



**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

Newark Transportation Improvement District Committee Meeting

Date/Time: Wednesday, August 10, 2022, 1:30 p.m.

Location: Hybrid Meeting – City Hall Council Chambers and Virtual via Teams

Attendees

<u>Committee Members</u>	
Newark Planning and Development	Renee Bensley
Newark Planning and Development	Mike Fortner, AICP
DeIDOT	Sarah Coakley, AICP
WILMAPCO	Heather Dunigan
Newark Design Committee	Joe Charma, PE
District 5 Representative	Jim Jones
<u>Other Attendees</u>	
Newark Planning and Development	Renee Bensley
Newark Planning and Development	Josh Solge
Newark Public Works and Water Resources	Mike Falkowski, PE
Newark Planning and Development	Katelyn Dinsmore
Newark Planning and Development	John Kennel
University of Delaware	Robert Mullen
University of Delaware	Caitlin Olsen
<u>Committee Support</u>	
AECOM	Mayuresh Khare, PE, AICP, PP
AECOM	Kelly Offner

Meeting Minutes

- The meeting started at 1:34 pm. Attendees present at City Hall introduced themselves. Mayuresh Khare (AECOM) read the names of the virtual attendees.
- Minutes from the June 8, 2022 meeting were approved without exception.
- Sarah Coakley began her presentation on DeIDOT projects and cost estimates with details on the pedestrian and bicycle improvement options for a Kensington Lane crossing (reference plans area "C") near S Chapel Street. Three options were presented that enable pedestrians to easily cross and get to the pathway on other side of the road, a mid-block crossing with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons north of Kensington Lane. Sarah reviewed the three options presented in the plans (1 standard crossing, 2 two-stage crossings). The costs for each alternative are all within a few thousand dollars of each other. The options will be presented as part of a public workshop that seeks feedback on the alternatives. Mayuresh and Sarah open the floor to feedback or questions from the Committee. Joe Charma favored the divided crosswalk scenario. Jim Jones preferred the split

crossing. Jim Jones asked about the type of curbs along the concrete median. Sarah responded that it will have vertical curbs. The Committee favored the split crossing that was shown.

- Sarah reviewed a list of DTC transit projects needing funding that are within the TID boundary, including 12 bus pads, three bus shelter pads, 3 bus shelter (see below) with total costs at \$319,000. She noted that there are increases of about 10%, on average, for construction cost estimates older than three months. TID improvement costs will rise just slightly to \$56.4M. Sarah presented a list of recommended TID improvement projects. DelDOT doesn't see the need to remove any identified improvements. Discussion regarding fundability of Paper Mill and Possum Park Roads ensued. Mayuresh commented that land use summaries, participant boundary, and facilities boundary are important for everyone to revisit, since these elements are linked with the identified improvements and fee determination. Sarah and Mayuresh asked for the Committee's questions in relation these elements. Renee Bensley commented that the area of Paper Mill and Possum Park Roads is in Planning Area 7, which Council formally adopted in the new five-year update to the Comprehensive Development Plan, and so it belongs in the TID. Mike Falkowski commented that there was a small subdivision approved in Planning Area 7 that would benefit from a pedestrian crossing. Sarah said that adding that intersection, at Paper Mill and Possum Park Roads, does not impact TID fees much.
- Sarah presented information about the current fee and zoning structures and multiple fee options for TID. DTC was not comfortable with a blanket percentage for transit improvements and provided detailed improvement list identified in the above bullet. Generally, the future development component of the TID costs should fall somewhere between 20-30%. The fees don't cover entrances to private developments, but cover identified improvements like lane widening, sidewalks, and adding turn lanes nearby. Renee Bensley asked if fee calculation was based on new use or old use, and if new use receives any credit for the previous use of the parcel. Sarah said that credit is applied for the old use when considering trip generation related to new use. Joe asked about the 20% TID fee component. Sarah replied that the fees assume that future development will be paying a minimum 20% of improvements and DelDOT will pay 80%. Jim Jones asked if proposed fee percentages consider potential impact on ability to obtain grants for projects from entities, such as matching funds. Sarah responded that most DelDOT projects are federally funded and the federal funding covers up to 80% of the project costs.
- Mayuresh Khare asked whether the improvement costs shown are in current dollars or if they have been adjusted to inflation. Sarah explained that the CPI goes up every year and fees are adjusted based on that. She also mentioned that with some other TIDs fees aren't keeping up with inflation. Sarah recommended that an escalation clause is added to cover the discrepancy in fees. Committee will discuss this increase structure at their next meeting.
- Sarah continued her presentation on the TID fee structures and noted that the increases will only apply to new developments/redevelopments. Mayuresh asked about the fee decider factors between residential and nonresidential developments. Sarah responded that residential development usually has a higher fee ratio, versus commercial. Sarah would like to receive more feedback on this from the City of Newark stakeholders. A balance should be struck between collecting fees to provide for improvements and encouraging investment/developments in the City. Renee and Sarah discussed how development overbuilds for parking are assessed. Sarah noted that the underlying uses of the development must be looked at to determining the fee but, generally, the fee is determined based on the proposed use that is shared prior to receiving the building permit. Mike Falkowski asked if existing single family residential lots pay into the TID. Sarah replied that individual existing single-family lots are not required to participate. It is land development applications, such as subdivisions, or site plans for non-residential, that trigger the requirement to participate. Only a building permit for an existing lot would not trigger TID participation. Renee noted that the threshold for intensity of building should be examined, especially as it pertains to repurposing single family for multi-tenant housing. Joe Charma added that parking lots don't inherently generate traffic, but the nearby uses that necessitate parking generate the traffic. Jim Jones agrees with Joe's comment. Sarah will check the ITE manual for the categorization of parking facilities.
- The Committee discussed the projects outside of TID participant boundary, including Paper Mill Road and Possum Park Road, White Clay Creek, and State Routes 4 and 72. Sarah continues with presentation of funding to cover projects inside and outside participant boundary and reviewed seven fee structure options, which calculate rates and incurred costs/payments for a range of 20-30% fee. Renee suggested presenting a split option (different percentages for projects inside vs outside the participant boundary) to Council. Mike Fortner and Joe Charma discuss the differences in fee

percentages, and the implications for developments. Sarah offered examples to the Committee and showed the Easttown and Henlopen TID schedule. Renee and others commented that Newark is unique in that there are few to no single-family developments being submitted. Question is whether multifamily developments are carrying correct fee rate.

- Renee asked how the Chrysler plant interfaces with the TID rates. Sarah responded that Chrysler is “grandfathered” for about 14,000 trips and will not pay into the TID until they exceed that limit. The STAR Campus is under the same fee structure. Renee asked if Committee was counting STAR Campus developments for fee credits. Sarah replied that the entire campus receives fee credits for the grandfathered component.
- Jim Jones returned to discussion of rate options and discussion of 30% rate cap. Jim moved that Committee recommend to council two preferred options, 1) Option 3 with 25% flat cost of future projects, and 2) Modified Option 7 split that covers 30% inside the participant boundary and 20% outside the participant boundary and support a third option as a back-up, similar to the modified option 7 split but with it covering 25% inside the participant boundary and 20% outside the participant boundary. Joe Charma seconded.
- Mayuresh prompted the group for next steps with Council and the Planning Commission. Sarah responded that the September committee meeting will be used to discuss recommendations for monitoring programs, outreach at Newark Community Day in mid-September, the joint public workshop in October or November, and then present to City Council for their modified TID agreement recommendation in the budget. Jim Jones asked about the Newark Community Day and public outreach. Sarah said that they will reuse boards from last year and request help at the Community Day table.
- Mayuresh suggested the Committee prepare for September outreach prior to the next meeting and requested who will be able to help for the Community Day.
- Sarah thanked the Committee for their ongoing cooperation and support.
- There were no public comments.
- The meeting adjourned at 2:58 pm.