



## PROJECT SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

MEETING MINUTES  
20 FEBRUARY 2015– 8:00 A.M.  
MEETING # PS0215

### ATTENDANCE

- City of DeKalb (1 votes): **John Laskowski**
- City of Sycamore (1 votes): **Brian Gregory**
- Town of Cortland (1 vote): **Noah Carmichael**
- DeKalb County (1 vote): **Nathan Schwartz**
- DSATS Staff: Brian Dickson, Jessica Hyink
- Others Present: none

(**BOLD** indicates main voting member. *Italics* indicates proxy voting member.)

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Schwartz called the meeting to order and established a quorum at 8:00 am.

Introduction of members present was made.

**Motion #PS0115-01:** A motion was made by John Laskowski to approve the February 2015 meeting agenda. Seconded by Noah Carmichael and approved unanimously by voice vote.

### BUSINESS

#### 1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. Dickson stated he was unable to complete the minutes from the January meeting and requested the approval be tabled at this meeting.

**Motion #PS0115-02:** A motion was made by Noah Carmichael to table the approval of the January 27, 2015 meeting minutes. Seconded by John Laskowski and approved unanimously by voice vote.

#### 2. Public Comment

None -

#### 3. Project Selection Criteria Discussion

Mr. Schwartz provided an overview of the discussion items addressed at the January meeting. He provided members with a table showing the Categories and Scoring points that other Illinois MPO's use to rate Surface Transportation Program projects. The meeting was then opened for discussion by members.

- Mr. Carmichael asked if the road conditions should have a higher weight than the other criteria
- Mr. Schwartz asked if instead of having one standard weighting system, should the Project Selection Committee weight the scores differently based on the type of project being considered.
- Mr. Schwartz presented to the committee a table of all Federal Aid System (FAS) routes sorted by the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) counts. Mr. Dickson noted that he would have the DSATS intern create maps showing the roadway system by ADT, by FAS classification, and Roadway Functional Class (FC) for members to review.
- Mr. Schwartz suggested that if project scores are relatively close to each other, the PSC should decide on which project(s) be selected.
- Mr. Schwartz noted that scoring on safety issues is done differently at every MPO examined. He asked that when examining the number of crashes in an area, should that data be weighted by the volume of traffic in that segment? Mr. Schwartz also suggested actually accident counts be compared to the IDOT standards for the roadway type.
- Mr. Gregory asked if the STU funds should be separated into types. Type I – Major Projects and Type II – Small Projects. Mr. Schwartz noted that both the City of DeKalb and DeKalb County have major projects that use more than 1 year of funding and removing a portion to allocated towards smaller projects will increase the number of years it takes to fund a large project. Mr. Laskowski noted that smaller projects would have less regional economic impact.
- Mr. Gregory noted that there are many focus groups that are vocal about specific kinds of projects both for and against based on the limited amount of funds available. He noted that it is the project selection committee to focus on the overall needs of the region.
- Mr. Carmichael noted there is a growing population of people that wants to see a higher dedication to bike and pedestrian projects and the addition of bike and pedestrian amenities in existing projects. Mr. Dickson noted that in the DSATS Bikeways Plan published in 2006, that all DSATS funded projects Bicycle and pedestrian ways of at least 5' wide paved sidewalks shall be established in new street construction or arterial street widening projects in urbanized areas along one side of the street unless The cost of establishing bikeways or walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Excessively disproportionate is defined as exceeding twenty percent of the cost of the transportation project cost, with the value of additional right of way necessary for the path counting as part of the twenty percent (note that the exact wording of the regulations was added to the minutes and not stated specifically at the meeting).
- Mr. Gregory asked if the additional cost of bike/pedestrian ways are included in the cost of all projects, would roadway projects in the smaller communities be eliminated? Mr. Schwartz noted that with tight funds for transportation projects, there have been comments by some in the community that question the use of funds for trail projects at the expense of roadway projects. It was noted that often there are other grants available for trails and that bike and pedestrian projects should focus on using those funds and leave STU funds for roadway projects.
- Members all noted that staff should put a priority on updating the Bike-Pedestrian plan and focus on the costs if implementing the suggested improvements.
- As some members had to leave for other meetings, it was agreed to continue the discussions at the next meeting

#### **4. Additional Business**

Members agreed to hold the next meeting on Tuesday, March 10 at 8:30 am prior to the TAC meeting at 10 am.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

***Motion #PS0215-03:*** The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 am.