



PROJECT SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING

MEETING MINUTES
10 MARCH 2015– 9:00 A.M.
MEETING # PS0315

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: Tom Zucker (VAC)

(**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 9:00 am.

Introduction of members present was made.

Motion #PS0315-01: A motion was made by Mr. Laskowski to approve the March 2015 meeting agenda. Seconded by Mr. Carmichael and approved unanimously by voice vote.

BUSINESS

1. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion #PS0315-02: A motion was made by Mr. Laskowski to approve the January 27, 2015 meeting minutes and the February 20, 2015 meeting minutes. Seconded by Mr. Carmichael and approved unanimously by voice vote.

2. Public Comment

None -

3. Project Selection Criteria

Mr. Schwartz noted that he updated the project selection criteria document based on changes suggested at the last meeting. This document was provided at the meeting. The meeting was then opened for discussion by members.

- *Road Condition:* Mr. Schwartz broke down the road rating points into smaller categories, and the committee agreed this categorization is preferred over breaking down the rating into even smaller points.

- *Safety*: The committee agreed this category is fine even though the onus is on the presenter to rate this category.
- *Traffic Volumes*: Mr. Schwartz restated a concern brought up last meeting that if traffic volumes are just under a rating that a project would miss out on an entire point. Thus he broke down the rating scale into half points, providing greater emphasis on the low end. Mr. Laskowski noted that the new break down resulted in a nice bell curve.
- *Transportation Control*: The committee agreed to rename this category "Alternate Transportation." Mr. Schwartz noted this category is similar to "Safety" in determining a scale. Mr. Laskowski suggested a 6-3-1 scale in which a project would receive 6 points for doing three things on the list, 3 points for doing two things, and 1 point for doing one thing. This scale would still be subjective but would require a guide. Mr. Dickson suggested having two scales- one for features and another for trails. Mr. Carmichael noted that a project could have only one listed item but have high public demand and that such a project should score higher. He is also concerned about projects that check off a lot of listed items with little public demand would beat out other projects. He agreed that public demand should be accounted for under the category "Regional/Community." Mr. Schwartz said he does not mind listing public demand in the "Alternate Transportation" category.
- *Regional/Community*: Mr. Schwartz directed attention to the map on road functional class. Mr. Laskowski noted that the map would be updated this summer. Mr. Schwartz questioned the lack of arterials. Mr. Dickson noted that IDOT has classified additional roads as arterials that are not classified as such on this map.

Mr. Laskowski asked if the committee wanted to identify FAU routes. Mr. Schwartz said there are just a few roads that aren't FAU routes but this could be incorporated into the rating scale. He also suggested that a route that is FAU would get 1 point, an arterial would get 2 points, etc; this may result in 8 items but the rating would still max out at 6; this scale would be used instead of usage. Mr. Laskowski likes the current scale as it favors bigger routes which will serve more people. Mr. Schwartz suggested that FAU just be added to the current 1 point category.

Mr. Schwartz asked if more examples are needed but noted that he did not want to list too many. He noted that for all categories it should be noted that up to 6 points can be awarded in each category.

Mr. Schwartz asked if zoning categories should be added. Mr. Laskowski suggested 1 for residential, 2 for institutional, 4 for industrial, and 6 for commercial but also suggested combining 2 and 4 into 3. He noted that the rating scale is fine as it is now without this detail.

Mr. Laskowski asked about the difference between categories 6 and 4. Mr. Schwartz indicated that 4 references industrial parks, while 6 references safer, larger employers such as hospitals. Mr. Dickson noted that a downtown area can have more cultural significance but may not have as much of an economic significance. Mr. Schwartz said it comes down to what you value- safety, economics, etc. Mr. Dickson said if a project has economic improvements, then usually other improvements follow. He also noted that the Feds and performance measures value safety above all else at this time but that could change. Mr. Schwartz suggested that the rating should be more subjective and that he could create a list of items for the rating system.

- *Various Considerations*: Mr. Dickson noted that community buy-in should be considered and this could be done through Mind Mixer or another online public forum. He also said that community support/buy-in should not be too specific.

Mr. Schwartz asked for other suggestions. Mr. Laskowski recommended economic benefits. Mr. Gregory recommended sponsorship by multiple agencies. Mr. Schwartz said he would work on the wording for this category.

- *Small Projects*: Mr. Schwartz asked if 10% sounded reasonable and added that most people use roads but that we don't want to forget about people who are walking and biking. Mr. Carmichael

asked if the amount is what should be limited, as a ten year project could have a small amount each year but would add up to be a larger project over time. He also noted that whether it is limited to number of years or dollar amount that a local match or combination of grant funds should be used. Mr. Laskowski asked if a 20% match is still required for small projects. The committee agreed that it is. Mr. Carmichael said that the community wants us to collaborate and work to identify small projects.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the funding should be cumulative or if the funding should be thrown into a pot if it's not used. Mr. Carmichael suggested a three year limit, and the committee agreed. Mr. Laskowski asked if the first small project fund could be used this year, and Mr. Schwartz said yes. Mr. Laskowski said he'd like to see how it would affect funding for other projects.

4. Transit Projects Review

The committee agreed to defer the transit projects review to the TAC committee. There was a question as to whether the Policy Committee needs to approve the list of transit projects. Mr. Dickson said that the list should be given to them but that they do not necessarily need to approve it. He also noted that this information is included in the TIP document to the Policy Committee.

5. DSATS Funded Project Priorities

Mr. Dickson provided an overview of DSATS funded project and asked how to set priorities. Mr. Schwartz suggested that costs, timelines, and whether a project is already programmed should be used to set priorities.

6. Additional Business

Members agreed to hold the next meeting on Tuesday, April 14 at 9:00 am prior to the TAC meeting at 10 am.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion #PS0315-03: The meeting was adjourned at 9:48 am.