

WILMAPCO Council:

MEMORANDUM

John Sisson, Chair
*Delaware Transit Corporation
Chief Executive Officer*

Bill Miners, Vice-Chair
*Chesapeake City
Councilman*

Jennifer Cohan
*Delaware Dept. of Transportation
Secretary*

Thomas P. Gordon
New Castle County Executive

Connie C. Holland
*Delaware Office of State Planning
Coordination, Director*

Tari Moore
Cecil County Executive

Heather Murphy
*Maryland Dept. of Transportation
Director, Office of Planning and
Capital Programming*

Michael Spencer
Mayor of Newport

Dennis P. Williams
Mayor of Wilmington

WILMAPCO Executive Director
Tigist Zegeye

To: Members of WILMAPCO's Air Quality Subcommittee (AQS)
From: Bill Swiatek, Senior Planner
Date: March 4, 2016
Re: **Air Quality Subcommittee Meeting**
Date: Thursday, March 10, 2016
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: WILMAPCO
Teleconference: Dial: 888 – 204 – 5984; access code: 1716749

A G E N D A

- 1. Acceptance of the notes from the December 17 meeting**
- 2. Air Quality Portion of the Project Prioritization Process – *B. Swiatek***
The AQS will score a pair of projects with the current scoring system, and finalize revisions to the air quality portion of the updated project prioritization process.
- 3. FAST Act Update– *M. Dixon***
FHWA will provide a summary of the FAST Act and changes to air quality planning and programming.
 - **Fact sheet:** <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/cmaqfs.cfm>
- 4. Ozone Standard– *G Becoat***
EPA will provide an update on new and upcoming federal standards.
- 5. Air Quality Outreach– *R. Novakoff***
The AQS will receive an update on the activities of the Air Quality Partnership of Delaware.
- 6. Other**

**JOINT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) &
AIR QUALITY SUBCOMMITTEE (AQS) MEETING
December 17, 2015**

A meeting of the Joint Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Air Quality Subcommittee (AQS) was held on Thursday, December 17, 2015, at WILMAPCO, 850 Library Avenue, Suite 100, Newark, DE 19711.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Ms. Gwinneth Kaminsky, TAC chairperson, brought the TAC meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. TAC Members present:

Ian Beam, Maryland Department of Transportation
 Dave Blankenship, City of Wilmington Department of Public Works
 Marco Boyce, New Castle County Department of Land Use
 Alex Brun, Maryland Department of the Environment (via conference call)
 David Dahlstrom, Maryland Department of Planning
 Anthony Di Giacomo, Cecil County Office of Planning & Zoning
 Mike Fortner, City of Newark
 Valerie Gray, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
 Herb Inden, Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination
 Gwinneth Kaminsky, City of Wilmington Department of Planning
 Jeanne Minner, Town of Elkton
 Catherine Smith, Delaware Transit Corporation
 Timothy Snow, Delaware Department of Transportation
 Peter Sotherland, Maryland State Highway Administration

AQS Members Present

Kevin Black, Federal Highway Administration (via conference call)
 Marco Boyce, New Castle County Department of Land Use
 Deanna Cuccinello, DNREC (via conference call)
 Anthony DiGiacomo, Cecil County Office of Planning & Zoning
 Jay Gerner, DelDOT
 Valerie Gray, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
 Jolyon Shelton, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
 Catherine Smith, Delaware Transit Corporation
 Timothy Snow, Delaware Department of Transportation

TAC Members absent:

Delaware Economic Development Office
 Delaware River and Bay Authority
 Maryland Transit Administration

TAC Ex-Officio Members absent:

Amtrak
 Diamond State Port Corporation
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Federal Highway Administration
U.S. Federal Transit Administration

Guests and Invitees:

None.

Staff:

Dan Blevins, Principal Planner
Janet Butler, Administrative Assistant
Sharen Elcock, Executive Assistant
Dave Gula, Principal Planner
Randi Novakoff, Outreach Manager
Bill Swiatek, Senior Planner
Jacob Thompson, Transportation Planner
Tigist Zegeye, Executive Director

Minutes prepared by: Janet Butler

3. MINUTES

ACTION: On motion by Mr. DiGiacomo and seconded by Ms. Smith the TAC approved the November 19, 2015 minutes.

Motion passed.

(12-17-15 - 01)

Abstentions: 1) Jeanne Minner, 2) Herb Inden, and 3) Dave Dahlstrom, who did not attend the TAC meeting on November 19, 2015.

The Air Quality Subcommittee minutes dated August 13, 2015, were approved by consensus.

4. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES:

a. Data and Demographics Subcommittee (DDS)

Mr. Blevins said the DDS met on Monday, December 14, 2015. They discussed the Cecil County, Maryland Functional Classification Update and the new web portal. Mr. Sotherland said he will give a presentation to DDS on the Maryland Functional Classification Update at a later date. They also discussed updates to the 2015 TAZ Projection Series.

b. Congestion Management Subcommittee (CMS)

Mr. Blevins said the CMS met on Thursday, December 10, 2015, and discussed selecting corridors for consideration for signal retiming. Mr. Blevins distributed the Signal Re-Timing Candidate Corridor Priorities and Draft Signal Improvement Corridors maps (**Attachment A**). He added 35 Bluetooth devices remain to be installed and the subcommittee is working to select locations. Mr. Blevins announced Mr. Vic Singer, New Castle County Civic League, is a new member of the CMS and he is a retired

rocket scientist. He wants to learn about new technologies and will be looking at reshaping policy on how New Castle County does traffic impact studies including Level of Service (LOS).

5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

None.

ACTION ITEMS:

6. To Recommend Release of the Draft FY 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program for Public Comment

Mr. Swiatek said the packet contains the following documents: 1) TIP Quick Guide and 2) the FY 2017-2020 TIP spreadsheet. On the spreadsheet, the columns show the funding by year. On the right it shows the differences between the FY 2017-2020 TIP and FY 2016-2019 TIP.

From the Air Quality (AQ) perspective, we looked at what was modeled and reviewed if there are any new projects to be modeled. There were none. Staff also assessed if any in-service horizon years have changed, and they have not. Since there are no concerns that projects will come in constructed before or after what was already expected, we can rely on our previous AQ conformity analysis. A memo will be completed to document this information.

The TIP Quick Guide indicates there is \$2.2 billion funding, and there is 3% more funding since the September 2015 version of the TIP. There is also a list of projects that were removed, including some with funding changes and scope such as the Boyds Corner Park and Ride, SR 896 Bethel-Church Road Interchange; bridge projects that were completed; and Cavalier's mitigation. The rest of the TIP Quick Guide includes a map, and provides an overview of how it is funded, where the projects are located, and lists of project types, by mode and category.

The public comment period is expected to be January 18, 2016 - March 2, 2016. A joint public workshop with DelDOT will be held on February 24, 2016, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., at the Newark Free Library. Public outreach methods will include the E-news, Transporter, Facebook, press release, legal ads in the Cecil Whig and News Journal newspapers, News Journal e-mail blast, and radio spot. There will also be an interactive map on the WILMAPCO website, TIP spreadsheet, TIP Guide, and TIP Flyer. The TIP flyer will also be e-mailed to the TAC. On January 14, 2015, the FY 2017-2020 TIP will go before the Council to be released for public comment. Mr. Swiatek said we welcome TAC's and AQS' help in promoting the TIP workshop and the public comment period.

Mr. Dahlstrom said he doesn't see the corresponding amount in the TIP spreadsheet of the \$2.2 billion mentioned in the TIP Quick Guide. Mr. Swiatek said it is found at the bottom of the chart, and it states more than \$2.186 billion. It was agreed to change the text from "more than" to "about." Mr. Dahlstrom asked if the percentages are referring to the dollar amount or percentages on the pie chart. Ms. Zegeye replied they are referring to the dollar amount by category.

ACTION: On motion by Mr. Dahlstrom and seconded by Mr. Fortner the TAC released the Draft FY 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program for Public Comment.

Motion passed.

(12-17-15 - 02)

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

7. SR 141 Land Use and Transportation Plan

Mr. Blevins said Route 141 is a major arterial that links the City of New Castle to Route 202/I-95. It functions as a western beltway of Wilmington serving local and regional trips. The SR 141 Land Use and Transportation Plan will focus on the section between SR 2/Kirkwood Highway and US 202/Concord Pike.

The second information session was held on October 20, 2015, and approximately 55 people attended. The purpose was to inform the public and listen to their suggestions and concerns. Discussions centered on existing transportation conditions, potential development, the draft vision and goals, and how land use might be organized. For instance, development of town centers, village centers, corporate campuses, and institutional campuses.

Mr. Blevins said DelDOT and Transportation Management Center (TMC) are working on signal-retiming. We were able to use the Bluetooth data, which can show how the technology can make improvements to the corridor. The immediate feedback indicated a minute and a half of reductions northbound and southbound has also improved.

Citizens are generally skeptical about big box development. Public comments revealed travel along the corridor is generally good; however the exception is the Tyler McConnell Bridge and the Du Pont Experimental Station light at the bridge exit. The consensus was that this plan would cause unchecked redevelopment and crowding along the Route 141 corridor surrounding the Barley Mill Plaza.

Next steps for the third public meeting are: 1) Compile comments; 2) Present refined vision and goals; 3) Convey this will be the final portion of the study for now; and 4) Convey there is little desire to move the project into the next phase of the project, which would include testing alternatives, development of the preferred approach, and developing a corridor monitoring/plan implementation process.

Mr. DiGiacomo asked with recent DuPont and Astra Zeneca developments, is there any projected demand for the future. Mr. Blevins replied yes; however, citizens are worried about growth and have had discussions about Barley Mill, Astra Zeneca, and the golf course. Mr. Blankenship commented that he found it interesting that data says only 4% of the vehicles traversed from one end to the other; and 96% view it not as a bypass road, but, as part of the grid.

Ms. Zegeye responded we met with representatives of several civic associations who are against development and we have listened to their concerns. They want to leave the

corridor the way it is now. Ms. Kaminsky asked how to handle the resistance to the project. Mr. Boyce said we need to attend more of their meetings because there is only a small group of people who come to those meetings and counter the plans, which holds up projects and the Unified Development Code (UDC) development. Ms. Zegeye responded we will document the goals and visions for the corridor and we hope the project will be picked up at a later date as part of next steps.

8. Public Opinion Survey

Ms. Novakoff distributed the WILMAPCO Public Opinion Survey of Cecil County Residents, Summary of Results, September 2015 (**Attachment B**). She said the Public Opinion Survey is conducted every year in Cecil County and every four years in New Castle County. Five thousand-three hundred calls were made to get the six hundred Cecil County randomly selected residents' responses. Demographic quotas were added this year for race and educational attainment levels so that our demographics more closely match those of the county. The survey is about 12 minutes long and there was an 11% response rate.

Eighty percent of Cecil County residents said the current transportation system meets their needs, which is the highest number we had for this question. About 50% said the condition of the roads and highways are "excellent" or "good," which is down from previous years. In addition, residents were asked to rate the job government agencies are doing with making improvements, and 43% said they noticed some improvements.

Employed respondents were asked how often they experienced traffic congestion during their work commute. Twenty-two percent reported they were regularly in traffic congestion, which was similar to the proportion of residents in 2014 and 2013; however, in 2012 it was slightly lower at 17%. About 52% indicated that their commute time would not change if there was no congestion, which was lower compared to 2013, but, similar to 2012 and 2011.

In general, Cecil County residents do not feel they have a lot of transportation options. In 2015, 72% reported they had "few options." This proportion was similar to 2014 and 2013. Respondents' assessment of the job the government had done improving accessibility to alternative modes of transportation was similar in 2015 compared to 2013, with three quarters (76%) of respondents saying that government agencies were doing a "fair" or "poor" job.

As in previous years, approximately 60% of respondents reported "always" or "usually" drive alone. Overall, the trend since 2007 has seen a slight decline in dependence on drive alone trips. Eighty-eight percent of employed residents report they usually drive alone for their work commute.

The proportion of respondents providing negative ratings to public transportation in Cecil County has been going down since the survey began. In 2015, 63% gave a "fair" or "poor" rating, which was less than last year (69%). When asked whether or not the

mass transit system had gotten better, 9% per cent said it deteriorated, 36% said it had improved, which represented an increase compared to previous years.

When asked how they would rate opportunities to participate in transportation planning, most respondents considered their opportunities to be “fair” or “poor.” However, there was no clear consensus on the preferred way to communicate with planners. About 30% of respondents preferred using the website; 30% preferred public meetings; 30% preferred surveys; and 15% preferred the telephone, with 1% saying “all of the above.”

Although the ratings of opportunities to participate in transportation planning were low, about 27% said they are familiar with WILMAPCO, which is consistent with previous years; however, there was a spike in our Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) years because of the increased volume of meetings and public presentations staff provides. Of those completing the survey, 40% said they were interested in receiving free newsletters or public meeting announcements from WILMAPCO regarding future transportation plans in their area.

Regarding demographics, our survey results compared to the American Community Survey (ACS) results showed we had more white participants. We also had to relax the Hispanic and educational attainment demographics because we were running out of survey samples. However age and location were very close to the ACS.

Mr. DiGiacomo asked if WILMAPCO compares the Cecil County results with the New Castle County results. Ms. Novakoff responded these are two different surveys, and some of the questions are the same, but, the questions aren’t asked in the same order, which makes a difference.

Regarding the question on familiarity with WILMAPCO, Mr. Blankenship said it may be helpful to find out how WILMAPCO’s results compare with other MPOs’ outreach results.

9. Wilmington Transit Moving Forward (WTMF)

Mr. Gula said Phase I of the WTMF Report was completed in August, 2014. For Phase II, the Project Management Committee (PMC) met five times in 2015, and the Transit Operational Analysis Subcommittee met twice. The Advisory Group’s (AG) first meeting was on November 18, 2015.

Mr. Gula stated that DTC has been a partner in this project and has utilized the Principles from the WTMF Report as guidance to develop service change proposals. The January 2015 Delaware Transit Corporation (DTC) Service Change Highlights include improved access to employment; additional services such as on Sundays; increased frequencies; direct service connections for local communities; improved scheduling efficiencies; improved service reliability; improved mobility; and enhanced schedule coordination.

The May 2015 Service Change Highlights include extending Route 8 to Southbridge along Heald and A Streets; more direct service between Wilmington and Newark on Route 31; and continued service and schedule adjustments to support WTMF short-term recommendations.

The January 2016 Service Proposal includes continued implementation of short-term improvements such as serving new markets, direct service connection for local communities, increased frequencies, improved service reliability, and improved mobility.

The Transit Operational Analysis and Support Task Order assists in implementation of the short-term and mid-term opportunities identified in WTMF August 2014 (Phase I); and transit service recommendations identified in the New Castle County Transit Origin/Destination Study (O-D Study) data.

The O/D study data indicates that the primary points of Origin and Destination for commuters in NCC is Downtown Wilmington. The U.S. Census LEHD Jobs by Block data shows the Downtown area containing 31,394 jobs; the O/D data contains 740 origin /746 destination points, segmented into North: 1,394 jobs with 17 origin/16 destination; Central: 17,300 jobs with 41 origin/442 destination; and South: 7,061 jobs with 193 origin/207 destination.

The Origin/Destination Study included average weekday ridership estimates and estimated weekday transfers by location. Additional analysis in Phase II includes route and segment performance criteria for all transit routes: peak headway; weekly riders; riders per rev. hr.; and high ridership segments.

A study by the Mission Group shows that trips outside the immediate stop areas on Light Rail Transit (LRT) and most Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) require multiple transfers to complete the trip. By allowing local bus routes to share the BRT corridor, more trips can be accomplished without a transfer and most trips only require one transfer. In Wilmington on Fourth Street, there are multiple locations for these transfer stations, including Walnut, King, Market, Orange, Washington, Adams/Jackson, and Lincoln/Union. DTC encourages transfers along the Fourth Street corridor.

The Comprehensive Operations Analysis next steps include: 1) Opportunity for transfers (move route to Fourth Street, east and west); 2) Environment for transfers for frequent services and enhanced passenger amenities; and 3) Develop corridor plans. In addition, the existing one-way street pattern funnels bus routes to Rodney Square; and traffic model evaluation is underway to determine impacts resulting from conversion of one-way streets to two-way streets.

Nineteen Guiding Principles were developed in the WTMF Phase I Report. Principle #15 includes identifying streets in Wilmington where transit service and amenities could be emphasized. These could be streets that already include a significant amount of bus service or streets on which additional bus service could be added, such as 11th and 12th

streets; Orange Street; Fourth Street; Walnut Street; King Street; Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd/Front Street; and French Street.

In addition, Principle #16 includes identifying multiple transit locations within the City of Wilmington that build upon existing Origin/Destination data. Transit infrastructure features include improvements to the roadway, (improved corridor to support pedestrian/bike/auto and bus, bus only lanes, shared bus/bike lanes, exclusive transit corridor, and queue jumps/signals) and enhanced passenger amenities, including shelters, signage, corridor branding, and passenger information/technology. These recommendations should be improvements which are implementable.

A prototype bus stop will be developed for deployment within the downtown area. The components include variably sized shelters with coverage on three sides, with advertising or transit information panels on the back and downstream sides; strong durability; shaded roofs; benches with center rail; real time LED display; LED lighting, a linear panel of bus stop ID and routes; separate kiosk for local information; bike rack, trash cans; security features; and shelter pad enhancements. The plans and discussions indicate the following priority transit corridors/locations: Fourth Street Courthouse Stop; Amtrak Station; and Market Street and Rosa Parks Drive (B&O Stop).

The projected timeline for WTMF includes an anticipated 9-10 month schedule, including the milestone TIGER grant consideration in spring 2016; Two Advisory Group Meetings; and a Public workshop to be held in spring 2016.

Mr. DiGiacomo said he is gratified to see that Delaware Avenue, Baynard Boulevard, and Washington Street bus routes will be going onto Market Street. Previously, the Wilmington Transit Mall was changed into a pedestrian mall. He added there used to be large retail stores that thrived such as Woolworth's, W.T. Grant's, and Kresge's because Market Street worked well as a bus transfer point. Ms. Smith said there is an economic factor because every rider is a pedestrian. Increased ridership is found around the bus hub; and when DART pulled the bus hub from 9th Street, fewer businesses were located there.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

10. Staff Report

- Staff participated in the Claymont Elementary School Walking Audit on November 30, 2015.
- Staff attended a Kick-off meeting to form a network of agencies and coalitions involved with community development, which is a statewide initiative.
- Staff participated in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) Air Quality Working Group meeting from December 14-15, 2015.
- Staff participated in the Southbridge Streetscape Phase II Concept Planning meeting.
- Staff attended the Delmarva Freight and Goods Task Force meeting in Dover on December 15, 2015.
- Staff attended the

- December 16, 2015 Stubbs Elementary School Safe Routes to School (SRTS) meeting.
- Staff helped to coordinate outreach for Cleveland Avenue multi-modal improvement study with Newark, NAACP, Newark Bike Committee, and City of Newark staff.
- Staff attended the North Claymont Master Plan kick-off meeting on December 8, 2015, and will participate in the public workshop on February 3, 2016, at Archmere Academy.
- Design Collective was chosen as the consultant for Route 9 Corridor Master Plan.
- The Newark Regional Transportation Center (NRTC) project is moving forward.
- The Walnut Street Improvement Study is wrapping up.
- Staff is waiting for modeling results from DelDOT Planning for the Glasgow Avenue Planning Study, and expects to hold a public workshop in early 2016.
- Jacob Thompson is the new WILMAPCO Transportation Planner. He has a master of environmental studies degree from the University of Pennsylvania, with a concentration in urban studies, and a bachelor's degree in geology from West Chester University.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Attachments (2)



PROJECT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

WILMAPCO has created a Prioritization process to evaluate transportation projects using measurable criteria based on the goals of our long-range plan. It provides a quantitative method to compare projects proposed for our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

STEP 1: Apply screening criteria

- Is project consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and local, county and state transportation plans and land use plans?
- If not, project should not be ranked or plan amendments should be made prior to ranking.

STEP 2: Staff calculates technical score

- Using available technical data, WILMAPCO Staff calculates a technical score for each project based on the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan.
- Each goal has a similar point value, with the maximum for each project of 33 points.

STEP 3: WILMAPCO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviews technical scoring for accuracy and proposes ranking considering:

- Technical score developed by staff
- Urgency of project
- Cost effectiveness/ life cycle costs
- Private/local funding match provided
- Project recommended in adopted transportation plan
- Submitting agency rankings by ensuring that top local priorities receive higher WILMAPCO ranking than lower local priorities
- Other issues not included in ranking
- Additional "special considerations" to break ties and serve as a reality check

STEP 4: WILMAPCO Council ranks submissions

Council ranks submissions considering:

- Technical score developed by staff and reviewed by TAC
- TAC proposed ranking
- Urgency of project
- Cost effectiveness/ life cycle costs
- Private/local funding match provided
- Project recommended in adopted transportation plan
- Submitting agency rankings by ensuring that top local priorities receive higher WILMAPCO ranking than lower local priorities
- Other issues not included in ranking
- Additional "special considerations" to break ties and serve as a reality check

DRAFT

**Comparison of approved process
with potential changes for
discussion**

Goal 1: Improve Quality of Life

(Max. 10 points)

- **Protect the public health, safety and welfare**
- **Preserve our natural, historic and cultural resources**
- **Support existing municipalities and communities**
- **Provide transportation opportunity and choice**

Criteria:

Air Quality – Project expected to improve air quality by:

- reducing emissions
 - reducing VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled)
 - not adding capacity
 - increasing access to non-auto modes
- 3 Project expected to substantially improve air quality (all four bullets apply)
 1 Project expected to slightly improve air quality (2-3 bullets)
 0 No expected air quality impact (does not add capacity)
 -3 Negative air quality impact expected

Environmental Justice– Project enhances environment in locations with a high percentage of low-income and/or minority residents. Supportive projects reduce risk of accidents, and/or enhance neighborhoods. Negative impacts include increased accident risk for vehicular and/or non-motorized traffic, displacement of homes or businesses, and/or increased traffic through neighborhoods.

- 3 Project supports environmental justice in area with high low-income or minority population
 1 Project supports environmental justice in area with above average low-income or minority population
 0 Project does not impact environmental justice
 -1 Project negatively impacts area with above average low-income or minority population
 -3 Project negatively impacts area with high low-income or minority population

Safety – An “aggregate” scoring system combines the absolute number of accidents and the rate at which accidents occur per 1 million miles of VMT to be used. Scoring is based on a 4-point maximum scale with 4 being the highest priority and zero being the lowest. Points are assigned based on the following:

| Crash rate per 1 million miles VMT (past 5 years) | | Total number of crashes (past 5 years) | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| 2 | Greater than 3 times the County average | 2 | 200+ accidents |
| 1 | 2 to 3 times County average | 1 | 100-200 accidents |
| 0 | At or below the County average | 0 | Less than 100 accidents |

GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

- 6 – 10 points

Criteria:

- Protect public health and safety
- Promote active transportation
- Preserve natural and cultural resources
- Ensure transportation choice and equity

AIR QUALITY Expected to impact air quality, based on project types:

| | | |
|-----------|--|--------------|
| 3 | Project expected to moderately or significantly improve air quality. Project types include: a. fixed-route bus and train service expansions b. public transit technology improvements c. major non-recreational nonmotorized system expansion (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity) d. diesel engine replacements e. alternative fueling stations f. park-and-ride lot expansions g. carpooling schemes | DRAFT |
| 1 | Project expected to slightly improve air quality. Project types include: a. fixed-route bus and train service replacements b. minor non-recreational nonmotorized system expansions (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity) c. major non-recreational nonmotorized system maintenance (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity) | |
| 0 | Project not expected to impact air quality. Project types include: a. roadway projects which do not add capacity b. park-and-ride lot maintenance c. rail preservation d. paratransit expansion and maintenance e. recreational nonmotorized system expansion/maintenance f. minor non-recreational nonmotorized system maintenance (not tied to a roadway project which would increase vehicle capacity) | |
| -1 | Project expected to slightly worsen air quality. Project types include: a. roadway projects which add capacity but are non-regionally significant, including those with a non-recreational nonmotorized system expansion component | |
| -3 | Project expected to moderately or significantly worsen air quality. Project types include: a. roadway projects which add capacity and are regionally significant, including those with a non-recreational nonmotorized system expansion component | |

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE Project enhances environment in locations with a high percentage of low-income and/or minority residents. Supportive projects reduce risk of accidents, and/or enhance neighborhoods. Negative impacts include increased accident risk for vehicular and/or non-motorized traffic, displacement of homes or businesses, and/or increased traffic through neighborhoods.

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 3 | Project supports environmental justice in area with high low-income or minority population |
| 1 | Project supports environmental justice in area with above average low-income or minority population |
| 0 | Project does not impact environmental justice |
| -1 | Project negatively impacts area with above average low-income or minority population |
| -3 | Project negatively impacts area with high low-income or minority population |

SAFETY Intersections scored using a composite of average annual crash frequency, manner of impact (i.e. Head-on, sideswipe, etc.), and severity (fatality, injury, property damage, etc.). Analysis includes a 3-year average of crashes at signalized and non-signalized intersections that average 10 or more crashes per year. Score is based on the highest scoring intersection within the project limits.

| | |
|----------|---------------------------|
| 4 | 20% highest crash scores |
| 3 | 20-40% worst crash scores |
| 2 | 40-60% worst crash scores |
| 1 | 60-80% worst crash scores |
| 0 | 20% lowest crash scores |

DRAFT

Goal 2: Efficiently Transport People

(Max. 12 points)

- Improve transportation system performance
- Promote accessibility, mobility and transportation alternatives

Criteria:

Congestion Management System – Corridor improvement recommended in CMS or location with Level of Service (LOS) E or F

If recommended in CMS or LOS E/F*:

- 2 Project within a CMS corridor identified by the CMS Subcommittee
- 1 Road segment with LOS E or F but outside of identified CMS corridors

* If project meets the above CMS criteria, then the following two criteria will be calculated in addition to the points awarded above.

| Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) | | Transit Usage—Transit Load Factor by segment based on the average # of riders vs. # of available seats. | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| + | 4 Greater than 60,000 AADT | + | 3 Greater than 35% capacity |
| | 3 40,000 – 60,000 AADT | | 2 25 – 35% capacity |
| | 2 20,000 – 40,000 AADT | | 1 15 – 25% capacity |
| | 0 Less than 20,000 AADT | | 0 Less than 15% capacity |

Transportation Justice – Use percentage of zero-car households, elderly & persons with disabilities instead of low-income/minority (thresholds as determined by EJ report, Phase II), identify projects that support non-motorized or transit alternatives.

- 3 Supportive project within an area of high concentrations of mobility-constrained populations
- 1 Supportive project within an area of moderate concentrations of mobility-constrained populations
- 0 Does not improve mobility or ease access to transportation choices

GOAL: EFFICIENTLY TRANSPORT PEOPLE

0 – 15 points

Criteria:

- Improve system performance
- Promote accessibility and connectivity
- Engage the public via an open involvement process

CONGESTION Corridor improvement recommended in Congestion Management System (CMS) or location with level of service (LOS) E or F. If recommended in CMS or LOS E/F*:

| | |
|----------|--|
| 2 | Project within a CMS corridor identified by the CMS Subcommittee |
| 1 | Road segment with LOS E or F but outside of identified CMS corridors |
| 0 | Road segment is neither in CMS nor LOS E or F |

*If project meets the above CMS criteria, then the following two criteria will be calculated in addition to the points awarded above.

| Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) | | Transit Usage—Transit Load Factor by segment based on average # of riders vs. # of available seats. | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| + | 4 | Greater than 60,000 AADT | + |
| | 3 | 40,000 – 60,000 AADT | |
| | 2 | 20,000 – 40,000 AADT | |
| | 0 | Less than 20,000 AADT | |
| | | | |
| | 3 | Greater than 35% capacity | |
| | 2 | 25 – 35% capacity | |
| | 1 | 15 – 25% capacity | |
| | 0 | Less than 15% capacity | |

TRANSPORTATION JUSTICE Use percentage of zero-car households, elderly & persons with disabilities instead of low-income/minority (thresholds as determined by EJ report, phase ii), identify projects that support non-motorized or transit alternatives.

| | |
|----------|--|
| 3 | Supportive project within an area of high concentrations of mobility-constrained populations |
| 1 | Supportive project within an area of moderate concentrations of mobility-constrained populations |
| 0 | Does not improve mobility or ease access to transportation choices |

PEDESTRIAN PRIORITY Project supports pedestrian and bicycle improvement based on pedestrian priority area scoring. Scores are based upon the highest pedestrian network score in which the project passes.

| | |
|----------|---|
| 3 | Top 90th percentile of pedestrian network scores |
| 1 | Top 70 th – 90th percentile of pedestrian network scores |
| 0 | Bottom 70th percentile of pedestrian network scores |

DRAFT

GOAL 3: Support Economic Activity and Growth

(Max 11 pts.)

- Ensure a predictable public investment program to guide private sector investment decisions
- Plan and invest to promote the attractiveness of the region

Criteria:

Freight – Scores using the three-tiered scoring defined in the WILMAPCO Freight & Goods Movement Analysis. Bottlenecks are identified using high truck trip generating traffic zones, areas of high truck crash frequencies and travel time delays which hamper the efficient movement of truck traffic which can effect economic growth and competitiveness.

- 4 “Significant Bottleneck” – Refers to segments with multiple failing criteria, and generally includes roadways which carry the highest traffic volumes and experience heaviest congestion.
- 3 “Moderate Bottleneck” – Refers to segments that are experiencing some failing, or nearly failing, criteria. There is more variation in scoring across the criteria, with some criteria demonstrating failure and others at more modest levels.
- 2 “Minor Bottleneck” – Refers to segments that experience one or more criteria that are near failing. While most have only a few criteria showing near failure, others are at acceptable levels.
- 0 All other road segments

Support of Economic Development Initiatives – Projects that support economic development initiatives. Those include adding or improving access to brownfield locations; an existing or planned site used for employment, tourism, manufacturing, commercial or industrial purposes; or addresses an issue identified through regional economic development planning.

- For New Castle County, use DE Office of State Planning Policies and Spending map. Areas are defined as follows:
 - Investment Level 1: Dense areas within municipalities, urban places, high density areas and areas with infrastructure and services (i.e. sewer, water, transit, etc...).
 - Investment Level 2: Less developed municipal areas or fast-growing areas. Also identifies areas in which full services are expected or planned.
 - For Cecil County, use the State Priority Funding Areas and County Certified Areas
- 3 Project located in Delaware Investment Level 1 area or Maryland Priority Funding Area
 - 1 Project located in Delaware Investment Level 2 area or Cecil County Certified Area
 - 0 Project not located in either of the above areas

Private or local funding contribution – Local and/or private commitment demonstrated by funding contribution

- 4 Greater than 80% through private/local funds
- 3 60-80% funded through private/local funds
- 2 40-60% funded through private/local funds
- 1 20-40% funded through private/local funds
- 0 Less than 20% through private/local fund

GOAL: SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOODS MOVEMENT

0 – 11 points

Criteria:

- Maximize our investments
- Develop effective transportation networks
- Plan for energy security and climate change

FREIGHT Scores using the three-tiered scoring defined in the WILMAPCO freight & goods movement analysis.

Bottlenecks are identified using high truck trip generating traffic zones, areas of high truck crash frequencies and travel time delays which hamper the efficient movement of truck traffic which can effect economic growth and competitiveness.

| | |
|---|--|
| 4 | "Significant Bottleneck" – Refers to segments with multiple failing criteria, and generally includes roadways which carry the highest traffic volumes and experience heaviest congestion. |
| 3 | "Moderate Bottleneck" – Refers to segments that are experiencing some failing, or nearly failing, criteria. There is more variation in scoring across the criteria, with some criteria demonstrating failure and others at more modest levels. |
| 2 | "Minor Bottleneck" – Refers to segments that experience one or more criteria that are near failing. While most have only a few criteria showing near failure, others are at acceptable levels. |
| 0 | All other road segments |

SUPPORT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES Projects that support economic development state and local policies.

Those include adding or improving access to brownfield locations; an existing or planned site used for employment, tourism, manufacturing, commercial or industrial purposes; or addresses an issue identified through regional economic development planning. For New Castle County, use DE Office of State Planning Policies and Spending map, Investment Level 1 and Investment Level 2: For Cecil County, use the State Priority Funding Areas and County Certified Areas.

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | Project located in Delaware Investment Level 1 area or Maryland Priority Funding Area |
| 2 | Project located in Delaware Investment Level 2 area or Cecil County Certified Area |
| 0 | Project not located in either of the above areas |

PRIVATE OR LOCAL FUNDING CONTRIBUTION Local and/or private commitment demonstrated by funding contribution.

| | |
|---|--|
| 4 | Greater than 80% through private/local funds |
| 3 | 60-80% funded through private/local funds |
| 2 | 40-60% funded through private/local funds |
| 1 | 20-40% funded through private/local funds |
| 0 | Less than 20% through private/local fund |

DRAFT 3/7/2016

FY 2018 TIP Project Prioritization - DRAFT

DRAFT 3/7/2016 8

1

| PROJECT | Air Quality | Revised AQ | Environmental Justice | Safety | Revised Safety | CMS Corridor | CMS ADT | CMS Transit | Transportation Justice | Pedestrian Priority | Freight | Economic Development | Funding Match | Technical Score | Revised Technical Score | COUNTY RANK for FY 2018 | COUNTY RANK for FY 2018 | Notes for FY 2018-21 TIP prioritization |
|--|-------------|------------|-----------------------|--------|----------------|--------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| PROJECTS IN FY 2017-2020 TIP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arterial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wilmington Initiatives: Walnut St, Front St - 4th St | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 2 | | |
| Wilmington Traffic Calming: 4th St: Walnut - I-95 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 15 | 1 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Wilmington Traffic Calming: King/Orange: MLK Blvd. to 13th | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 2 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Wilmington Traffic Calming: Walnut: MLK Blvd. to 16th | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 2 | | |
| SR 2, Kirkwood Highway and Red Mill Rd. Intersection | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 3 | | |
| US 40: US 40/SR 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 15 | | | Added |
| Churchmans: SR 273/Chapman Rd. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 5 | | HSIP - Moved from Unfunded list |
| US 40: US 40/SR 896 Grade Separated Intersection | 0 | -3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 1 | | |
| SR 2 Elkton Rd: Maryland State Line - Casho Mill Rd. | 1 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 3 | | |
| US 40: US 40, Salem Church Rd to Walther Rd | -3 | -3 | 1 | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 12 | | | Added |
| US 40: US 40/SR 72 Intersection, including Del Laws Rd. | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 1 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 5 | | |
| SR 4, Christina Parkway: SR 2 - SR 896 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 5 | | |
| I-95 & SR 141 Interchange - Commons Boulevard | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 4 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 5 | | Added |
| SR 9, River Rd. Area, Dobbinsville | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 7 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| SR299: SR 1 - Catherine Street | 0 | -3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 4 | | |
| SR 72: SR 71 - McCoy Rd | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 | | |
| US 13: Duck Creek - SR 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Collectors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Garasches Lane / Southbridge Improvements | 1 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | | Rename, DelDOT to provide revised info |
| Possum Park Rd. at Old Possum Park Rd. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Expressways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I-295 Westbound: US 13 - I-95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | 4 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 1 | | |
| SR 1 Widening, SR 273 - Roth BR | -3 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 4 | | |
| I-95: SR 896 Interchange | 0 | -3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 1 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Road A /SR 7 | -3 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 6 | | |
| Local | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Southern New Castle County: Cedar Lane Rd.: Marl Pit - Boyd's Corner | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Southern New Castle County: Cedar Lane Rd. at Marl Pit Rd | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | | Added as separate project from corridor |
| Southern New Castle County: Boyd's Corner Rd.: Cedar Ln - US 13 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | | |
| Southern New Castle County: Lorewood Grove Rd.: N412A - SR 1 | 1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | Moved from Unfunded list |
| Pedestrian/Bicycle | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| US 13: Christina River Bridge Memorial Drive - US 40 Pedestrian Safety | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | | 4 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 23 | 1 | | Expanded limits, moved from Unfunded list |
| Grubb Road Pedestrian Improvements: Foulk Rd. - Naamans Rd. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 | | Part of grouped ped/bike, Moved from |
| Myrtle Avenue Sidewalk Improvements | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | | |
| Manor Avenue Sidewalk Improvements | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Transit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transit Vehicle Replacement and Refurbishment, New Castle County | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 1 | | |
| Rail Improvements: Fairplay Station Parking / Elevator | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 7 | | Renamed |
| Transit Vehicle Expansion, NCC | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 5 | | |
| Claymont Train Station | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 3 | | |
| Christiana Mall Park and Ride New Castle County Transit Center | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | | Renamed |
| Rideshare Program, statewide | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 6 | | |

DRAFT 3/7/2016

FY 2018 TIP Project Prioritization - DRAFT

DRAFT 3/7/2016 9

2

| 1 PROJECT | Air Quality | Revised AQ | Environmental Justice | Safety | Revised Safety | CMS Corridor | CMS ADT | CMS Transit | Transportation Justice | Pedestrian Priority | Freight | Economic Development | Funding Match | Technical Score | Revised Technical Score | COUNCIL RANK for FY 2018 | COUNCIL RANK for FY 2019 | Notes for FY 2018-21 TIP prioritization |
|---|-------------|------------|-----------------------|--------|----------------|--------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 46 NOT IN FY 2016-2019 TIP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 Arterial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 Churchmans: SR4/Harmony Rd. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 1 | | |
| 49 Churchmans: SR4/SR7 JP Morgan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 2 | | |
| 50 Churchmans: SR2/Harmony Rd. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 3 | | |
| 51 Churchmans: Churchmans Rd. Extension | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 3 | | |
| 52 Wilmington Initiatives: Market St: 11th St. - 16th St. | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 5 | | |
| 53 US 40: SR 1 - SR 72, Widening | 0 | -3 | -1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 4 | | |
| 54 SR 2: S. Union Street Streetscape | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 5 | | |
| 55 US 13: SR 71, Tybouts Corner - US 40 | 0 | -3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 1 | | |
| 56 Tyler McConnell Bridge, SR141: Montchanin Rd. - Alapocas Rd. | 0 | -3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 6 | | |
| 57 SR 141: US 13 - Burnside Blvd. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 6 | | |
| 58 City of New Castle: SR 9 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 7 | | |
| 59 US 40: Eden Square Connector | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 8 | | |
| 60 US 13, Odessa Transportation Plan Implementation | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 | | |
| 61 City of New Castle Intersections | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | | |
| 62 Newtown Road: SR896 - SR 72 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | | |
| 63 Collectors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 Wilmington Traffic Calming: 12th St. Connector | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 3 | | |
| 65 Expressways | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 I-95: Riverfront Interchange | 0 | -3 | -3 | 2 | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 2 | | |
| 67 US 301: Spur | -3 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | | Moved from Funded list |
| 68 Local | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 Wilmington Initiatives: Shipley Street | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1 | | |
| 70 Wilmington Initiatives: Tatnall St. Connector | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | | |
| 71 Wilmington Riverfront: West St. Connector Extension | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | | |
| 72 Westtown: Wiggins Mill Rd: Green Giant Rd. - St Annes Church Rd. | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | | Moved from Funded list |
| 73 Mill Creek Rd. and McKennan's Church Rd. Intersection | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | | |
| 74 Reybold Road Extended: SR 72 - Salem Church Rd. | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | | |
| 75 Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 Aeronautics, New Castle County Airport Terminal Improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | | |
| 77 Pedestrian/Bicycle | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 Wilmington Initiatives: Bicycle Improvements | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 19 | 2 | | |
| 79 US 40 Plan: US 40 Sidepaths (SR 72-SR 1, SR 896-SR 72) | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 19 | 3 | | Renamed |
| 80 SR 48: N. DuPont Rd - SR 141 Pedestrian Safety Improvements | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 18 | 4 | | |
| 81 US 40: SR 72 - Salem Church Sidepath | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 5 | | |
| 82 Delaware Avenue Separated Bicycle Facility (Cycletrack) | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 14 | 5 | | Renamed |
| 83 DuPont Road Pedestrian Facilities | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 6 | | |
| 84 US 40: Newtown Trail & Pedestrian Improvements | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 7 | | |
| 85 Churchmans: Red Mill Rd. Sidewalks | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 7 | | |
| 86 Wilmington Initiatives: Water Street Walkway | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 8 | | |
| 87 Bicycle, Pedestrian: Foulk Rd. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 | | |
| 88 Bicycle, Pedestrian: Marsh Rd. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | | |
| 89 SR 3, Marsh Rd/Washington Street Ext. and SR 3 Pedestrian Improvements | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 10 | | |

3

| | | Air Quality | Revised AQ | Environmental Justice | Safety | Revised Safety | CMS Corridor | CMS ADT | CMS Transit | Transportation Justice | Pedestrian Priority | Freight | Economic Development | Funding Match | Technical Score | Revised Technical Score | Council RANK for FY 2018 | Council RANK for FY 2018 | Notes for FY 2018-21 TIP prioritization |
|-----|---|-------------|------------|-----------------------|--------|----------------|--------------|---------|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1 | PROJECT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90 | Transit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | Wilmington DART Bus Hub | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 19 | 21 | 1 | | |
| 92 | Transit Vehicle Expansion: SR 141 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 8 | | Moved from FUNDED |
| 93 | Transit bus stop improvements - NCC | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 2 | | |
| 94 | US 40: Transit Improvements | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 3 | | |
| 95 | Statewide CAD/AVL - Real time transit info via smart phone | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 3 | | |
| 96 | Boyd's Corner Park and Ride Expansion | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4 | | |
| 97 | Transit Vehicle Expansion: Paratransit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 9 | | Moved from FUNDED |
| 98 | Rail preservation: NCC Historic Red Clay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | |
| 99 | PROJECTS REMOVED FROM LIST | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | US 40: Salem Church Rd - SR 1 Sidepath | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 18 | 3 | | Part of US 40 widening project |
| 101 | Rail: Newark Regional Transit Center (Newark Train Station) | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 4 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 102 | SR SR 1/SR72 Diverging Diamond Interchange | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 2 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 103 | Bicycle, pedestrian and other improvements, statewide | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 2 | | Grouped project |
| 104 | Wilmington Riverfront: Christina River Bridge | 0 | -3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 11 | 1 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 105 | New Castle Industrial Track: s. of Christina River - Riverwalk | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 3 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 106 | I-95 & SR 141 Interchange - Ramps | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 4 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 5 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 107 | US 13, Philadelphia Pike, Claymont Renaissance Plan Implementation | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 6 | | No future projects planned |
| 108 | Southern New Castle County: Jamison Corner Rd. Relocated at Boyd's Corner | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 1 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 109 | US 301: MD Line - SR 1 | -3 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 7 | | Construction funds in FY 2017 |
| 110 | Wilmington Riverfront: Justison Landing | | -1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 | | | Complete |
| 111 | Brackenville Road Slope Stabilization | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | Preservation project |
| 112 | Valley Rd and Little Baltimore Rd Intersection Improvements | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | Drainage improvements |

Air Quality: review by Air Quality Subcommittee

Environmental Justice: 2021: 2007 WILMAPCO Regional Freight and Goods Movement Analysis

Safety: DelDOT crash data, 2004-8

CMS: 2012 Congestion Management System Summary

Transportation Justice: 2014 Accessibility and Mobility Report

Freight: 2007 WILMAPCO Regional Freight and Goods Movement Analysis

Economic Development: Delaware Office of State Planning Policies and Spending Map

Funding Match: DelDOT Finance

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
 Washington, DC 20590
 202-366-4000

Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or "FAST Act"

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

| Fiscal year | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Estimated funding* | \$2.309 B | \$2.360 B | \$2.405 B | \$2.449 B | \$2.499 B |

*Calculated (sum of estimated individual State CMAQ apportionments)

Program purpose

The FAST Act continued the CMAQ program to provide a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas).

Statutory citation

FAST Act § 1114; 23 U.S.C. 149

Funding features

Type of budget authority

Contract authority from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund, subject to the overall Federal-aid obligation limitation.

Apportionment of funds

As under MAP-21, the FAST Act directs FHWA to apportion funding as a lump sum for each State then divide that total among apportioned programs. Once each State's combined total apportionment is calculated, funding is set-aside for the State's CMAQ Program. (See "Apportionment" fact sheet for a description of this calculation)

Set-asides

The following amounts are to be set aside from a State's CMAQ apportionment:

- 2% for State Planning and Research (SPR). [23 U.S.C. 505]
- For a State that has a nonattainment or maintenance area for fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), an amount equal to 25% of the amount of State's CMAQ apportionment attributable to the weighted population of such areas in the State (eligible uses for these funds are noted below). States with low population density will have a reduced set-aside under certain conditions (more below). [23 U.S.C. 149(k)]

Transferability to Other Federal-aid Apportioned Programs

A State may transfer to the National Highway Performance Program, National Highway Freight Program, Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, Transportation Alternatives, and Highway Safety Improvement Program up to 50% of CMAQ funds made available each fiscal year (excluding set-asides). [23 U.S.C. 126]

Federal share

In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 120. (See the "Federal Share" fact sheet for additional detail.)

Eligible activities

Funds may be used for a transportation project or program that is likely to contribute to the attainment or maintenance of a national ambient air quality standard, with a high level of effectiveness in reducing air pollution, and that is included in the metropolitan planning organization's (MPO's) current transportation plan and transportation improvement program (TIP) or the current state transportation improvement program (STIP) in areas without an MPO.

The FAST Act added eligibility for verified technologies for non-road vehicles and non-road engines that are used in port-related freight operations located in ozone, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} nonattainment or maintenance areas funded in whole or in part under 23 U.S.C. or chapter 53 of 49 U.S.C. [23 U.S.C. 149(b)(8)(A)(ii)]

The Act also specifically makes eligible vehicle-to-infrastructure communications equipment. [23 U.S.C. 149(b)(9)]

The FAST Act continues eligibility for electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure and adds priority for infrastructure located on the corridors designated under 23 U.S.C. 151. [23 U.S.C. 149(c)(2)]

The FAST Act amended the eligible uses of CMAQ funds set aside for PM_{2.5} nonattainment and maintenance areas. PM_{2.5} set-aside funds may be used to reduce fine particulate matter emissions in a PM_{2.5} nonattainment or maintenance area, including—

- diesel retrofits;
- installation of diesel emission control technology on nonroad diesel equipment or on-road diesel equipment that is operated on a highway construction projects ; and
- the most cost-effective projects to reduce emissions from port-related landside nonroad or on-road equipment that is operated within the boundaries of the area. [23 U.S.C. 149(k)(2) & (4)]

Program features

The FAST Act continues existing program features and adds the new exemption described below.

Exemption from PM_{2.5} set-aside for States with low population density

A State with low population density (80 or fewer persons per square mile of land area) may have its PM_{2.5} set-aside reduced if—

- one or more PM_{2.5} nonattainment or maintenance areas within the State does not have projects that are part of the emissions analysis of a metropolitan transportation plan or TIP; and
- regional motor vehicle emissions are an insignificant contributor to the air quality problem for the PM_{2.5} nonattainment or maintenance area(s). [23 U.S.C. 149(k)(3)]

February 2016

Page last modified on March 1, 2016