and did not change cycle lengths and/or signal types.
- Sarah continued by described results of the modeling for each of the five major road segments each in the a.m and p.m. (again see PowerPoint presentation). Jim Jones questioned the logic for decreasing travel times in Segment 1. Sarah explained it was the result of signal optimization. Jim asked why optimization is not being done for the existing condition analysis. Sarah replied optimization exercise is conducted whenever projects are undertaken in a certain area. Mayuresh noted that the current analysis is comparing existing condition results with no optimization and future condition results with optimization and is therefore not really an "apples to apples" comparison to determine change in travel time. Alan Silverman said he thought a motion to show existing condition results with optimization should be made. Mike Fortner and Heather Dunigan agreed. After additional discussion, it was clear that consensus existed for this change, so a formal vote was not taken. Sarah said she would make the changes for all the segments before the August meeting.
- For Segment 2, Alan asked about the 44% travel time increase at Park Place and questioned why so many drivers would travel north on College Avenue from the STAR campus. Sarah replied that the distributions were based on distributions determined by JMT. Mayuresh noted that signal split optimization could have an impact on available green time and associated travel time. Savannah Edwards asked if there were any specific significant contributing factors to the extreme numbers (87% change in PM conditions) on East Park Place. Sarah said she wasn't sure and thought it could be due to future land uses.
- For Segment 3, Mayuresh asked if any changes to the posted speed limit will be considered for future condition analysis. They are not considered in the current analysis since the increase in travel time is only related to signal delay with running time remaining the same, Sarah replied that changes to posted speed limit have not been considered in this analysis.
- For Segment 5, Joe Charma said he thought the analysis did not include the upcoming projects on Elkton Road to which Sarah affirmed. Joe questioned the relative time. Mayuresh questioned if percent travel time increase without consideration of absolute times should be the basis for improvements. Sarah said the Newark TID is DelDOT's first using travel time so there is no precedent but it makes sense to consider both percentile and absolute change in travel time. Joe thought the analyses should also include level of service (LOS). Sarah said LOS information could be displayed on a map and said DelDOT considered anything over 90 seconds of delay as "excessive". Alan asked how one-off situations like a temporary lane closure would affect the analyses. Sarah said temporary impacts are not factored in.

- Joe said he thought more variables should be included in the decision-making process and not just reliance on a 10% increase in travel time. He asked the basis for selecting the 10% threshold. Sarah said the 10% was based on the amount of development proposed and is DelDOT's "educated guess" on what is most appropriate. Mayuresh asked if the 10% threshold should be applied to entire length of the segments or both to segments and links as a link could show a change prompting improvement needs but the overall segment may not. Joe thought segment criteria would be appropriate. Jim agreed. Heather suggested that the entire segment length may be divided into two or three sections based on the length of the segment to undertake meaningful analysis for change in travel time. Sarah said she would like to continue this discussion at the August meeting. Heather also suggested that mapping would help.
- David Athey discussed the public meeting is still planned for the fall and whether it could be done in-person, would need to be done virtually, or if a combination of the two should be planned. Sarah described recent virtual open houses DelDOT has hosted for their Five Points project and how surveys for public input were successfully posted online. Mary Ellen Gray said the City was still in Phase II meaning no in-person meetings were allowed. At this time the Committee should plan for a virtual meeting with an optional in-person backup. David asked about the University's plans and whether that would impact how and when the meeting was held. Caitlin Olsen said the University is planning for a hybrid approach to reopening in the fall and a September meeting would be OK.
- There were no public comments.
- The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.