

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

October 21, 2021

A meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held on Thursday, October 21, 2021, via video conference/conference call.

Ms. Heather Dunigan began with a few minutes to remember Mr. Ian Beam and mourn his recent passing. TAC members shared memories of Mr. Beam. Donations to his family can be made at www.utown.org/give . Please go to the FellowshipOne Giving tab and select the Beam Family Fund in the fund list.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Michael Fortner, City of Newark, and TAC Chair, brought the TAC meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. TAC Members present:

Ben Allen, Maryland State Highway Administration
Trisha Arndt, Delaware Office of State Planning
Cooper Bowers, Delaware Department of Transportation
Tyson Byrne, Maryland Department of Transportation
Nicholas Cannistraci, Town of Elkton
Marvina Cephas, DNREC
David Dahlstrom, Maryland Department of Planning
Michael Fortner, City of Newark
Gwinneth Kaminsky Rivera, City of Wilmington
Matthew Littlejohn, Cecil County Division of Planning and Zoning
Matthew Rogers, New Castle County Department of Land Use
Catherine Salarano, Maryland Department of the Environment
Catherine Smith, Delaware Transit Corporation

TAC Ex-Officio Members present:

Lindsay Donnellon, U.S. Federal Highway Administration

TAC Members absent:

City of Wilmington Department of Public Works
Delaware Division of Small Business, Development, and Tourism
Delaware River and Bay Authority
Maryland Transit Administration

TAC Ex-Officio Members absent:

Amtrak
Diamond State Port Corporation
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
U.S. Federal Transit Administration

Guests and Invitees:

Jane Dilley, League of Women Voters
Dan Janousek, MDOT

Staff:

Dan Blevins, Principal Planner
Heather Dunigan, Principal Planner
Sharen Elcock, Executive Assistant
Dave Gula, Principal Planner
Randi Novakoff, Outreach Manager
Bill Swiatek, Principal Planner
Jacob Thompson, Senior Planner
Dawn Voss, Administrative Assistant
Tigist Zegeye, Executive Director

Minutes prepared by: Dawn Voss.

3. MINUTES

Approval of the September 16, 2021 TAC Minutes.

ACTION: On motion by Mr. Matt Rogers and seconded by Ms. Tricia Arndt the TAC approved the September 16, 2021 TAC minutes.

Motion passed.

(10-21-21-01)

4. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES

a. Nonmotorized Transportation Working Group

Ms. Heather Dunigan said the Nonmotorized Transportation Working Group met on October 5th. The group discussed candidate projects for funding through the Delaware bicycle and pedestrian projects pool. A number of other projects were considered for inclusion beyond the draft list presented by WILMAPCO. The group recommended to keep the list as presented with the addition of a project from the City of Wilmington. The Townsend Walkable Community Workshop, the Churchman’s Crossing Plan Update, and the City of New Castle Transportation Plan were presented at the meeting.

b. Air Quality Subcommittee

Mr. Bill Swiatek said the Air Quality Subcommittee met on October 7th. The group had an initial review of the air quality conformity results for New Castle County. These will be formally approved at the next meeting of the AQS, which will be a joint meeting with the TAC next month. This run included only New Castle County. There were four years 2025, 2035, 2045, and 2050. Direct PM 2.5 is comfortably under the budget. Indirect PM 2.5, which is NOx, comfortably met the budget in all analysis years, as did ozone. VOCs, volatile organic compounds, are under the budget for all years considered. Again, it is the same with NOx. Staff are working with DelDOT and DNREC on building an air quality conformity document. A draft will be available at the joint TAC/AQS meeting in November. The results and document are expected to be ready in December for public review beginning in January.

In the chat, Mr. Swiatek included a link to the charts reviewed.

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/l335q3ll9dvusfv/Draft%20Results%20-%20AQ%20-%20FY%202023%20TIP.pdf?dl=0>

5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None

ACTION ITEMS

6. To Recommend Amending the FY 2022 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with carry-over tasks

Ms. Tigist Zegeye said the staff is proposing to amend the FY 2022 UPWP by adding the incomplete work tasks as carry over from the prior years. The UPWP may be amended by the Council to add or modify work tasks. Items proposed that were not completed by June 30th of 2021 and are to be amended to the FY 22 UPWP include the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update, New Castle County Route 40 Plan Development, Congestion Management System Consultants Support, University of Delaware Park and Ride, the Regional Transportation Performance Measurement Development, the Statewide Truck Parking Study, the Port Circulation Study, the First and Final Mile Freight Network Development Study, Member Agency Consultant Support, completion of the City of New Castle Transportation Plan Update, and the Union Street Reconfiguration and Streetscape Improvement Study. It is proposed that \$507,250 be carried over. The funds are coming from Maryland FTA, FHWA, State, and Cecil County carry over funds. From Delaware, funds are coming from FHWA, FTA, the State, New Castle County, and the City of Wilmington. The total available funds that will be carried over is \$712,633, however, at this time only the \$507,250 is being requested to continue the listed projects.

Mr. Matt Rogers asked regarding the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update, if that will be adequate for what they are looking to do in the next year. Ms. Zegeye replied that this is to complete what was started. Hopefully, the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update will be completed by January of this year. So, this is to finish the update of the Plan. Mr. Rogers asked for clarification that this does not include any of the next step with regards to that. Ms. Zegeye replied no, she believes the next step is to work on monitoring and triggering support that is currently in the approved FY 22 UPWP budgeted for \$49,000.

ACTION: On motion by Ms. Tricia Arndt and seconded by Mr. Tyson Byrne the TAC recommends amending the FY 2022 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with carry-over tasks.

Motion passed.

(10-21-21-02)

7. To recommend amending the WILMAPCO FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), New Castle County Element

Ms. Heather Dunigan said this request comes from DeIDOT. The Air Quality Subcommittee concurred that it would not trigger a revised conformity analysis. The project can help make the rider experience nicer on the transit system with and onboard visual and audible information system showing next stops, safety information, and other information. Currently, the buses have audible stop announcements. This will be helpful for people who are hearing impaired to get the information. This would add the project for the onboard system at \$2.7 million.

ACTION: On motion by Mr. Matt Rogers and seconded by Ms. Tricia Arndt the TAC recommends amending the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), New Castle County Element.

Motion passed.

(10-21-21-03)

8. To recommend amending the WILMAPCO FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), New Castle County Element

Ms. Heather Dunigan said this request comes from DeIDOT and DART. The Air Quality Subcommittee concurred that it would not trigger a revised conformity analysis. This will purchase six electric buses and install charging infrastructure. The total project cost is \$7.2 million.

In the chat, Ms. Cathy Smith added: With the purchase of these six buses, our fleet will be 10% electric buses.

ACTION: On motion by Mr. Matt Rogers and seconded by Mr. Cooper Bowers the TAC recommends amending the FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), New Castle County Element.

Motion passed.

(10-21-21-04)

9. To Recommend Approval of the Technical Scoring for Project Prioritization for the 2021 Delaware Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Candidate Projects

Ms. Heather Dunigan said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements project is in the Delaware Statewide Element of the WILMAPCO TIP for locally generated statewide bicycle and pedestrian projects. Two years ago, close to thirty projects were submitted by local governments to WILMAPCO and shared by us to DeIDOT for funding consideration. Staff is currently working with DeIDOT on how we can solicit projects on an annual basis and, hopefully, in conjunction with the TAP program call for projects. DeIDOT reached out to WILMAPCO earlier this fall hoping to get a list of projects for this year by the end of October. As this does not allow us time for a call for projects, staff suggests using high scoring bike/ped projects from the FY 2023-2026 TIP Prioritization approved by Council in May 2021. These projects were drawn from the Regional Transportation Plan and staff is recommending inclusion of the top ten prioritized projects rather than the entire list. At the request of the NMTWG, the 12th Street Project in the City of Wilmington has been added. DeIDOT requested a short list of five projects, but Ms. Dunigan thinks our list will include eleven projects that will benefit from the additional technical analysis that DeIDOT will do. A few top-scoring projects from the list were removed because they were too small or too large to be part of this bike/ped pool of funding or did not fit in the category of funding. The Nonmotorized Transportation Working Group discussed a few other projects that members thought were worthy of inclusion., In the interest of keeping as close as possible to the five projects that DeIDOT wants submitted, the committee opted to keep the list as shown This will be brought to Council at their next meeting, and then submitted to DeIDOT for consideration. Likely, only two or three of these might get funded, but DeIDOT's additional analysis will be helpful.

ACTION: On motion by Ms. Gwinn Kaminsky and seconded by Ms. Tricia Arndt the TAC recommends approval of the Technical Scoring for Project Prioritization for the 2021 Delaware Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Candidate Projects.

Motion passed with Mr. Tyson Byrne of MDOT abstaining.

(10-21-21-05)

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:

10. New Castle County Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Matt Rogers said the County has been doing small group outreach efforts during the fall that will lead to the third forum to be held in December. During this process, drafts of the elements will be released. The County have already begun work on the elements with some of the people on the TAC. *The New Castle County NCC2050 Comprehensive Plan Overview video was shown:*

During the outreach process, the team had a number of different approaches, and much of it has been dictated by COVID. Almost all of it has been virtual, but deep dive meetings and forums were held. The stakeholder advisory committee, as well as the interagency working group met. Opportunities to interact on the website were offered including surveys and virtual workshops. There have been a lot of opportunities for the public to participate, and currently they are reaching out to a little over a dozen different groups. Tonight, they will be speaking with CCLPH and the Route 9 Monitoring Committee. Last night, Mr. Rich Hall, Ms. Andrea Trabelsi and Mr. Rogers met with five community members in the Glasgow area. So, they are reaching out to a variety of groups that showed interest.

The six basic themes that have been developed through the visioning process and public engagement are a livable built environment for all, conservation and preservation, robust economy, sustainable growth, thriving places and community character, and diverse engagement. They have heard broad support for preserving open space and agricultural land; general agreement that more affordable housing is needed; desire for more walkable, mixed-use development, residential density, and housing type diversity (at least in some places in the County); the need to address climate change action and social justice priorities; and support for improving infrastructure.

Though not an all-inclusive list of recommendations, strategies, goals, and objectives that will be within the plan, Mr. Rogers highlighted three priority recommendations of most concern among the public. One is to preserve 30% of the land in the county for open space in next thirty years and to improve ecosystem health. The second is to lead in addressing climate change. Number six out of the recommendations is to focus growth by directing growth to State Strategies Investment Areas One and Two. This involves ensuring growth is directed to areas that have a plan for infrastructure improvements to support development. This is the basic presentation that is being delivered to these groups, and then it is open for questions and discussion. The team wants these smaller meetings to be more discussion driven with the public.

Ms. Tricia Arndt said the amount of effort that Mr. Rogers and his team have put into outreach is really impressive, especially during a pandemic. She really likes how the plan is shaping up. They have had some somewhat contentious public meetings online so it is good to hear that they are having these smaller meetings where they can really get into the issues and hear what folks are saying that are not necessarily the vocal minority.

Mr. Rogers said he thinks they have gotten a lot more residents to participate in things than they have in the past, which further encourages them to go back out over and over again and try to dig a little bit deeper with things. Just recently for the planning board meeting, over three-hundred people attended. Only one person attended in person, but three-hundred people virtually attended, which is stellar. It opens up opportunities for people who have families and

real lives to actually attend and participate when their items come up on the agenda. So, it has been a good process and if the meeting is contentious that shows at least there is interest.

11. Union Street Reconfiguration and Streetscape Improvement Study

Mr. Dave Gula said work began on the Union Street Configuration and Streetscape Improvement Study last fall. The first advisory meeting was on April 22. The second advisory committee meeting was October 13th. The advisory committee is made up of business owners, residents, elected officials, and people who either live or work on Union Street and have a stake in what's happening. The management committee works through Wilmington Initiatives. The idea was to have the community confirm the issues and guide the solutions.

The visioning process began with the advisory committee in April and continued with the May workshop. When asked about their relationship with Union Street, workshop attendees replied 67% live near Union Street, 48% go to businesses on Union Street, very few are just commuters. When asked what they visited on Union Street, the word cloud showed restaurants as the most popular locations. When asked how they get to Union Street, 58% drive, 27% walk, 10% bike. When asked how they would like to get the Union Street, 67% would walk, 63% would drive, 42% would bike, and 15% would use transit.

A map showing where most people go on Union Street illustrated the parts of the street that are being the most utilized. People were concerned about maneuvering through the intersection of Union Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, but this workshop was held before signal and pedestrian improvements made over the summer were functional. We will see if those improvements have made it less dangerous and confusing. The public indicated better crossings are needed throughout the corridor. There is concern as traffic approaches Lancaster, there is less activity, but the street is very wide, so it encourages drivers to speed. People expressed they love outdoor dining, better signage for parking is needed, and the separated bike lane is uncomfortable because it is not protected. Also, it feels unsafe walking at night. There is good lighting in some areas, but more is needed. People drive too fast. There are many bus stops, but not many amenities at them. Some people love the back-in angled parking while others hate it. Angled parking adds a few spaces, but it is difficult to do with cars going so fast. People like to walk, but the sidewalk widths are very irregular. Some sidewalks have a utility pole in the middle of a three-foot sidewalk.

When asked what they want Union Street to be like in the future, 69% said they want to support the businesses and having more economic growth; 62 said improve the appearance of the street; 53% said make it easier and safer to walk; 44% said increase the tree cover and green space; 30% said make it easier and safer to bike; and 12% said improve the public transit experience. One comment said they would accept fewer bus stops if they could have more amenities at them. When asked what street components are the most important 19% said street trees; 17% said outdoor dining; and 15% said wider sidewalks. When asked what is least important, 14% said planters; 12% said wider sidewalks; and 10% said bike parking. For the future Union Street is considered a destination. It is a place to stroll, people watch, and have a drink. It is walkable, but the wish list for change prioritizes pedestrians including shade trees, crosswalks, wider sidewalks, better lighting, art, slower traffic, and space for outdoor dining. People want consistent aesthetics along the corridor, convenient and comfortable transit, safe and protected bike lanes, management of the parking. There is not enough parking, and so a more comprehensive strategy for parking needs to be found. There may be some way to add some off-street parking for weekends or special events. Managing loading zones has come up as well.

The Purpose and Need Statement is required as we seek state and federal funds for this project. The Purpose of the project is to transform Union Street into a Main Street corridor that supports the multi modal mobility and connectivity of the local business community and the residents of the Flats, Little Italy, Union Park Gardens, and surrounding neighborhoods. The Need is: Transportation and streetscape improvements are needed along Union Street between Pennsylvania Avenue and Sycamore Street to (a) better function as a Main Street corridor, balancing moving cars while functioning as a place for residents and neighbors to shop, dine, work, recreate, socialize, and play and (b) improved multi-modal mobility and conductivity. The focus is to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists rather than vehicles.

The draft measures of effectiveness were presented to the advisory committee. Based on the purpose and need, effectiveness measures Union Street's better function as a main street with green space and shade trees; public gathering spaces; business frontage space; and streetscape lighting. With multimodal mobility issues, sidewalks and crosswalks must meet ADA specifications and more sidewalk space is needed. If the bike lane is moved and protected, the team must ensure it does not cause delays for transit or make it harder for people to access the transit. More space for transit amenities is also needed. Coordination may be needed for scheduling freight deliveries and pickups. This will be worked out with the businesses. There are slight vehicle delays later in the evening when it is at its busiest, but there are no real traffic challenges. The on-street parking capacity will continue to be a challenge. For bikes, it is a matter of making bike amenities comfortable and connected.

Alternative 2 is the top performing alternative with a score of 32. It moves both the curb and the utilities. People did not ask about removing utilities. This was initiated through the consultant team. It is expensive and adds time to the construction. Similar projects in Wilmington to underground utilities along Shipley Street cost one million dollars per block. Since there is a pole line on both sides of the street, that is roughly \$2 million per block and since it is more than twelve blocks, that's more than \$24 million added to the cost of the project, which is not yet funded. In Wilmington, transportation funds are not used to underground utilities, so other funds have to be found to do that. With all that said, this alternative allows for a protected bike lane that would be at curb level rather than street level and would be protected by parked cars. Currently, most of the café seating is on the east side of the street, and this provides ample room for the sidewalk, some trees, lighting, the bike lane, and the buffers needed. On the west side, it provides space for potential café seating. In all of the options, the travel lanes are eleven feet and parking lanes are eight feet, which is the standard in the city right now.

Alternative 6 is the second-best performing alternative. It moves the curbs but not the utilities, so it is less expensive and simplifies construction. This alternative has parallel parking on both sides, with a separated bike lane on the west side. As this is laid out, the buses would have island bus stops with the sidewalk, bike lane, bus stop, and then traveling lane. The sidewalk on the west side is still wide enough for café seating. It does cause some separation on the east side where the café seating would be on the sidewalk with the utilities, tree line, and then the unobstructed ADA sidewalk. However, there will not be many utility poles per block, and lights and trees will also be spread out so it will not be too crowded, and the team would try to make this as uniform as possible for the length of the corridor.

The pavement for these two alternatives is very similar. The pavement area is thirty-eight feet with moving curbs in both directions. These are the top two scoring alternatives, and they were presented to the advisory committee and will be presented to the public. The other alternatives scored a little lower. Alternative 5 has bike lanes on both sides, one northbound and one

southbound with thirty-eight feet of pavement. It does not remove the utilities, but it provides less space on the west side for café seating. The score is lower because it does not meet that mandate from the public for more outdoor dining space. Alternative 1 moves the curb and the utilities to provide space on the west side for café seating and walking. It provides a dedicated bike lane which is protected and buffered but is northbound. This alternative tried to provide north and southbound bike travel, but the sharrow (shared use) lane and the speeds on the street make the southbound ride uncomfortable. It does not meet the level of protection needed for cyclists, so it scores lower.

Ms. Gwinneth Kaminsky asked if the eleven-foot width of the sharrow, which is the same width as the regular traffic lane, meets standards. She thought it would need to be a little wider to be a sharrow. Mr. Gula replied this is the standard. In a shared lane, the bike is considered a vehicle just like a car is a vehicle. The lane is designed for cars and bikes to share, so this is not a lane where cars are trying to get around the cyclists, which is why the level of comfort and safety of the sharrow is not as high as it is for a protected lane. Ms. Kaminsky replied that she always thought they were wider by a couple of feet so that is interesting. Mr. Gula said this is the most recent state of things. The sharrow has evolved quite a bit since we first saw them in Wilmington.

Alternative 3 shows back-in, angled parking moved to the opposite side of the street, because it is easier for drivers to maneuver into the space and see oncoming traffic to get out. Because of the pavement width and the sidewalk width needed for café seating, this option only provides a sharrow for bike movements. It does not score as well because that is not safe or comfortable. This one also moves utilities and curbs, which is more expensive and adds construction time. Alternative 4 moves the curb and the utilities and has a bike lanes in each direction. It cuts down the amount of sidewalk space, so an extra seven feet is lost on each side. Also moving utilities adds cost and construction time.

The matrix was shared that shows what is included in the scoring for green space and shade trees, public gathering space, and streetscape lighting under Better Function as a Main Street. The second category is Multimodal Improvements. The advisory committee asked that the matrix be changed so the alternatives were in order from highest scoring to lowest. The advisory committee agreed with the way the vision, and the purpose and need were translated to the measures of effectiveness and how they were applied to each of the alternatives. Three alternatives were dropped from consideration because they do not meet the general purpose and need. These alternatives did not move the curb or the utilities, did not increase the size of the sidewalks, and made it difficult to improve the bike experience.

There was a question about using the pandemic ARP funds for the project to underground utilities. The City replied that there are timeframes for these funds to be used and this project is currently unfunded. So, we do not know that you could use the funds for that project, unless you got the full funding for the street project in the necessary timeframe, which seems unlikely. The team is looking for funding from the DelDOT CTP, but we do not know when we will get that. There was a question if the community requested to have the utilities underground. The team did not hear that from anyone, even though it is shown as a the top scoring alternative. Price was not factored into that scoring. The team did hear that space for outdoor dining is important as was shown in the measure of effectiveness and the purpose and need. That was reiterated by numerous people from the advisory committee. It was commented that Bancroft Parkway is comfortable for biking, which removes the need for bike lanes to go both directions on Union Street. Union Street is included in the city's bike plan as having a bicycle amenity. This means trying to create the best southbound bike lane possible which is buffered and separated from

traffic. There were questions about the pavement width for the two top-performing alternatives. Those two payment widths are the same. Then immediately after that, the point was made, that excess pavement for travel lanes is not wanted. People want to see more space dedicated to pedestrians. Someone asked if hanging vines can be planted along the rail viaduct at 11th and Pennsylvania Avenue. It may be done by working with Delaware Center for Horticulture, so that is something to consider. Someone commented when trees are planted, avoid thick canopies and roots buckling the sidewalks. The city has an arborist to help with selecting the tree types and installing them using technologies to keep the roots from impacting sidewalks or pavement. There was a question about how much time would be added to construction to underground utilities. The team needs to look into that have that information for people making the decision.

The next workshop will be held Wednesday, October 27th. The advisory committee was asked to help with public outreach for the workshop. First, they were asked if there was anything in the workshop that be done better, and no comments were received. They were asked to help share the information. Members posted copies of the flyers on Facebook, Nextdoor, Instagram, and other social media. Mr. Gula dropped flyers off at the West End Neighborhood House. People were asked to distribute the flyers in surrounding neighborhoods. They also work with the managers of the Woodlawn Flats who put them on their social media. After the workshop, the team will take the public feedback to determine the preferred concept or concepts and then assess their feasibility and go deeper into design. That will give a better idea of costs. Then there is another management meeting with Wilmington Initiatives. Then there will be an advisory committee to present the preferred concept or concepts after which a draft final report will be prepared and presented at a final public meeting before being submitted as the final report.

Ms. Kaminsky said she is really pleased that the eleven-foot width is being retained for the roads. A lot of these projects tend to try to go down to ten, and some roads just do not want that, so it is good to see the alternatives keeping the eleven feet. Mr. Gula replied that has been our standard with the city for a number of years now. Ms. Kaminsky said she knows that, but a lot of projects lately have gone down to ten and it has been a little disturbing because it makes drivers uncomfortable, which is not something we should strive for.

INFORMATION ITEMS

12. Staff Report

Ms. Dunigan reported the following updates:

- On September 24th staff participated in the Cecil County Tour meeting.
- The City of New Castle Transportation Plan Advisory Committee will meet on October 26th and then an in-person City Council workshop will be November 9th.
- The draft Churchman's Crossing Plan is available for review on the WILMAPCO website. The advisory committee meeting was on September 25th. A public workshop will be October 25th.
- The Union Street Reconfiguration had an advisory committee meeting on October 13th. A public workshop will be on October 27th and a legislative briefing will be on October 20th.
- The I-95 Cap Feasibility Study Advisory Committee had a meeting on September 30th that included a walking tour of the corridor. A follow-up virtual meeting will be held on November 2nd for people who were not available for the first meeting.
- The Concord Pike Master Plan Monitoring Committee had a kickoff meeting on October 4th.
- Staff participated in the Transportation Performance Measure Workshop that was held on September 28th and 30th with DeIDOT and FHWA.
- A Middletown Walkable Community Workshop was held on September 29th.
- Staff attended the National AMPO meeting on October 4th.

- Staff continues to collaborate and support Northeast on the implementation of an EPA grant that will bring better mobility solutions to the Prices Run neighborhood. A draft action plan is being prepared.
- The Route 9 Monitoring Committee meets this afternoon.
- The Transportation Justice Plan is featured as a best-case scenario on the FHWA Capacity Building Program website. Staff has a lunch and learn scheduled for October 28th at noon.
- The APA annual meeting is scheduled for November 10th. Registration is not required. The information is available on the APA or WILMAPCO websites.
- Save the date for the Delmarva Winter Freight Meeting, which will be held virtually on December 7th. The registration link for that is available on the WILMAPCO website.

Mr. Bill Swiatek posted in the chat: APA Delaware Annual Meeting:

<https://mcusercontent.com/ed4dc2de1b5d47944ab963bbb/images/2a146905-2415-5075-0c60-dcec1a06b0b6.jpg>

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Tyson Byrne introduced Mr. Dan Janousek, who will be representing MDOT at the TAC and at some other meetings for the time being. Mr. Janousek has been working with MDOT since 2018. Mr. Byrne wanted to welcome Mr. Janousek and introduce him to the WILMAPCO region. Mr. Janousek was working in the Baltimore region and covered the St. Mary's MPO, so he has a lot of experience in dealing with different needs of MPOs. Mr. Janousek said he has been working with MDOT for four years and has been working with St Mary's MPO and has been on the Baltimore committees and technical committees. He worked as a planner for twenty-five years and a transportation planner for the last ten or fifteen. He worked on a lot of bike/ped issues in Prince George's County and got their master plans going. He worked in Montgomery County on their traffic impact analysis and development reviews. He started off in zoning years ago, and now works on larger issues and will help with the tour every year. Any amendments for MDOT will come from him as a request and then managed through the committee. Ms. Heather Murphy will still be attending the Council when she can, and Mr. Janousek will be attending them virtually. If anyone needs anything, feel free to reach out to Mr. Janousek or Mr. Byrne. Ms. Dunigan welcomed Mr. Janousek to the TAC. Mr. Janousek replied that he has been looking over WILMAPCO plans through the UPWP and TIP to get familiar with some of the projects. He attended the Cecil County Tour meeting this year. The first year he was here Mr. Beam brought him up to it as an introduction to the tour meeting. He will keep an eye on local events, so he is not caught off guard.

ADJOURNMENT:

ACTION: On motion by Ms. Tricia Arndt and seconded by Ms. Gwinn Kaminsky the TAC adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

Motion passed.

(10-16-21-06)

The TAC adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

Attachments (0)