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I. INTRODUCTION

The Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Cecil County, Maryland and New Castle County, Delaware. We are charged with planning and coordinating transportation investments for the Wilmington region.

The Wilmington region is home to nearly 660,600 people, most of whom (84%) live in New Castle County. Wilmington, a financial hub supporting a population of more than 71,000, serves as the principal city. Urbanized development stretches outside of Wilmington along the I-95 corridor, from the Town of Elkton to the Pennsylvania border. Natural and rural landscapes, sprawling suburbs, and small towns blanket the rest of the region.

WILMAPCO's mission is to create the best transportation Plan for the region, one that meets all the requirements mandated by the Federal Clean Air Act and its Amendments (CAAA) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST).
WILMAPCO’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) establishes the region’s long-term transportation goals, and identifies objectives and actions to realize them. Below are the goals and objectives listed in the 2040 RTP, 2015 Update, adopted in 2015.

WILMAPCO RTP Goals and Objectives

Improve Quality of Life

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

Efficiently Transport People

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

Support Sustainable Economic Development and Goods Movement

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

The Regional Progress Report tracks the progress of various actions associated with the objectives above.

Each action is assessed individually with a quantitative or qualitative performance indicator or measure. Potential performance measures were identified in the 2015 Update to the 2040 RTP. They are identified in the report, along with National Performance Measures (discussed in the next section), and other measures. Considering the assessment, each action is assigned one of three traffic light colors to indicate its progress. Reds are given to those actions which are off track from their objectives. Yellows are given for actions partially off track; and greens for actions which are on target.

Taken as a whole, the Progress Report identifies where we have made good progress with our long-range plan and where more attention is needed.
II. NATIONAL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT UPDATE

Performance measurement was a chief aspiration of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century, (MAP-21) the preceding federal transportation legislation and is carried over in the current FAST Act.

National Goal Areas and Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Infrastructure Condition</th>
<th>Congestion Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Serious injuries per VMT</td>
<td>• Bridge condition on the NHS</td>
<td>• Traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fatalities per VMT</td>
<td>• Pavement condition on interstate system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>• Pavement conditions on the NHS (excluding interstate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of fatalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Reliability</th>
<th>Freight Movement and Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Environmental Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Performance of the Interstate system</td>
<td>• Freight movement on the Interstate</td>
<td>• On-road mobile source emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance of the NHS (excluding Interstate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduced Project Delivery Days

Performance measures are to be developed by both state DOTs and their corresponding MPOs in coordination with one another. Our coordination with the Maryland and Delaware Departments of Transportation (MDOT and DelDOT) began with the 2014 Progress Report. Measures have been generally agreed upon, but are still being developed.

Data unavailability precludes us from presenting the eventual performance measures or targets in this report. The required national performance measures are highlighted where they might fit in each action, even if the measure is not ready.

While these national performance measures are useful for establishing universal measures across the country, they only assess baseline conditions, year-to-year. They do not examine the “why,” or root causes, of an observed trend. This report strives to do just that. Often our indicators take a deeper dive into the trends, and “connect the dots” as to why performance in one area is excelling, while in another it is flagging.

III. SYSTEM STATUS AND THE CONTINUING CYCLE OF SPRAWL

The WILMAPCO region is home to some 660,600 people and 329,600 jobs, most of which are situated around the I-95 and commuter/freight rail corridor in the region’s north. The highways which run along this corridor, and those which connect it from the north and south, form the bedrock of the region’s transportation system.

During the past century, land and transportation policies combined with affordable fuel and technology to enable the dispersion of population and jobs from the City of Wilmington. In 1920 more than 74% of New Castle County’s residents lived within that city’s limits – today the figure is only about 13%. Housing developments along new suburban highways captured most of the in-migration.

Car travel became the mode of choice for this increasingly dispersed population. Today, more workers drive alone to work than ever before, according to the U.S. Census. Cars, and the increasingly advanced web of highways on which they operate, have brought fast, efficient, and unprecedented mobility to many of our region’s residents and visitors.
Land use and transportation policies continue to support further de-densification, and, by extension, car travel. Current laws make it more difficult to redevelop existing property than to develop on open land. Crucially, regional transportation planning has little influence over land use planning. It is, historically, reactionary to it.
Conceptually, fresh development on the region's edge triggers new highways, capacity and flow improvements to existing ones, and stifles expansion of mass transit. Each year, for example, a lower and lower percentage of our region's residents live within walking distance of a bus stop.

Mapped household projections from 2017 through 2040 illustrate the de-densification trend. Nearly half (45%) of household growth between 2017 and 2040 is projected to occur outside our Center and Core Transportation Investment Areas (TIAs²) along the I-95 corridor. These 17,600 new households will continue to create demand for highway expansion, especially in southern New Castle County, where the infrastructure is today underdeveloped. This limits available funding for transportation enhancements in the developed areas.

Further, this impressive household growth outside the Center/Core is projected to be matched by employment growth. Forty percent of new jobs through 2040 are expected to

² Transportation Investment Areas (TIAs) are identified in the 2040 RTP. Each has a different transportation investment profile, with the most intensive investments reserved for the Centers and the least intensive for the Rural areas.
take root in Community, Developing and Rural TIAs. In New Castle County, 60% of the new jobs are expected to fall within its “Developing” TIA in the south.

Projected Employment Change through 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIA</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>38,619</td>
<td>41,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>140,447</td>
<td>153,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>14,686</td>
<td>16,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>8,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>16,605</td>
<td>21,915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cecil County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIA</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>5,973</td>
<td>7,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>14,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>2,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17,757</td>
<td>23,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These demographic projections are helping push projected Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) to new heights. Regionally, we expect VMT to increase by 32% between 2015 and 2040, although households are only expected to grow by 19% during that period. New Castle County’s southwards growth is largely behind the figures, compelling future households to log an additional eight miles of driving each day. These figures challenge our RTP action to lower VMT.

Projected Daily VMT per Households, 2015 – 2040

Continued sprawl and VMT growth has correlated with a roadway-dominate Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) during the last decade. As shown in the graph below, roadway projects typically receive well over half of the planned capital expenditures. Transit projects usually account for about 10% of capital spending, with even less assigned to dedicated pedestrian and bicycle projects.

---

3 Figures for 2025 and 2035 are interpolated.
4 The TIP is an annually updated, four-year listing of planned transportation project spending.
The map on the following page illustrates where much of this highway investment is going. Most planned spending ($1.1 billion or 60%) in New Castle County is tied to ten major projects south of US 40. These projects are partially responses to the ongoing southwards sprawl and will help drive continued VMT growth. They also have contributed to social equity concerns, in that so much spending is planned for growing suburban areas instead of fully funding projects in and around Wilmington.

Source: WILMAPCO TIP. Note the chart does not include funding for projects categorized as "other."

---

5 Source: WILMAPCO TIP. Note the chart does not include funding for projects categorized as "other."
Major 2040 RTP Projects (Above $15 Million) in Southern New Castle County

- US 40: Salem Church Rd to Weather Road
  - $26 m, in 2023
- SR 1: Tyburn Corner to SR 273
  - $123 m, in 2020
- US 40 and SR 896 Interchange
  - $81 m, in 2022
- US 40 / SR 72 Wrangle Hill Road
  - $23 m, in 2018
- SR 72, McCoy Road to SR 71
  - $23 m, in 2019
- SR 880 at Bethel Church Rd Interchange
  - $35 m, in 2022
- US 301: Spur
  - $164 m, in 2030
- Boys Corner Rd;
  - Cedar Lane to US 13
  - $23 m, in 2021
- US 301: MD State Line to SR 1 (Mainline)
  - $554 m, in 2019

Transportation Investment Areas:
- Center
- Core
- Community
- Developing
- Rural

Source: WILMAPCO 2040 RTP: Data Update
V. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS REPORT FINDINGS

Like other previous Progress Reports, the present document has uncovered reasons for optimism and concern. Overall, half (50%) of our actions showed good progress and received green lights, 29% showed partial progress and received yellow lights and 21% showed poor progress and received red lights.

Key areas of success include, but are not limited to: conforming to air-quality requirements, sub-regional planning and implementation, congestion mitigation process, social justice initiatives, and our work in promoting active transportation.

Problem areas include, but are not limited to: encouraging future growth along the I-95 corridor in New Castle County, the continued growth in single occupancy vehicle trips, and VMT, using WILMAPCO project prioritization processes to select projects for funding, ensuring affordable transportation choices, and reducing an uptick in vehicle and pedestrian crashes.
GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

Obj. 1: Protect Public Health and Safety

Actions

- Develop and maintain a safe transportation system
- Support disaster planning efforts
- Reduce and mitigate the impacts of transportation emissions
- Improve access to healthy and affordable food, employment, and services

Wilmington’s western neighborhoods and beyond from atop St. Francis Hospital
Develop and Maintain a Safe Transportation System

Injuries/fatalities per VMT (RTP)
Pedestrian and bicycle crashes (RTP)
Number and rate of serious injuries and fatalities (NPM)
Number of nonmotorized serious injuries and fatalities (NPM)

The RTP identifies safety as the “first priority” in making transportation investments.

Safety features into much planning at WILMAPCO. Staff supports the development and interpretation of individual crash data in Delaware. These data feed into our project prioritization processes. Additionally, staff provides annual feedback and technical support with the Delaware Department of Transportation's (DelDOT's) Hazard Elimination Program, which aims to improve road safety.

Progress with improving safety can be measured via injury and fatality crash rates. Overall, following years of steady declines, injuries and fatalities have increased in recent years. More crashes (along with more miles traveled) are driving the rise, which correlates with our continued heavy investment in highway travel.

In 2015, more than 15,200 crashes occurred on New Castle County roads – the highest figure in our records, which date to 1993. New Castle County's 26 fatal pedestrian crashes in 2015 were the highest in our records, helping give Delaware the dubious distinction of being the most dangerous US state for people walking. And Cecil County’s 1,400 total crashes in 2016 reversed two years of steady declines.

Regional bicycle crashes, meanwhile, have been trending downwards. Cecil County's four bicycle crashes in 2016 were the lowest figure in our records.

Although made safer during the past century, vehicle travel is still downright dangerous. Efforts to support alternative means of transportation must be stepped up, which requires a pivot towards denser land policy and rethinking highway design along stretches where people do or could walk.
Road Injuries per VMT\(^1\)

Road Fatalities per VMT\(^2\)

\(^1\) Sources: SHA, DelDOT, DSP
\(^2\) Sources: SHA, DelDOT, DSP
Total Road Injuries and Fatalities, New Castle County

- Source: DSP

Total Road Injuries and Fatalities, Cecil County

- Source: SHA

---

3 Source: DSP
4 Source: SHA
Pedestrian Crashes in Cecil County

- 2012: 44 fatal, 8 injuries
- 2013: 36 fatal, 9 injuries
- 2014: 26 fatal, 5 injuries
- 2015: 26 fatal, 2 injuries
- 2016: 38 fatal, 2 injuries

Bicycle Crashes in Cecil County

- 2012: 13 fatal, 1 injury
- 2013: 9 fatal, 6 injuries
- 2014: 9 fatal, 8 injuries
- 2015: 8 fatal, 7 injuries
- 2016: 4 fatal, 4 injuries

Source: SHA
Pedestrian Crashes in New Castle County

Bicycle Crashes in New Castle County

[Graphs showing pedestrian and bicycle crashes from 2012 to 2016]

7 Source DSP
8 Source: DSP
Support Disaster Planning Efforts

Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) asks WILMAPCO to use our strength in technical analyses to support national security efforts, and emergency preparedness planning.

WILMAPCO is meeting this charge. We have assisted our partners with traffic data collection and analyses, and have increased general awareness of emergency preparation. For example, we created a webpage (http://www.wilmapco.org/emergency-preparedness) to help prepare residents for emergencies, and highlighted the impacts to state-designated evacuation routes in our Sea-level Rise Vulnerability Assessment. We are also a member of DelDOT’s Transportation Management Team, which aims to quicken the response to travel incidents.

Reduce and Mitigate the Impacts of Transportation Emissions

Air quality conformity (RTP)
Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)

As New Castle County and Cecil County are in nonattainment for ozone and New Castle County is in maintenance for fine particulate matter (PM2.5), one action in the 2040 RTP charged WILMAPCO with conforming to required air quality standards.

WILMAPCO has shown that our planned projects do conform to these standards. As shown in the graphs below, the projected emissions from the on-road transportation sector (including planned projects) fall below the required budgets and baselines. A word of caution is necessary. Our projections indicate a slight uptick in transportation emissions during the 2030s. This is a result of increasing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and the implementation of all known vehicle technologies.

WILMAPCO is also a leader in promoting air quality awareness efforts through the Air Quality Partnership of Delaware. The partnership – a coalition of government agencies, businesses, and individuals – provides education about the health and environmental impacts of poor air quality, ways individuals can stay safe when air quality is particularly bad, and ways individuals can help reduce their contribution to air pollution.
On-road Mobile Source Ozone Projections in Cecil County\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC Emissions</th>
<th>NOx Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) Source: MDOT

On-road Mobile Source Ozone Projections in New Castle County\(^10\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VOC Emissions</th>
<th>NOx Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^10\) Source: DelDOT
Connectivity analysis (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to improve access to healthy and affordable food, employment, and services. We have partially met this charge. A “connectivity analysis” was conducted in the 2015 Transportation Justice (TJ) report that accessed connectivity from places with concentrations of seniors, the disabled, and zero car households. This analysis will be replicated regionwide for all neighborhoods with the next iteration of our Environmental Justice/Title VI Report in 2018.

Major sub-regional level studies conducted by WILMAPCO should also aim to meet this action. While improving transportation accessibility to employment and services is featured in all recent planning efforts, only the North Claymont Area Master Plan and the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan explicitly considered access to healthy and affordable food.

11 Source: DelDOT
GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

Obj. 2: Promote Active Transportation

Actions

- Fund alternative transportation in the TIP
- Apply a Complete Streets Policy in all WILMAPCO studies
- Prioritize TAP investments within areas of greatest need/capacity
- Develop and implement SRTS Programs
Fund Alternative Transportation in the TIP

The RTP asks WILMAPCO to fund alternative transportation in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), our listing of planned projects that have received federal funding. While still accounting for over half of planned TIP spending this year, the percentage of funding dedicated to roadway-only projects has dropped eight percentage points since the 2015 fiscal year. Those dollars have shifted to multimodal, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian projects. In 2018, transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects enjoyed their highest share of funding on record – 12% and 3% respectively. It remains to be seen if this additional funding will help stem the still-increasing percentage of regional workers who drive alone to work each day.

TIP Funding Trends, since 1997\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} Source: WILMAPCO
Apply a Complete Streets Policy in all WILMAPCO Studies

The 2040 RTP urged WILMAPCO to apply a complete streets policy in all studies. This action continues to be met. WILMAPCO sub-regional plans always consider multimodal options. Recent studies such as the SR 141 Corridor 20-year Land Use and Transportation Plan, the Glasgow Avenue Planning Study, the North Claymont Area Master Plan, and the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan all called for marked improvements to roadside pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Prioritize TAP Investments Within Areas of Greatest Need/Capacity

The 2040 RTP asked WILMAPCO to prioritize the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) investments within the areas of greatest need and capacity.

WILMAPCO has a separate project prioritization process to score TAP submissions and projects. Projects are scored based on the projects’ proximity to pedestrian and bicycle generating activities, its support for redevelopment, social equity, and overall potential.

13 Source: ACS

---

Percentage of Commuters Driving Alone, since 1980

- New Castle County
- Cecil County
- WILMAPCO region

[Graph showing the percentage of commuters driving alone in New Castle County, Cecil County, and WILMAPCO region from 1980 to 2011-15]
use. Criteria are mostly quantitative, though a few measures are judged qualitatively. Projects can receive up to 36 points, with factors such as safety (5 possible points), bus stop proximity (4 possible points) and filling a gap in the nonmotorized system (4 possible points) weighted heaviest. Ultimately, the WILMAPCO Council ranks the proposed projects, with input from the Technical Advisory Committee, considering their technical score, cost-effectiveness, and other factors.

**Elements of WILMAPCO’s TAP Technical Scoring Index**

Unfortunately, this process was not consulted by DelDOT with the latest round of funded TAP projects. Several high-ranking projects in Wilmington were bumped in favor of a new project in Wilmington and a low-scoring suburban bridge project. More consultation and a smoother administrative transition in Wilmington would have avoided this outcome.

Meanwhile, in Cecil County, the situation is better. Our TAP scoring has been used in project selection since its inception.

---

14 For more information, and to see a full breakdown of the TAP project prioritization weighting, please visit: [http://www.wilmapco.org/priority](http://www.wilmapco.org/priority).
Develop and Implement SRTS Programs

Qualitative review of UPWP; percentage of school children walking/biking in participating schools (RTP)

The RTP asked planners to help develop and implement Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Programs. This federal initiative provides improved infrastructure and educational support to encourage more children to walk and bike to school.

WILMAPCO continues to successfully address this effort. In New Castle County, we have partnered with DelDOT to support SRTS programs at about a dozen schools. We are today actively engaged in seven schools: Claymont, Downes, Eisenberg, Elbert-Palmer, McCullough, Stubbs, and Wilmington Montessori. WILMAPCO has not actively led SRTS programs in Cecil County, where participation requirements for schools are more rigorous.

DelDOT has begun to re-examine SRTS funding. Match funding (20%) is now required of schools and/or local partners, which will be an added hurdle for developing and continuing SRTS programs.
GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

Obj. 3: Ensure Transportation Choice and Equity

Actions

- Analyze the inequities EJ groups experience in the transportation network
- Reduce transportation costs
- Ensure EJ communities receive their fair share of transportation spending
- Plan for livable sustainable and prosperous neighborhoods
Analyze the Inequities EJ Groups Experience in the Transportation Network

Maintain an EJ report (RTP)

The RTP challenged WILMAPCO to analyze the inequities that low-income and ethnic and racial minorities, or Environmental Justice (EJ) groups, experience with the transportation system.

This action continues to be met. Our last EJ study was conducted in 2013, and is due for an update next year. The 2013 study analyzed transportation funding equity, food desert analysis, bus connectivity, and more.

Reduce Transportation Costs

Transportation as a percentage of household spending (RTP)

The RTP directed planners help ensure affordable transportation choices for residents. These include providing reliable alternative transportation options and reducing single occupancy vehicle trips.

The graph below tracks consumer spending on transportation generally and gasoline specifically in the Philadelphia Metropolitan Statistical Area, which includes the WILMAPCO region. Since the late 1990s, residents have spent a higher percentage of annual household spending on gasoline, but less on transportation.

Percentage of Household Expenditures on Transportation and Gasoline, Metropolitan Philadelphia, since 1986\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{15}\) Source: BLS
More specific to our region, WILMAPCO recently completed an analysis\textsuperscript{16}, examining transportation and housing costs, by neighborhood. Only the City of Wilmington was found to be home to location efficient communities, or places that provide a variety of transportation choices including transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities that can be reached without a car. Elsewhere, in the growing areas outside of towns where most of our population resides, most households (81\%) were estimated to spend more than 18\% (the national average) of annual household income on transportation costs alone. The analysis showed that the average household in our region spends more than expected on transportation.

**Median Transportation Costs of Households within WILMAPCO’s Block Groups\textsuperscript{17}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cecil Co.</th>
<th>New Castle Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFORDABLE - 18% or less</td>
<td>9,263 25%</td>
<td>14,525 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE AVERAGE - 18% to 25%</td>
<td>27,131 75%</td>
<td>45,648 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH - above 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,566 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efforts regarding this action could improve. Logical long-term steps include fostering more location efficient places, encouraging infill, and redistributing heavy planned transportation spending away from suburban highways and into alternative transportation and the redevelopment of urban transportation networks.


\textsuperscript{17} Source: Transportation and Housing Costs Data Report, WILMAPCO, September 2016. [http://www.wilmapco.org/data/TranspHousingCosts_DataReport.pdf](http://www.wilmapco.org/data/TranspHousingCosts_DataReport.pdf). Cost data are measured at the census block group level against the area median income. Household numbers represent the total number of households in the block groups for each cost range. Original data source: Center for Neighborhood Technology.
Ensure EJ Communities Receive their Fair Share of Transportation Spending

Tip spending within EJ communities (RTP)

The RTP asks WILMAPCO to ensure that EJ communities receive their fair share of transportation spending. The graph below updates our transportation equity benchmark analysis, found in the EJ report. The analysis places the percentage of transportation project funding slated for EJ areas\(^8\) against the expected funding level, or benchmark. This benchmark is simply the percentage of the region’s population within EJ areas.

**TIP Spending Equity Benchmark, since FY 2002\(^9\)**

As shown in the graph above, funding for projects within EJ areas has dropped since the FY 2004 TIP. This is a result of a greater percentage of funding being directed to suburban highway expansion projects during the past decade, as outlined in the

---

\(^8\) Only TIP projects with specific spatial geometry were included in this analysis. Additionally, TIP projects within EJ neighborhoods were not counted if they fell on an expressway, such as I-95. A repaving project on a raised section of I-95, for example, represents little direct benefit to the surrounding neighborhoods. Data source: WILMAPCO.

\(^9\) Source: WILMAPCO. Only TIP projects with specific spatial geometry were included in this analysis. Additionally, TIP projects within EJ neighborhoods were not counted if they fell on an expressway, such as I-95. A repaving project on a raised section of I-95, for example, represents little direct benefit to the surrounding neighborhoods. Data source: WILMAPCO.
Introduction and shown elsewhere in this report. WILMAPCO must work to reverse this inequitable spending pattern by funding a fair share of projects in low income and minority neighborhoods.

Plan for Livable, Sustainable, and Prosperous Neighborhoods

Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)

The 2040 RTP directs WILMAPCO to plan for livable, sustainable, and prosperous neighborhoods. Recent studies such as the Elkton Transit Oriented Development Study, the Glasgow Avenue Planning Study, the North Claymont Area Master Plan, and the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan all addressed improvements to quality of life, environmental sustainability, and economic development. WILMAPCO ultimately strives for a comprehensive approach to planning, which harmonizes diverse interests to produce the best plan for our region and its places.
GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

Obj. 4: Preserve our Natural and Cultural Resources

Actions

- Support the designation and implementation of scenic byways
- Limit projects within Rural TIAs to preservation and safety
- Avoid projects within sensitive ecological areas
- Establish a better relationship between transportation and tourism
Support the Designation and Implementation of Scenic Byways

Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)
Corridor management plans (RTP)

The RTP sought to support the designation and implementation of scenic byways. WILMAPCO has met this charge. Specifically, in 2016, we led the development of the Red Clay Valley Scenic Byways Design Standards. Staff also strengthened the recognition of the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad Byway though our role with the South Wilmington Planning Network, along with recommendations to enhance signage for that byway along the Route 9 corridor with the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan. Within the North Claymont Area Master Plan, wayfinding enhancements were recommended for the National Park Service’s Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail.

Limit projects within Rural Transportation Investment Areas to Preservation and Safety & Avoid Projects Within Sensitive Ecological Areas

Analysis of RTP/aspiration projects (RTP)

The RTP identified certain types of projects to be discouraged in Rural Transportation Investment Areas. These include: intersection capacity projects, park-and-ride expansions, road building and widening, mass transit expansions and so on. Similarly, the RTP also directs WILMAPCO to avoid planning projects within sensitive ecological areas.

The map below illustrates a trio of expansion projects from the FY 2018-21 TIP which pass through rural lands and/or ecologically sensitive areas. The most significant of these is the continued building of the US 301 Expressway – a major new highway just north of Middletown. While each of these projects was approved after findings of no major local environmental impacts, each will bring lasting change to a sensitive landscape, and may trigger nearby land development.

---

See the appendix for a matrix.

---

2017 Regional Progress Report
Current TIP Expansion Projects in Rural and Sensitive Natural Areas

- NCC Industrial Track Greenway, Phase III
  - Mode: Bike/Pedestrian
  - FY18-21: $16.2 m

- SR 896 / Bethel Church Interchange
  - Mode: Road
  - FY18-21: $0.5 m

- US 301 Expressway
  - Mode: Road
  - FY18-21: $280.6 m

Source: WILMAPCO

---
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Establish a Better Relationship Between Transportation and Tourism

Greenway progress (RTP)

The RTP called for establishing a better relationship between transportation and tourism. Optimizing the transportation system generally will further this action, including improving wayfinding signage and transportation communication technologies. Progress has been made developing mobile apps that communicate traffic conditions and real-time bus information. WILMAPCO sub-regional studies also have an eye towards promoting tourism. In the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan, for example, increased attention to promoting the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad Byway along the corridor was recommended. And our Red Clay Valley Scenic Byways Design Standards recommendations work to preserve and promote tourism along a key scenic corridor.

Another key initiative which helps promote local mobility and tourism is the East Coast Greenway. The Greenway is a 3,000-mile trail linking Canada to Key West, which traverses the WILMAPCO region. New Castle County has completed (or funded) 78.5% of the network, which is up from 77% in 2015. Cecil County continues to lag behind in completing and designating its segments.

East Coast Greenway Status in New Castle County

Source: WILMAPCO
GOAL: EFFICIENTLY TRANSPORT PEOPLE

Obj. 1: Improve System Performance

Actions

- Support high technology transit and highway projects
- Fund preservation projects first
- Support carpooling initiatives
- Fund expansion projects within Center and Core TIAs when necessary
Support High Technology Transit and Highway Projects

EZ-Pass use (RTP)
Reduce commuter bus travel times (RTP)
Transit on-time performance (RTP)

The RTP asks WILMAPCO to support high technology transit and highway projects. These projects will help, at least temporarily, reduce traffic congestion without adding roadway capacity, make public transit a more user-friendly experience, and build the infrastructure needed for tomorrow's higher technology highway system.

Results here have been mixed. While staff has provided strong support for successful signal retiming projects, shaving minutes off daily commutes, and EZ-Pass use (an automated toll transaction system) continues to rise, public bus performance continues to lag, especially in New Castle County. There, only 66% of fixed route trips can be said to be “on time,” the percentage of paratransit trips on time has been in decline since 2012, and the percentage of bus commutes of greater than 30 minutes increased over data from 2007-2011.

It should be noted that DTC’s method for measuring the on-time performance of its fixed route buses in New Castle County and throughout Delaware has improved recently. Prior to 2016, on-time performance checks were done manually with a sample of 10% of the system. Today, automated electronic checks are in place for all trips. Due to the shift in sampling techniques, we will not graph historic fixed-route bus on-time performance data against current performance, because the values are significantly different. On-time performance between 2000 and 2015 generally suggests that fixed-route buses were on-time more than 90% of the time, while in 2016, the automated electronic system showed that fixed-route buses were on-time only 66% of the time. Moving forward, we will be using the 2016 data as a beginning year to graph future performance.
EZ-Pass Use in New Castle County, Delaware

Bus Commutes of More Than 30 Minutes, since 2007-2011

---

23 Source: DelDOT. EZ-Pass data was requested from MDOT/SHA for Cecil County, but was not available in the correct format.

24 Source: ACS
On-time Paratransit Performance in New Castle County, since 2000\(^{25}\)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\begin{axis}[
    title=On-time Paratransit Performance in New Castle County, since 2000\(^{25}\),
    xlabel=Year, ylabel=Percentage on Time,
    xmin=2000, xmax=2016,
    ymin=50, ymax=100,
    ytick={50,60,70,80,90,100},
]
    \addplot[green,mark=o] coordinates {
        (2000,80)
        (2002,85)
        (2004,83)
        (2006,88)
        (2008,90)
        (2010,91)
        (2012,90)
        (2014,89)
        (2016,85)
    };
\end{axis}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

On-time Bus Performance in Cecil County, since 2015\(^{26}\)

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\begin{axis}[
    title=On-time Bus Performance in Cecil County, since 2015\(^{26}\),
    xlabel=Year, ylabel=Percentage on Time,
    xmin=2015, xmax=2017,
    ymin=50, ymax=100,
    xtick={2015,2016,2017},
    ytick={50,60,70,80,90,100},
]
    \addplot[green,mark=o] coordinates {
        (2015,65)
        (2016,90)
        (2017,96)
    } node [above] at (axis cs:2015,65) {Demand Response};
    \addplot[red,mark=diamond] coordinates {
        (2015,70)
        (2016,85)
        (2017,90)
    } node [above] at (axis cs:2015,70) {Fixed Route Target};
\end{axis}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\(^{25}\) Source: DTC.
\(^{26}\) Source: Cecil County Transit.
Fund Preservation Projects First

TIP preservation spending (RTP)
Municipal Street aid (RTP)
Road and bridge conditions (RTP)

The RTP challenges WILMAPCO to fund preservation projects first. Results here have been mixed. Preservation projects typically outpace planned spending on management and expansion projects in the TIP. However, the 42% of capital spend generally allotted to preservation projects may not be enough. Municipal Street Aid funding, which towns typically use to repair streets, is today under levels from a decade ago. Conditions on bridges in New Castle County, meanwhile, have steadily worsened since 2013, and ride quality could be improved on Cecil County’s secondary roadways.

WILMAPCO should consider setting a target for preservation spending in the TIP, which would help to support improve road and bridge conditions.

TIP Funding by Category, since FY 1999

Source: WILMAPCO
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Municipal Street Aid Funding in the TIP, since FY 2008

Bridge Conditions in New Castle County, National Highway System Structures

Source: WILMAPCO. Figures between FY’08 to FY’16 are adjusted for inflation.

Source: DelDOT. The condition is that of total bridges, not their deck areas. Those data were unavailable.
Bridge Conditions in New Castle County, All Structures\(^{30}\)

Cecil County Highway Conditions, since 2012\(^{31}\)

\(^{30}\) Source: DelDOT. The condition is that of total bridges, not their deck areas. Those data were unavailable. Annual data for conditions on Cecil County bridges were requested from MDOT/SHA, but unavailable. In 2017, a pair of bridges in that county were considered functionally obsolete. However, no bridges were listed in poor condition.

\(^{31}\) Source: SHA. Note: in 2012 data collection was carried out in the inventory direction only. Road condition data were requested from DelDOT, but unavailable.
Support Carpooling Initiatives

Percentage of workers carpooling (RTP)  
Park-and-Ride lot use (RTP)

The RTP asks WILMAPCO to support carpooling initiatives. While Rideshare Delaware, a group which promotes car sharing, has been consistently funded in the TIP, carpooling commutes have remained in freefall since 1980. As shown in the graph below, in that year, more than 21% of commutes regionally were made via carpool. Today the figure is less than 9%. Park and ride lots are also generally underutilized. As shown in the other graph below, on average, they are utilized to less than half of capacity.

Additional attention and resources should be provided to support carpooling. Beyond reversing our sprawling development pattern, emerging technologies may offer the best path forward for reducing single occupancy vehicle trips.

---

**Percentage of Workers Commuting via Carpool, since 1980**

- **New Castle County**
- **Cecil County**
- **WILMAPCO region**

---

32 Source: ACS
Usage of Park and Ride/Pool Parking Lots, since 2000

The RTP asks WILMAPCO to fund expansion projects within our Center and Core TIAs when necessary. Home to the most people and jobs, the Core TIA has historically received the heaviest amount of planned spending, as shown on the graph below. Most of the funding there, and in the generally less well-funded Centers, are going towards preserving existing infrastructure and not expanding it. System expansions, such as new rail infrastructure and highway interchange upgrades, however, are sometimes necessary in Center and Core TIAs to help promote redevelopment there.

Sources: WILMAPCO, SHA
More than two dozen (29) expansion projects were listed in the RTP there. During the past two years, only two have transitioned onto the TIP, the funded project listing. Many of the funded expansion projects are indeed outside the Center and Core TIAs.

TIP Spending by Transportation Investment Area, since FY 2004

34 Source: WILMAPCO. $ x 1,000.
Aspirational and Funded (TIP) Expansion Projects \(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\) Source: WILMAPCO
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GOAL: EFFICIENTLY TRANSPORT PEOPLE

Obj. 2: Promote Accessibility and Connectivity

Actions

- Ensure access to public transportation
- Analyze barriers Tj groups experience in the transportation network
- Fund strategic improvements to the public transit
- Develop a complete and safe nonmotorized transportation network
Ensure Access to Public Transportation

Ensuring access to public transportation was called for in the RTP. While rates of public transit use among regional workers have declined since 1980, they have rebounded ever so slightly. As shown on the graph below, today about 4% of regional workers commute via public transit, compared to about 3% in 1990.

These rates would likely improve if more jobs and people were located closer to the system. As shown on the graph below, 40% of jobs in New Castle County are located beyond walking distance to a bus stop. The percentage of that county's population within walking distance to a bus stop has dropped over the past two decades from 56% to 49%. In rural Cecil County, these figures are even lower, though they are improving with upgrades to its growing bus system.

Encouraging a denser development pattern while increasing spending to produce a more robust and reliable public transportation system will help make public transportation a more viable mode of travel regionally.

Percentage of Workers Commuting via Transit, since 1980

Source: ACS

2017 Regional Progress Report
Analyze Barriers TJ Groups Experience in the Transportation Network

Maintain a TJ Report (RTP)
Connectivity matrix (RTP)

The RTP challenged WILMAPCO to analyze the barriers faced by Transportation Justice (TJ) groups while using the transportation network. TJ populations include: seniors, the disabled, and households without motorized vehicles.

In 2015, WILMAPCO produced a TJ Report that considered the needs and barriers faced by these populations. We found that seniors are often burdened and by the financial cost of car ownership and decreasing physical ability to safely operate vehicles and survive crashes. People with disabilities, who are often seniors themselves, are more likely to encounter problems with travel due to their limitations. Households without a vehicle present are mobility constrained by having to negotiate a transportation system where car travel is often their only viable option.

A “connectivity matrix” was introduced in that report, that measured the transportation connectivity between concentrations of TJ populations and key destinations (libraries, grocery stores, hospitals, and senior centers) with four modes of travel (walking, biking, public bus, and car). We found that TJ communities inside Wilmington and Elkton were

37 Sources: WILMAPCO, DTC, Cecil County Transit
very well connected to these destinations, areas on the outskirts of these places had some connections, while TJ areas on the edges of our region were poorly connected. A separate analysis was completed to consider public transit and walking connections in and around our suburban age restricted communities. Here we found that more than half the communities were a great distance from existing pedestrian and bus routes, making future connections unlikely, or, at best, a long-term prospect.

WILMAPCO aims to continue to build on this analysis with our next Environmental Justice (EJ) report, expected next year.

**Fund Strategic Improvements to the Public Transit Network**

TIP transit funding trends (RTP)
Ridership and transit use analysis (RTP)
Filling the commuter rail gap progress (RTP)

Funding strategic improvements to our regional transit system was an action of the RTP. The aim of the action was to curb increasing reliance on private cars in the region. While funding for public transit has increased as a percentage in recent TIPs and bus ridership is up in Cecil County, bus ridership has plummeted in New Castle County since 2012. Additionally, despite much study and discussion, little progress has been made in filling the commuter rail gap in Cecil County. A cornerstone project of the RTP, this project aims to link the Baltimore and Philadelphia regional rail systems together.

**TIP Funding Trends, since 1997**

![TIP Funding Trends Chart](chart.png)

---

39 Source: WILMAPCO
Public Bus Ridership, Cecil County, since 2004

Source: Cecil County Transit

Public Bus Ridership, New Castle County, since 2000

Source: DTC
Develop a Complete and Safe Nonmotorized Transportation Network

Greenway progress (RTP)
Nonmotorized use analysis (RTP)
TIP funding trends (other)

The RTP called for the development of a complete and safe nonmotorized transportation network. Results here have been mixed. Steady progress has been made completing the East Coast Greenway in New Castle County. Bicycle crashes are trending downward across the region and the percentage of funding for multimodal and pedestrian/bike projects has clawed slowly upwards in recent TIPs. Moreover, as we show in this section, most of that funding (86%) is going to areas we identify as priorities for pedestrian improvements.

Still, as shown earlier, the percentage of commute trips made on foot has slid steadily over the past decades, and travel along Delaware highways is often not only uncomfortable, but downright unsafe for pedestrians.

Translating the emerging nonmotorized network into a functional and safe transportation network requires revisions to land development policy and rethinking the design and use of our highways.

TIP Funding Trends, since 1997

42 Source: WILMAPCO
Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Multimodal FY 2018 – 2021 TIP Projects vs. Prioritized Pedestrian Network\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{43} Source: WILMAPCO

2017 Regional Progress Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MD 222 Bridge over Rock Run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MD 272 Bridge over Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Valley Rd / Little Baltimore Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SR 2, Elkton Road: MD Line to Casho Mill Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SR 4: SR 2 - SR 896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Possum Park &amp; Old Possum Park Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 2/ Red Mill Road Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BR 191 on Milltown Rd over Mill Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Old Capital Trail: Newport Rd - Stanton Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 4 / Harmony Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR 4 / SR 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SR 273/ Chapman Road Intersection Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HSIP NCC, SR 273, Appleby Road to Airport Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SR 7: Newtown Road to SR 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BR 291 on Songsmith Dr over tributary to Smalley's Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>US 40 / SR 896 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>US 40 / SR 72 Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>US 40: Salem Church Rd - Walther Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Denny Rd / Lexington Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>HSIP NCC, NS4, Howell School Road, SR 896 to SR 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SR 72: McCoy Road - SR 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lorewood Grove Rd: Hyatts Corner - Lorewood Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jamison Corner Rd: Relocated to Boyds Corner Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Boyds Corner Rd: Cedar Lane to US 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR 299: SR 1 to Catherine Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>US 13: Duck Creek - SR 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>US 13: US 40 - Memorial Dr Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Wilmington Signal Improvements, Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4th St: Walnut St - I-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>King &amp; Orange Streets: MLK - 13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Walnut St: MLK to 13th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Wilmington Initiatives: Walnut Street: Front Street to 3rd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Wilmington Riverfront Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NCC Industrial Track Greenway, Phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Christina River Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Garasches Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Claymont Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Multimodal FY 2018 – 2021 TIP Spending by Pedestrian Prioritization Network Area Type

- **High**: 26%
- **Low**: 14%
- **Moderate**: 60%

East Coast Greenway Status in New Castle County

---

44 Source: WILMAPCO. To put these numbers in perspective, low priority stretches of roadway account for about 71% of roadway miles in the region. Moderate priority miles account for about 21%; high priority for 7%. Funding going towards moderate and high priority pedestrian areas is, therefore, more than triple what we would expect simply based on mileage. It is mostly being directed towards places with some clear pedestrian need.

45 Source: WILMAPCO
Percentage of Workers Commuting via Walking, since 1980\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\begin{axis}[
    width=\textwidth,
    height=0.5\textwidth,
    xlabel=Year,
    ylabel=Percentage,
    xmin=1980, xmax=2011, ymin=0, ymax=10,
    ytick={0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10},
    legend style={at={(0.5,0.5)},anchor=west},
]
\addplot[blue,mark=o] coordinates {
    (1980,5)
    (1990,4.5)
    (2000,3.5)
    (2011-15,2.5)
};
\addplot[orange,mark=x] coordinates {
    (1980,4)
    (1990,4)
    (2000,3)
    (2011-15,2)
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\addplot[yellow,mark=triangle] coordinates {
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    (1990,2)
    (2000,1.5)
    (2011-15,1)
};
\addplot[purple,mark=*] coordinates {
    (1980,2.5)
    (1990,2)
    (2000,1.5)
    (2011-15,1)
};
\legend{New Castle County,Cecil County,WILMAPCO region}
\end{axis}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{46} Source: ACS

Percentage of Workers Commuting via Bicycling, since 1990\textsuperscript{47}
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\addplot[blue,mark=o] coordinates {
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};
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};
\addplot[purple,mark=*] coordinates {
    (1990,0.1)
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\legend{New Castle County,Cecil County,WILMAPCO region}
\end{axis}
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{47} Source: ACS
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Pedestrian Crashes in Cecil County

- 2012: 44
- 2013: 36
- 2014: 26
- 2015: 26
- 2016: 38

Sources: SHA

Pedestrian Crashes in New Castle County

- 2012: 327
- 2013: 295
- 2014: 255
- 2015: 255
- 2016: 258

Sources: DSP

---

Source: SHA
Source: DSP
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GOAL: EFFICIENTLY TRANSPORT PEOPLE

Obj. 3: Engage the Public Via an Open Involvement Process

A public outreach participant in the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan

Actions

- Reach a wide and growing public audience
- Achieve an early, open, ongoing, and transparent public dialogue in all WILMAPCO projects
- Realize an inclusionary public participation process
Reach a Wide and Growing Public Audience

Transporter distribution (RTP)
Festival attendance (RTP)
Media attention (RTP)
Electronic reach (RTP)
Familiarity with WILMAPCO (RTP)

The RTP urged WILMAPCO to reach a wide and growing public audience. As demonstrated in the graphs below, we are trending in the right direction. Readership of both the hard copy “Transporter” newsletter and electronic newsletter has grown. Webpage hits and Facebook followers are also up. It remains to be seen, however, whether these better numbers can nudge up the percentage of residents who say they are familiar with WILMAPCO in our regional public opinion survey due in 2018.

"Transporter" Newsletter Readership, since 2008

Source: WILMAPCO. The analysis excludes recipients with a PO Box and those with a specific affiliation to an agency or community group.
Website Views, since 2011\textsuperscript{51}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Website Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>34,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-Newsletter Subscribers, since 2013\textsuperscript{52}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>E-Newsletter Subscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{51} Source: WILMAPCO.

\textsuperscript{52} Source: WILMAPCO.
Facebook Followers, since 2013\textsuperscript{53}


graph

Those Familiar with WILMAPCO, since 2007\textsuperscript{54}


graph

\textsuperscript{53} Source: WILMAPCO.
\textsuperscript{54} Source: WILMAPCO Public Opinion Surveys.
Achieve an early, open, ongoing, and transparent public dialogue in all WILMAPCO Projects

Review of public participation components of studies (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to foster strong community engagement in all projects. While this largely has been achieved, there is room for improvement. The matrix below assesses key aspirational outreach components, as documented in the Public Participation Plan, against each recent sub-regional study. Project managers were asked to assess how well their study met each of the outreach components – achieved (green), somewhat achieved (yellow), not achieved (red) or not relevant (gray).

Overall, our studies achieved most of the good public outreach components. Several measures, however, were not achieved. For example, specific outreach to support limited English proficient and low-literacy populations should have occurred with the North Claymont Plan, and both the Route 141 and Glasgow Avenue plans did not invite community representatives to sit on their steering or decision-making committees.
Realize an Inclusionary Public Participation Process

EJ/TJ Report (RTP)
Transporter distribution analysis (RTP)
Racial/ethnic makeup of PAC

The RTP challenged WILMAPCO to realize an inclusionary public participation process. Overall, this has been partially achieved.

Both the Environmental Justice (2013) Report, which examines the burdens carried by low-income and minority populations, and Transportation Justice (2015) Report, which examines the transportation needs of seniors, the disabled, and households without motorized vehicles, are up to date. These social justice initiatives feature both technical analyses of the transportation system, and recommendations for improved public outreach. A joint update of the EJ and TJ work is planned next year.

WILMAPCO’s refined focus on Environmental Justice, which began in 2008, has produced encouraging results from a public outreach perspective. When we first analyzed the readership of our “Transporter” newsletter within concentrations of low-income and minority neighborhoods, or EJ areas, a clear disparity emerged. Subscription rates in these places fell behind the regional average. Beginning around 2010, targeted public outreach occurred within EJ areas to help boost subscriptions. It worked. As shown below, while readership is up across the board, readership within EJ neighborhoods began outpacing the regional average beginning in 2013. The focused EJ outreach has also spawned successful Safe Routes to School Programs at Edison Charter, Elbert-Palmer, and Stubbs Elementary Schools, three low-income schools in Wilmington.

A separate initiative in 2013 introduced racial/ethnic and income response quotas for our regional public opinion telephone survey, which up until that point, was not collecting a representative sample of opinions from minority and lower income residents.

More work, however, is left undone. Efforts to diversify the racial and ethnic makeup of WILMAPCO’s Public Advisory Committee about a decade ago saw some success. As shown in the chart on the following page, the percentage of minority PAC members increased from just 4% of the body in 2006 to 18% in 2012. Today, however, only 15% of PAC members are from ethnic or racial minority groups. That figure that lags considerably behind the 36% of our region’s residents from those communities.
“Transporter” Newsletter Readership in EJ Areas, since 2008\textsuperscript{55}

![Graph showing percentage of readership]

Racial and Ethnic Minorities Represented on the Public Advisory Committee (PAC), since 2006\textsuperscript{56}

![Bar chart showing representation]

\textsuperscript{55} Source: WILMAPCO. The analysis excludes recipients with a PO Box and those with a specific affiliation to an agency or community group.

\textsuperscript{56} Source: WILMAPCO; Minority Population from American Community Survey (2015, 5-year estimates)
GOAL: SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOODS MOVEMENT

Obj. 1: Maximize our Investments

Actions

- Encourage increased density and future growth in Center and Core Transportation Investment Areas
- Use WILMAPCO’s approved project prioritization process to select projects for funding
- Create and support the implementation of sub-regional plans
- Support municipalities and existing communities
- Seek additional and innovative funding sources for transportation improvements
Encourage Increased Density and Future Growth in Center and Core TIAs

Household growth by TIA (RTP)
Employment growth by TIA
TIP spending by TIA (RTP)

The RTP seeks to encourage increased density and future growth within Center and Core Transportation Investment Areas (TIAs). These places roughly follow the I-95 corridor through our region. As shown in the “Core Trends” section at the beginning of this document, this has proven difficult to achieve.

While most of our region’s households (78%) and jobs (88%) are located within Center and Core TIAs, they are only expected to capture about half of household and employment growth through 2040. And, as shown in the graphs below, differences emerge by county.

New Castle County is projected to experience weak employment and household growth within its Center and Core TIAs. While over 91% of jobs are found in these places today, only 12% of new jobs over the next two decades are expected to locate there. Further, while 84% of New Castle County’s households are in Center and Core TIAs, they are expected to only receive a 57% share of the household growth through 2040. Both employment and households are expected to continue growing at a much faster rate outside of Center and Core TIAs.

New Castle County Employment and Households within Center and Core TIAs in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>Overall share in 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected share of GROWTH through 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>Overall share in 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected share of GROWTH through 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WILMAPCO.
Cecil County Employment and Households within Center and Core TIAs in 2017

**EMPLOYMENT**

Overall share in 2017: 66%

Projected GROWTH through 2040: 69%

**HOUSEHOLDS**

Overall share in 2017: 45%

Projected GROWTH through 2040: 51%

In the less dense and more rural Cecil County, the situation is reversed. There, Center and Core TIAs are expected to capture a slightly higher proportion (relative to their existing share) of job and household growth through 2040, which is a positive trend.

While Core TIAs have consistently received the bulk of planned transportation spending, heavy recent spending in Rural and Developing TIAs (namely related to the US 301 Expressway project) can be identified. The transportation upgrades, in turn, encourage further development and population growth outside of the I-95 corridor.

---

58 Source: WILMAPCO.
Perhaps hardest hit by this pattern is our Center TIAs, Newark and Wilmington, in New Castle County. While home to the most job and population density in the region, little growth is expected in the cities through 2040. Only 2,400 new households are expected to form (a 6% increase) with a shade over 100 new jobs (0% increase).

These figures can be compared to those in Rural TIAs, with fewer people and jobs, where growth is supposed to be discouraged. There, over 5,000 new households are expected through 2040 (a 32% increase) and 600 new jobs (a 4% increase). Perhaps not surprisingly, and partially in response to past and projected growth, planned transportation spending in Rural TIAs is more than double that of Center TIAs.

59 Source: WILMAPCO. $ x 1,000.
Demographic Projections and TIP Spending in Center and Rural TIAs

NEW CASTLE COUNTY, 2017-2040

6% more households
0% more jobs

32% more households
4% more jobs

CECIL COUNTY, 2017-2040

24% more households
19% more jobs

32% more households
23% more jobs

AVERAGE TIP SPENDING SINCE FY 2010 (REGIONAL)

$214 million

$461 million

Use WILMAPCO’s Approved Project Prioritization Process to Select Projects for Funding

Prioritization versus eventual funding (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to use our approved project prioritization process in selecting projects for funding. While the approved prioritization exercise is utilized with each TIP, many high-scoring projects remain on the shelf while even more lower-scoring projects have received funding.

The WILMAPCO prioritization process is centered around a geographically based, largely qualitative analysis of the project's ability to realize the goals of the RTP. Projects located in congested corridors, areas of heavy freight and transit movement, Environmental and Transportation Justice neighborhoods, and several other measures receive points in the analysis. This technical analysis informs, but does not serve as

60 Source: WILMAPCO.
61 See: http://www.wilmapco.org/priority
the ultimate prioritized ranking of the projects. Because of the ambiguity of other parts of our prioritization process – such as the priority given by a project’s sponsoring agency and “special considerations” that ultimately may influence their ranking – it is difficult to measure how successfully we have met this measure.

An analysis can be done of project technical scores and the projects that found their way into and out of the TIP, our mechanism for assigning funding to projects. Of the 37 projects in the FY 2018-21 TIP, the median technical score was 12, with 18 funded projects scoring under 12. We actively track 46 other unfunded projects not currently in the TIP that were in a recent TIP. Of those 46 projects, one-third (15) have earned technical scores over 12. Most of these projects are bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects.

Projects in the FY 2018 TIP vs Unfunded Projects in a Previous TIP[^62]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Score</th>
<th>FY 2018 TIP</th>
<th>Unfunded Projects in a Previous TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Median</td>
<td>18 funded projects</td>
<td>15 unfunded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Median</td>
<td>18 funded projects</td>
<td>15 unfunded projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the percentage of funding for bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects has inched up in the current TIP, this analysis shows that many high-scoring transportation projects remain shelved. While occasionally low-scoring projects may be of special interest to a sponsoring agency (almost always DelDOT), and should be bumped up in the process as intended, the large number of these projects compared to high-scoring projects on the shelf suggests that WILMAPCO’s technical scoring is not informing project selection.

High-scoring unfunded projects ought to be considered strongly for adding into the next TIP. Additionally, the technical scoring analysis should be updated and re-applied to the dozens of other unfunded aspirational projects in the RTP, which never made it into a TIP. High-scoring projects on that list should be considered as equally strong for funding.

[^62]: Source: WILMAPCO.
Create and Support the Implementation of Sub-Regional Plans

Qualitative review of Unified Plan Work Program (RTP) Implementation progress (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to create and support the implementation of sub-regional plans. This has largely been accomplished. After a plan is endorsed by the WILMAPCO Council, staff assists with its implementation by relevant agencies though technical support.

A scan of our current Unified Planning Work Program reveals that since 1995, the agency has created at least 40 corridor and community plans. As shown in the graph and detailed table below, most have proceeded to at least some stage of implementation. Only 7 plans (18%) have seen no progress towards implementation, coded as “P0.” Conversely, 8 plans (P5, 20%) are mostly or fully implemented. Most WILMAPCO sub-regional plans (P2, P3, and P4 - 63%) have seen some level of implementation already, with more needed.

Implementation Status of WILMAPCO Sub-Regional Plans, Summary

63 Source: WILMAPCO. P0 = No progress; P1 = Minor project Project Development (PD) or Project Engineering (PE) funding identified in TIP; P2 = Minor project(s) Construction © funding identified or major project(s) PD or PE funding identified; P3 = Some policy change realized and/or minor project(s) fully constructed and/or major project(s) C funding identified; P4 = Major project(s) fully constructed; P5 = Plan mostly implemented; most recommended projects/programs/policy changes fully constructed or realized.
### Implementation Status of WILMAPCO Sub-Regional Plans, Detail 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year Adopted</th>
<th>P0</th>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>P5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churchmans Crossing Implementation (ongoing)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Mobility Friendly Design Standards</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of New Castle Transportation Plan</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centreville Village Plan</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Coast Greenway</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle County Greenway Plan</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler McConnell Bridge</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claymont Transportation Plan</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claymont Regional Transportation Center</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbridge Circulation Study</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington Bicycle Plan</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware City Transportation Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Chesapeake City Parking Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County Transit Study</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Avenue/11th/12th Streets Curve Study</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Newark Planning (Transportation/Traffic Calming/Bike Plan)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 301</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Elkton TOD Feasibility Study</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Elkton Bike Plan</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Wilmington Circulation Study</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Susquehanna Heritage Greenways Management Plan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County Bicycle Plan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Perryville Greenway Plan</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Perryville Transit Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Regional Transportation Center</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington Initiatives Implementation (ongoing)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Port Deposit Transit Feasibility Study</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington Transit Moving Forward</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 40 Corridor Improvements, New Castle Co. (ongoing)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of North East Transportation and Land Use Maps Update</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of North East Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Marshallton Circulation Study</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil County Route 40 Program Development Support</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Clay Valley Scenic Byway Standards</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 141 Land Use and Transportation Plan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardentown Paths Plan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Claymont Area Master Plan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9 Corridor Master Plan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow Avenue Planning Study</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 Source: WILMAPCO. P0 = No progress; P1 = Minor project Project Development (PD) or Project Engineering (PE) funding identified in TIP; P2 = Minor project(s) Construction © funding identified or major project(s) PD or PE funding identified; P3 = Some policy change realized and/or minor project(s) fully constructed and/or major project(s) C funding identified; P4 = Major project(s) fully constructed; P5 = Plan mostly implemented; most recommended projects/programs/policy changes fully constructed or realized.
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Support Municipalities and Existing Communities

Qualitative review of Unified Plan Work Program (RTP)
Summarize transportation recommendations within comprehensive plans (Other)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to support municipalities and existing communities. This has largely been accomplished through the previous successful action – creating and supporting the implementation of sub-regional plans. WILMAPCO’s leadership on both Wilmington Initiatives and the South Wilmington Planning Network have provided an extra layer of ongoing project implementation support to our largest city. Staff has provided extra support to the City of Newark as well, through our support of Bike Newark and the traffic committee. Additionally, we have also supported Claymont in the implementation of its plans, as well as the City of New Castle’s parking subcommittee.

Transportation-related recommendations from comprehensive plans across the region are summarized in the Appendix. We keep this list current with each progress report to maintain a list of the transportation aspirations at the local level.

Seek Additional and Innovative Funding Sources for Transportation Improvements

Capital funding available versus alternative funding sources secured (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to seek additional and innovative funding sources for transportation improvements. We have met this charge though helping to acquire major alternative grant funding for four significant projects. Both the Newark Regional Transportation Center and Claymont Train Station projects were awarded competitive TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) funding – $12.25 million for Newark and $10 million for Claymont. WILMAPCO helped show that each project was of national interest to obtain the grants. WILMAPCO supported securing mostly private investment to construct the Wilmington Transit Center (a $18 million project) and $159 million in private bond investment to support the US 301 Expressway.
GOAL: SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOODS MOVEMENT

Obj. 2: Develop Effective Transportation Networks

Actions

- Manage congestion
- Streamline freight movement
- Enhance intermodal systems connectivity
- Promote seamless interregional travel
Manage Congestion

Complete Congestion Management Process (RTP)
Integrate CMP into the Transportation Improvement Program (RTP)

Free flowing traffic facilitates economic development. Each year, WILMAPCO identifies the region’s most congested traffic corridors through our Congestion Management Process. Transportation projects within these corridors receive extra points in our project prioritization process to help speed their implementation.

The map below shows our congested corridors, which we call our Congestion Management System (CMS) corridors, and the planned/funded projects that fall within them. As shown, more than $244 million in spending between FY 2018 and FY 2021 has been set aside to complete 30 management and expansion projects within these corridors. These projects are mostly road projects - rebuilds of intersections and new road and bridges - but also include enhancements for people walking and bicycling, and improvements to the commuter rail system.

All but two of the eleven CMS corridors has at least one management and expansion project funded through FY 2021. The corridors that do not are SR 7 in New Castle County and MD 213 in Cecil County. More consideration should be given to projects within these corridors to help alleviate congestion.
## FY 2018-2021 TIP Management and Expansion Projects in Congested Corridors

### Map ID | CMS Corridor Name | Project Details | FY 2018-2021
--- | --- | --- | ---
1 | Del. 2, Elkton Rd | SR 2, Elkton Road: MD Line to Casto Mill Rd | $26.7 M
2 | Del. 2, Elkton Rd | SR 4: SR 2 - SR 896 | $988 K
3 | Del. 2, Elkton Rd, SR4/Churchmans Rd, SR 48 | Third Rail Track Expansion, Newark - Wilmington | $22.4 M
4 | SR 896 | I-95 & SR 896 Interchange | $4.6 M
5 | SR 896 | US 40 / SR 896 Interchange | $5.6 M
6 | SR 896 | Denny Rd / Lexington Parkway | $250 K
7 | SR 896 | HSIP NCC, N54, Howell School Road, SR 896 to SR 71 | $4.5 M
8 | US 40 | US 40 / SR 72 Interchange | $15.5 M
9 | US 40 | US 40: Salem Church Rd - Walton Rd | $4.6 M
10 | US 40 | US 40 / SR 7 Intersection | $0
11 | SR 273, SR 896 | SR 1: Roth Bridge to SR 273 | $3.5 M
12 | SR 273 | SR 7: Newtown Road to SR 273 | $121 K
13 | SR 273 | HSIP NCC, SR 273, Appleby Road to Airport Road | $9.5 M
14 | SR 273 | Road A/ SR 7 | $12.9 M
15 | SR 273 | SR 273/Chapman Road Intersection Improvements | $2.3 M
16 | SR4/Churchmans Rd | SR 4 / Harmony Rd | $250 K
17 | Kirkwood Highway | SR 2 / Red Mill Road Intersection | $10.4 M
18 | SR4/Churchmans Rd | Fairplay Train Station (Churchmans Crossing) Elevator | $14 K
19 | SR4/Churchmans Rd | SR 4 / SR 7 | $300 K
21 | US 13 | I-295 Improvements | $7.0 M
22 | SR 48, US 13 | Wilmington Riverfront Program | $722 K
23 | US 13 | Christina River Bridge | $69 M
24 | US 13 | Garasches Lane | $3.3 M
25 | SR 48 | Wilmington Transit Center/ Christiana Crescent Elevators/ Riverfront Deck Repairs | $18.8 M
26 | SR 48 | Wilmington Initiatives: Walnut Street: Front Street to 3rd Street | $2.4 M
27 | SR 48, SR 52 | Walnut St: MLK to 13th St. | $2.0 M
28 | SR 48, SR 52 | King & Orange Streets: MLK - 3rd | $6.2 M
29 | SR 48 | 4th St. Walnut St - I-95 | $750 K
30 | SR 48, SR 52, US 202 | Wilmington Signal Improvements, Phase II | $500 K

---

**65 Source:** WILMAPCO.
Streamline Freight Movement

Maintain a freight plan (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to help support streamlined freight movement. Ten years ago, WILMAPCO produced a regional Freight Plan, in which freight traffic bottlenecks were identified. In the year since, we have improved data collection efforts and have developed a better understanding of regional freight patterns through studies such as the Chesapeake Connector Study, the Delmarva Freight Study, and the Supply Chain Analysis.

Our identified freight bottlenecks are ultimately featured in our project prioritization process. Proposed projects located within the bottlenecks receive points to help streamline their implementation.

A map of the current freight bottlenecks and management and expansion TIP projects within them are found below. Many of the bottlenecks have active projects, while others do not. Identified bottlenecks without project should be considered strongly for future projects which would enhance freight movement within their corridors.
Source: WILMAPCO. In WILMAPCO’s 2007 freight and goods movement report [http://www.wilmapco.org/wilmapco-freight-goods-movement](http://www.wilmapco.org/wilmapco-freight-goods-movement) a scoring index was developed to identify freight bottlenecks along our highways. The scoring criteria used include: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), Volume/Capacity (V/C), Travel Time (Percent Below Posted Speed), Average Daily Truck Percentage, Daily Truck Generation by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ), and Aggregate Crash Score. Each road segment was then scored and categorized as: Significant (2.0+), Moderate (1.5-2.0), and Minor (1.01-1.5). The freight bottlenecks shown on this map represent significant and moderate bottlenecks using updated data.
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FY 2018-2021 TIP Management and Expansion Projects in Freight Bottlenecks

| MAP ID | Freight Bottleneck Name | Project Description | FY 2018-2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-95 (Stateline to SR 7), and</td>
<td>Third Rail Track Expansion, Newark - Wilmington</td>
<td>$22.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>US 301 (I-95 to US 40)</td>
<td>I-95 &amp; SR 896 Interchange</td>
<td>$4.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>US 301 (I-95 to US 40)</td>
<td>US 40 / SR 896 Interchange</td>
<td>$5.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>US 301 (SR 896 to Middletown)</td>
<td>US 301: Maryland Line to SR 1</td>
<td>$281 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US 301 (SR 896 to Middletown)</td>
<td>Middletown Park and Ride</td>
<td>$3.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SR 7 (I-95 to SR 273)</td>
<td>SR 1: Roth Bridge to SR 273</td>
<td>$3.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SR 7 (I-95 to SR 273)</td>
<td>SR 7: Newtown Road to SR 273</td>
<td>$121 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-95 (Stateline to SR 7)</td>
<td>SR 273/Chapman Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-95 (Stateline to SR 7), and</td>
<td>Road A/SR 7</td>
<td>$12.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SR 7 (SR 4)</td>
<td>SR 4 / SR 7</td>
<td>$300 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SR 141 (SR 4 to US 13)</td>
<td>SR 141: I-95 - Jay Dr</td>
<td>$463.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>US 13 (I-495 to US 40)</td>
<td>US 13: US 40 - Memorial Dr Pedestrian</td>
<td>$7.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-295</td>
<td>I-295 Improvements</td>
<td>$7.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I-95 (SR 48 to I-495)</td>
<td>NCC Industrial Track Greenway, Phase III</td>
<td>$16.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I-95 (SR 48 to I-495)</td>
<td>Wilmington Riverfront Program</td>
<td>$722 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I-95 (SR 48 to I-495)</td>
<td>Christina River Bridge</td>
<td>$69.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Walnut Street</td>
<td>Walnut St: MLK to 13th St.</td>
<td>$2.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Walnut Street</td>
<td>Wilmington Initiatives: Walnut Street: Front Street to 3rd Street</td>
<td>$2.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Walnut Street</td>
<td>King &amp; Orange Streets: MLK - 13th</td>
<td>$6.2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Wilmington Signal Improvements, Phase II</td>
<td>$500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-495 (I-95 to US 13)</td>
<td>Claymont Sidewalks</td>
<td>$1.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I-495 (I-95 to US 13)</td>
<td>Claymont Train Station</td>
<td>$49.8 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhance Intermodal Systems Connectivity

Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to enhance intermodal systems connectivity. This has been largely accomplished through sub-regional planning studies. In the Route 9 Corridor Master Plan, for example, new road and highway connections to the Port of Wilmington were proposed to streamline current and future freight movement. Other key regional studies, such as the Chesapeake Connector Study, the Delmarva Freight Study, and our

67 Source: WILMAPCO. In WILMAPCO’s 2007 freight and goods movement report (http://www.wilmapco.org/wilmapco-freight-goods-movement) a scoring index was developed to identify freight bottlenecks along our highways. The scoring criteria used include: Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), Volume/ Capacity (V/C), Travel Time (Percent Below Posted Speed), Average Daily Truck Percentage, Daily Truck Generation by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ), and Aggregate Crash Score. Each road segment was then scored and categorized as: Significant (2.0+), Moderate (1.5-2.0), and Minor (1.01-1.5). The freight bottlenecks shown on this map represent significant and moderate bottlenecks using updated data.
Supply Chain Analysis all promote intermodal systems connectivity.

**Promote Seamless Interregional Travel**

Maintain an interregional plan (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to promote seamless travel between and through the Wilmington region to neighboring regions, such as Philadelphia and Baltimore.

We have accomplished this through maintaining an Interregional Report. Updated about every four years, the report is a broad demographic and traffic survey of the WILMAPCO region and beyond. It identifies major interregional corridors, and lists the planned transportation projects of significance for interregional travel. The Interregional Report was last updated in 2012; a new report is expected by next year.

The map below provides a status update to major transportation projects identified in the previous Interregional Report. Each of the projects identified in New Castle County have been completed, are funded, or, in the case of an SR 7 widening project, have been removed from consideration. In the other surrounding counties, most of the projects are still planned but without funding.
2017 Status of Major Interregional Projects and Studies

Source: WILMAPCO, DVRPC, NJDOT, Chester County, PA.
GOAL: SUPPORT SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GOODS MOVEMENT

Obj. 3: Plan for Energy Security and Climate Change

An electric vehicle charging station at the I-95 rest stop in Delaware

Actions

- Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled
- Support cleaner vehicle infrastructure
- Understand and adapt to sea level rise
Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled

Per capita VMT (RTP)

The RTP aspires to reduce the amount of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), regionally. As shown on the graph below, the typical household in the WILMAPCO region clocks more VMT than the national average. Per capita VMT has been falling steadily in Cecil County since the Great Recession a decade ago. It is projected to increase again in the 2020s. Meanwhile, per capita VMT in New Castle County began increasing in 2012 and is projected to continue doing so through 2040.

**USA Average**

Unchecked suburban sprawl and relatively low fuel prices are behind the rise in VMT. Encouraging a denser development pattern while simultaneously transitioning to a direct tax on VMT and providing alternative transportation options will help reverse these trends.

*Average Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled by Household, Since 2000*69

---

69 Sources: DelDOT, SHA, FHWA, ACS
Support Cleaner Vehicle Infrastructure

Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)
% of private clean fuel fleet (RTP)

The RTP directs WILMAPCO to support the deployment of cleaner vehicle infrastructure. We have accomplished this action. In 2014, WILMAPCO developed a methodology and report to help support the implementation of electric vehicle charging stations. The report was key in securing grant funds to implement Elkton's first public charging station. Additionally, we have coordinated with DNREC and Electrify America to help bring additional propane and electric charging stations to the Wilmington area.

As shown in the graph below, public EV charging infrastructure is starting to slowly take seed. Today, there are 11 public charging stations across the region, compared to only two in 2012. While almost certainly on the rise, data showing the percentage of our clean fuel vehicle fleet was unavailable.

Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations in the WILMAPCO Region, Since 2012

70 Source: Alternative Fuels Data Center
Understand and Adapt to Sea Level Rise

Qualitative review of UPWP (RTP)
Vulnerability assessment of infrastructure and planned projects (RTP)

The RTP asks WILMAPCO to understand and adapt to Sea Level Rise (SLR). We have met this charge. In 2011, we became one of the first Metropolitan Planning Organizations to assess the vulnerability of transportation infrastructure and planned projects to SLR. In the years since, the work has informed both national and state-level dialogues about SLR adaptation. Our SLR vulnerability assessment will be updated in time when fresh SLR from the State of Delaware is released.

In the meantime, the map and table below illustrates the 20 funded projects which may be challenged by SLR. Half of these projects are in the City of Wilmington, mostly in the Riverfront and South Wilmington districts. These projects should receive a closer examination for potential SLR mitigation measures – such as reconstructing a roadway or railway to a higher elevation, strengthening the foundations of a bridge, rethinking the long-term routing of a bus line – and/or being rethought entirely as projects.
Funded TIP Projects Potentially Challenged by Sea Level Rise

Source: WILMAPCO, Towson University, DNREC, SHA, DelDOT
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### Funded TIP Projects Potentially Challenged by Sea Level Rise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>FY 2018-2021</th>
<th>Level Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MD 222 Bridge over Rock Run</td>
<td>$38 K</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Susquehanna River Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$0.5 M</td>
<td>2 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Rail Track Expansion, Newark - Wilmington</td>
<td>$22 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interstate Maintenance</td>
<td>$9 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SR 9, River Road Flood Remediation</td>
<td>$1.2 M</td>
<td>1.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BR 302 over Toms Creek and BR 304 over Gamble Gut on SR 9</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BR 308 on Clarks Corner Rd over Dragon Run</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>US 13: Duck Creek - SR 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wilmington Signal Improvements, Phase II</td>
<td>$0.5 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of I-95 from I-495 to North of Brandywine River Bridge</td>
<td>$91 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wilmington Initiatives: Walnut Street: Front Street to 3rd Street</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
<td>1.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Walnut St: MLK to 13th St</td>
<td>$2 M</td>
<td>1.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wilmington Transit Center/ Christiana Crescent Elevators/ Riverfront Deck Repairs</td>
<td>$19 M</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wilmington Riverfront Program</td>
<td>$0.7 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Garasches Lane</td>
<td>$5.2 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NCC Industrial Track Greenway, Phase III</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christina River Bridge</td>
<td>$69 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>BR 686, S. Walnut St over NS Rail</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Claymont Sidewalks</td>
<td>$1.5 M</td>
<td>0.5 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Summary of Transportation Recommendations in Comprehensive Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Transportation Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cecil County</strong> (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Pop. 103,828</td>
<td>Pop. Projections 129,996 (2020) 154,954 (2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Widen I-95 through Cecil County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Upgrade MD 213 from US 40 to Frenchtown Rd. to 4 lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Upgrade MD 272 from US 40 to Lums Rd. to 4 lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Complete I-10/North-South connection between MD 7 and US 40 to serve mixed use employment area west of Elkton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Continue general bridge rehabilitation and replacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| New Castle County (2012) | | |
| | 1. Improve designated roadways as shown in the WILMAPCO 2040 Regional Transportation Plan | 1. Coordination with DeDOT and DART to identify bus stop and Park and Ride facilities in development review process | 1. Revise the UDC to improve walkability and interconnectivity and support mobility friendly development and design |
| | | 2. Participate in articulating transportation investment priorities that ensure concurrent delivery of services | 2. Promote walking and bicycling by enhancing pedestrian and bicycle connections in the county |
| | | 3. Encourage expansion of commuter rail system by encouraging transit supportive density | 3. Coordinate with DeDOT in producing a statewide pedestrian action plan |
### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Pop.</th>
<th>Pop. Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elkton</td>
<td>15,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,277 (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,079 (2030)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Roadways to be Improved/Studied</th>
<th>Transit Needs</th>
<th>Bike/Ped Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construct northern loop road around Elkton from MD 781 to MD 379.</td>
<td>1. Support expansion of MARC, SEPTA and bus transit service</td>
<td>1. Include right-of-way for bicycles in road widening plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intersection upgrade at US 40 and MD 213</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Install sidewalks on MD 213 between US 40 and MD 279 and along MD 7 from US 40 to Main St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extension of Chesapeake Boulevard to Frenchtown Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bicycle improvement projects as outlined by MDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Divided 2 to 4 lanes on MD 213 from US 40 to Frenchtown Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Support development of East Coast Greenway and Mason Dixon Trail plans and create a trail network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highway reconstruction projects as outlined by MDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Ensure multiple safe crossings across US 40, MD 213 and MD 279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Pop.</th>
<th>Pop. Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington (Various years)</td>
<td>70,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71,727 (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70,446 (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,037 (2030)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Roadways to be Improved/Studied</th>
<th>Transit Needs</th>
<th>Bike/Ped Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Link 23rd and 25th St. as part of any future development of the B &amp; O area</td>
<td>1. Realign all bus stops located along regular routes in West Center City, the East Side, Riverside, and the Northwest</td>
<td>1. Develop a City-wide bike route plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apply ITS to Delaware Ave., West 4th St., West 2nd St., Washington St. and MLK through West Center City</td>
<td>2. Augment Saturday and Sunday bus service</td>
<td>2. Coordinate with the East Coast Greenway Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change direction of 6th St. to westbound between King St. and either Adams or Jackson St.</td>
<td>3. Establish an unlimited ride monthly pass program with CBD employers to improve mobility within the CBD during the workday</td>
<td>3. Conduct a traffic engineering analysis of the Lee Blvd., Talbott St., Shiloh St. and West Park Dr. intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Change the direction of 5th St. to eastbound between King and Monroe St.</td>
<td>4. Improve access to the Train Station</td>
<td>4. Improve signage for westbound traffic on 4th St. at Union St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Change direction of Windsor St. to southbound between 8th and 9th St.</td>
<td>5. Enhance streetscape of Northern Wilmington, West 4th and East 4th Streets in the East Side</td>
<td>5. Upgrade curbs, traffic control &quot;A&quot; St. between Nead and Market St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improve signage for westbound traffic on 4th St. at Union St.</td>
<td>6. Implement alternative east-west routes to downtown Wilmington</td>
<td>6. Implement alternative east-west routes to downtown Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implement alternative east-west routes to downtown Wilmington</td>
<td>7. Establish Transit On-Patrol neighborhood watch program</td>
<td>7. Improve access to the Train Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Implement alternative east-west routes to downtown Wilmington</td>
<td>8. Increase enforcement of Traffic and Parking regulations in Riverside and Price's Run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Establish Transit On-Patrol neighborhood watch program</td>
<td>9. Implement the West Center City portion of the Delaware Avenue Project Phase I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish Transit On-Patrol neighborhood watch program</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Develop a City-wide bike route plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Increase enforcement of Traffic and Parking regulations in Riverside and Price's Run</td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Coordinate with the East Coast Greenway Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implement the West Center City portion of the Delaware Avenue Project Phase I</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Conduct a traffic engineering analysis of the Lee Blvd., Talbott St., Shiloh St. and West Park Dr. intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Regional Progress Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Transportation Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 Pop.</td>
<td>Pcp. Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bellefonte</strong> (2007)</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,361 (2010) 1,492 (2020) 1,567 (2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delaware City</strong> (2014)</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>2,053 (2010) 2,372 (2020) 2,616 (2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clayton</strong> (2008)</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,415 (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middletown</strong> (2012)</td>
<td>18,671</td>
<td>23,000-33,000 (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Transportation Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 Pop.  Pop. Projections</td>
<td>Key Roadways to be Improved/Studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Castle</strong></td>
<td>5,285</td>
<td>5,530 (2010) 6,324 (2020) 6,694 (2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Transportation Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Roadways to be Improved/Studied</td>
<td>Transit Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 Pop.</td>
<td>Pop. Projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newport (2014)</strong></td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>343 (2030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smyrna (2006)</strong></td>
<td>10,023</td>
<td>8,813 (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,237 (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,079 (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Townsend (2016)</strong></td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Transportation Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2010 Pop.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pop. Projections</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cecilton     | 663 | 641 (2010) | 673 (2020) | 800 (2030) | 1. Extend Center St. to Douglas Ln. to form connection to MD 213  
2. Traffic calming devices on MD 213 at north and south entrances to town  
3. If dualization of MD 213 occurs, consider a boulevard concept that is compatible with growth patterns | 1. Proposed greenbelt system surrounding growth areas, anchored by Cecilton Park and Cecilton Elem. School  
2. Consider bike link from MD 282 to MD 213 via Cecilton Park  
3. Provide safe ped. links to and from Cecilton Elem. School  
4. Implement network of ped. trails and greenways  
5. Improve sidewalks |
| Charlestown  | 1,103 | 1,103 | | | 1. Increase route choices by providing for additional access to Route 40  
1. Improve pedestrian connectivity to activity centers (e.g., waterfront, town hall, recreation areas, shopping)  
2. Recommended pedestrian link between the subdivisions Scott Gardens, Trinity Woods, and Cool Springs |
| Chesapeake City | 673 | 900 (2010) | 1,040 (2020) | 1. Add southern route to Eldredge St.  
2. Add roundabout at Lock and Hemphill Streets  
3. Add connection to Boat Yard Rd.  
4. Extends Hemphill Street eastward to provide direct access to Rt. 213  
5. Access management along Rt. 213  
6. Traffic study to identify improvements needed for Boat Yard Rd., Eldredge St., & Lock St. | 1. Add bus service to Eldon if commuter rail is re-introduced to Eldon  
1. Develop town-wide trail network plan  
2. Require that roads in growth areas include bike and ped. facilities  
3. Include bike lanes along Hemphill Rd. & Bridgeview Dr. extension  
4. Sidewalk study  
5. Expand C&D Canal greenway |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Transportation Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| North East      |              | 1. Reconstruct MD 272 bridge over Amtrak line.  
2. MD 7 from east Charlestown to MD 272. MD 7: Ridgely Forest impacts. A Traffic Signal Warrant Study at the MD 7/Mechanics Valley Road-Cemetery Road intersection.  
3. MD 272 from the north end of the culvert in the North East to Lums Rd.  
4. US 43 from MD 272 to the DE line.  
5. Reconstruction of East Cecil Avenue. |
| Perryville      |              | 1. Create an improved access road that bears off to the left from IKEA Way and continues across Mill Creek to the Perryville Community Park.  
2. Create a Riverfront loop system beginning on Broad St. at MD 222.  
3. Resurface Broad St., Construct New River Rd.  
4. New access street where current municipal driveway is located.  
5. Extension of Country Boulevard across US 40 to MD 222.  
6. Preserve a right-of-way, redirect MD 222, and extend AIken Ave to 4 lanes to better handle traffic at the MD 222/US 40 intersection.  
7. Widened and extend Front St. to Susquehanna Ave.  
8. Connect the west ends of Franklin and Charles Streets. |
| Port Deposit    | 653          | 1. 3000 slot machine casino on the west side of MD 275 will generate large amounts of traffic in the area. |
| Rising Sun      | 2.781        | 1. Control truck traffic on MD 274, possibly by diverting traffic from MD 274 to US 1 on an alternative route.  
2. Secure a “roundabout” intersection at MD 1 and N. Walnut St.  
3. Develop outer loop system to divert east and westbound traffic on MD 273.  
4. Investigate issues with the intersection at MD 273 and 274. |
|                 | 1,313 (2010) | 1. Cooperate with the state to plan and provide possible “park and ride” facilities. |
|                 | 2,106 (2020) | 1. Cooperate with the state to plan and provide possible “park and ride” facilities. |
|                 | 2,522 (2030) | 1. Cooperate with the state to plan and provide possible “park and ride” facilities. |
|                 |              | 1. Bike route from I95 underpass, Frenchtown Road to MD 222.  
2. Bike route along MD 222 to Main Street Plant Deposit.  
3. Bike route alternative from MD 222 connect with old access road to Tomes School for Boys.  
5. Amend Port Deposit Subdivision regulations to incorporate design guidelines for sidewalks. |
## Summary of Transportation Recommendations in Sustainable Community Action Plans in Cecil County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Transportation Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cecil (2016)   | 1. Implement safety crosswalk signals and acquire school crossing guards for key locations such as the intersection of MD 213 and MD 282.  
2. Create a bicycle link from MD 282 to MD 213 by way of the Town Park.  
3. Reduce volume and speed of truck traffic on MD 213. |
| Charlestown (2017) | 1. Create a colonial traffic circle at the Firehouse corner including a landscaped circle and statue, possibly as a community safety enhancement project.  
2. Incorporate traffic calming measures into street improvements and safer walking and driving routes to the elementary school.  
3. Add crosswalks with signs, and use town land to develop parking area.  
4. Add period street lighting and provide for a walkable streetscape in the historic district.  
5. Use greenways and trails to connect open space and parks, including trails to Peddies Creek and all parks. |
| Chesapeake City (2012) | 1. Repair 18 segments of sidewalk that were identified in the Revitalization Plan.  
2. Implement 8 phases of walking and biking trails that were identified in the Revitalization Plan.  
3. Acquire bike racks and install at key locations throughout the Town.  
4. Improve existing parking areas in the Village Centers and develop additional parking areas.  
5. Improve bicycle amenities, such as bike lanes, off road trails, and bike racks, plus explore a bike share program.  
6. Work in cooperation with Elkton, Cecil County, WILMAPCO, etc. to re-introduce rail service in Elkton. |
| Elkton (2017)   | 1. Extend MARC passenger rail service to Elkton.  
2. Construct a multi-modal transit center.  
3. Construct Phase II streetscape on North Street and Railroad Avenue to establish the “Train to Main” pedestrian link.  
4. Implement the prioritized pedestrian and ADA improvements recommended in the Elkton Pedestrian Plan.  
5. Construct improvements to sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure.  
6. Improve public and private parking lots. |
| North East (2014) | 1. Implement streetscape improvements, narrow traffic lanes, median refuges, bulb-outs, accessible pedestrian/countdown signals where applicable, pedestrian-scale lighting, wayfinding signage, ADA-compliant sidewalks, and designs to promote regional and local mobility and connectivity.  
2. Redesign roads to accommodate multiple modes of transportation.  
3. Provide a continuous network of sidewalks.  
4. Relocate Cecil Transit and Greyhound in conjunction with development of TOD Station Area 2.  
5. Construct parking lots for increased bus ridership.  
6. Rebuild the Rolling Mill Bridge with accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians.  
7. Construct the proposed transit hub with covered bicycle spaces, secure racks and lockers for bicyclists. |
2. Invest in additional parking for businesses and MARC commuter rail.  
3. Install bus shelters at transit stops.  
4. Add bike racks and bike lanes.  
5. Expand Greenway trails and sidewalks.  
6. Develop trail connections and work with LSHG and MDOT on the Susquehanna River pedestrian/bike crossing. |
| Port Deposit (2012) | 1. Implement streetscaping improvements to provide ADA curbs and sidewalks.  
2. Decrease the number of utility poles obstructing pathways.  
3. Identify MD 222 as a “Share the Road” and/or “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” designation.  
4. Create parking spaces for bikes and install bike racks.  
5. Install “Share the Road” and “Dangerous Curve” signs. |
| Rising Sun (2014) | 1. Invest in streetscaping, parking, sidewalks, lighting, and trails.  
2. Complete a series of connecting pedestrian pathways and bike trails between parks and surrounding neighborhoods.  
3. Incorporate bike racks and provide a comfort station at the bike trail near the Volunteer Fire Department site.  
4. Expand sidewalks along Hopewell Road.  
5. Explore shared parking in the downtown area.  
6. Explore the feasibility of providing transit services to Cecil College and County employment areas. |
## Summary of Transportation Recommendations in 2017 Priority Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cecil County (2017)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implement a new I-95 interchange in the area of Belvidere Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhance I-95 and US 40 toll discounts for Cecil County residents and businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Widen MD 272 to four lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks between US 40 and I-95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Examine potential improvements to MD 222 between US 40 and MD 275 to enhance vehicular LOS and to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extend MARC Penn Line commuter rail service from Perryville to connect with SEPTA Wilmington/Newark line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Extend SEPTA Wilmington/Newark line regional rail service from Newark to Elkton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implement fixed-route transit service between Newark and Aberdeen until the commuter rail link is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establish a mid-county multi-modal transportation hub in the North East area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Improve the intersections of MD 213, MD 222, and MD 272 with US 40, including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Improve all US 40 intersections to include acceleration and deceleration lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Implement road improvements on MD 222 from US 40 to MD 275.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implement rail crossing safety improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Continue coordination with DelDOT in the planning of US 301 improvements in New Castle County, Delaware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North East (2017)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reconstruct Route 7, including milling and overlay from Mauldin Avenue to Mechanics Valley Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Widen Route 7 (West Cecil Avenue), west of Route 272, and install sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian lighting between North East Isles Drive and Catherine Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Install sidewalk linkage along Route 40 between Sycamore Drive and Route 272.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Install on Route 7, East Cecil Avenue, two traffic reduction devices with intermitting signal lights, with timers for school opening and dismissal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Install sidewalk from the existing sidewalk on Route 7 to Mechanics Valley Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Review impacts of rail service to State Highway systems in North East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implement MARC train service in North East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Implement a new I-95 interchange in the area of Belvidere Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perryville (2017)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhance the I-95 and Route 40 toll discounts for Cecil County residents and businesses, by allowing the Hatem Bridge passes to be used on I-95 during rush hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Redesign and construct a new MD 222/I-95 interchange, including an upgraded bridge over I-95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accept maintenance responsibility for the southern end of MD 327.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Install sidewalk on MD 222 from Clayton Street to Marks Church Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increase MARC Penn Line service to include mid-day and weekend service for the entire line and special event trains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Replace the bridge over the Amtrak line on MD 327, but ensure maintenance of traffic during construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>