

**Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee
Advisory Committee**

Kane County Government Center

Meeting Minutes - December 6, 2005

Members in Attendance:

Chairman Don Wolfe	Kane County Board
Vice Chairman Frank Griffin	Kane County Economic Development Advisory Board
Christine Ludwiszewski	Attainable Housing Alliance
Rick Dunlap	Fox Valley Bldg & Constr. Trades Council/Local 150
Catherine Hurlbut	Kane County Board
Larry Keller	President, Village of West Dundee
Christine Klein	Fox Valley Association of Realtors
Marilyn Michelini (alternate)	Village of Montgomery
Tom Rickert	Kane County Division of Transportation
Dave Morrison (alternate)	Village of Elburn

Others Present:

Carl Schoedel	Dir. Kane County Div. of Transportation
Jerry Dickson	Kane County Div. of Transportation
Heidi Files	Kane County Div. of Transportation
Steve Coffinbargar	Kane County Div. of Transportation
Karl Fry	Intersect LLC, Consultant for Kane County
Atty. William Chesbrough	Kane County State's Attorney
Chris Aiston	City of Geneva
Chuck Radovich	City of Geneva Attorney
Tom Van Cleave	Kane County Board
Deborah Allan	Kane County Board
Melbourne Lenczewski	Hampshire Building Dept.
Jerry Swanson	City of Batavia
Mary Ann Wilkison	Village of Burlington
Greg Chismark	City of St. Charles
Tom Armstrong	City of Elgin
Jeff Mihelich	Village of Algonquin
Scott Buening	Village of Sugar Grove

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wolfe called the Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Advisory Committee meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL/ INTRODUCTIONS

A quorum was established with 10 voting members present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

IV. MINUTES

The following two sets of minutes were approved, with noted changes, on motion by Ludwiszewski, seconded by Michelini. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Approval of October 4, 2005 Meeting Minutes - No changes.

Approval of November 16, 2005 Meeting Minutes - Change on page 2, first paragraph, first sentence, delete the word "worked" after "Ms. Files". Same paragraph, 8th sentence, delete the first set of words "number of".

V. RECEIVING COMMUNICATIONS - None

VI. REPORTS

a) Progress Report - Land Use Assumptions Data - Mr. Fry, with Intersect, LLC, reviewed his PowerPoint presentation, reminding members that under state statute, the county was required to adopt land use assumptions. As part of the land use assumptions, the county will provide projections for anticipated development between 2005 and 2015. Mr. Fry explained that the population baseline information used for 2005 estimate would be obtained from the 2000 Census and from obtaining the most recent trends as reported from the Census Bureau. The 2015 estimate would

be obtained from the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission's ("NIPC") 2030 population forecast. Because years 2000 to 2004 showed an annual 4% increase in population for Kane County, the 2005 estimate would also be 4% annually. In determining the 2015 population estimate, the estimate would be consistent with NIPC's control totals. In looking at population growth over the next 25 years, the average population growth was expected to be 1.8% annually, with the growth tapering off nearing 2030. (Hurlbut arrives 8:10 a.m.)

Mr. Fry then discussed the calculations used for employment projections, noting the same process used in obtaining the population figures would be used. The expected average annual growth, based on NIPC's 2030 forecast, would be 1.7% annually but tapering off in the later years. Because there were some discrepancies which existed when NIPC was putting together its control totals for employment, Mr. Fry felt it would be up to this committee or the county board to review the NIPC figures again based on the public input received.

In reviewing anticipated development, Mr. Fry explained he was obtaining this information from a number of municipalities and county comprehensive plans and the information would be used for the traffic model and for developing the impact fee calculation. Examples of population and employment forecasts followed. Per Mr. Fry, the population and employment forecasts for each municipality and each township would be posted in the county's web site.

Per Chairman Wolfe's question as to whether the figures were being compared to national figures for commercial and residential, Mr. Fry stated they were not but offered to review them to see if an unbalance existed. Griffin commented on the current overbuilding of retail in the county, which was why some retailers were struggling. He also expressed concern about NIPC's forecast numbers early on and how those numbers changed over the years, pointing to Hampshire's figures; wherein, Mr. Fry noted the Hampshire/Huntley area was one of the hot spots. Mr. Scott Buening, Village Sugar Grove, asked what population projection figures were being used, wherein Mr. Fry indicated that for the development of the ordinance, he was using 2005 and 2015 figures. County Board member Van Cleave stressed that the municipalities needed to balance their residential developments with commercial developments and he hoped the matter would be considered and encouraged by the county to the municipalities. Regarding the road impact fee, Van Cleave was hoping to have the matter move forward sooner than a year rather than later. County Board member Allan inquired as to the lag time before commercial development arrives after the residential, wherein Griffin and Mr. Fry explained it differed from merchant to merchant.

Mr. Fry proceeded to describe the next phase of the impact fee process and how the traffic model would convey what roads needed to accommodate what developments. Currently, the information provided by the municipalities was being taken at face value, and, once assembled, the information would be reviewed realistically.

Mr. Chris Aiston, City of Geneva, expressed concern as to how the impact fee would affect municipal development, conveying that there was a cost of doing business and a cost to development. While the municipalities remained basically autonomous with respect to zoning, the cost of the impact fee would have an impact on municipal development as well as internal municipal developments.

VII. OLD BUSINESS - None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

a) Public Hearing on Land Use Assumptions - December 20, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. - Staff Coffinbargar confirmed that a December 20, 2005, 7:00 p.m. public hearing on land use assumptions would be held in the lower Auditorium. Public comment would be received until January 9, 2006.

b) Procedure to Adopt Land Use Assumptions - Mr. Fry explained that after the public comment period ended on January 9, 2006, this committee would be meeting tentatively on January 11, 2006. Following that, the Transportation Committee would need to make a recommendation on January 23, 2006 with an anticipation of final adoption of the land use assumptions by the County Board on February 14, 2006. Chairman Wolfe expressed concern that the schedule expectations were high and that no input would be received from the Development Committee. Mr. Fry reminded members of the state statute requirements and said that some sort of action would be taken at the February County Board meeting. **Hurlbut recommended placing this matter on the January Committee of the Whole agenda.** Mr. Fry also added that the Impact Fee Advisory Committee members were welcomed to join the public hearing but it was not a regular meeting and attendance was not mandatory. Maps of the land use assumptions would be at the public hearing and also posted on the county's web site. Dialog followed on whether this impact fee matter should come before the Development Committee wherein Hurlbut did not see the necessity.

c) Schedule Next Meeting - Tentative Date of January 11, 2006 - So noted by staff and members.

On another matter, Griffin raised discussion about a distribution facility that was in the process of constructing an addition and being taxed as a manufacturing facility as defined by the ordinance. His concern was that the ordinance could impede future development as well as future development of existing corporations within

Kane County, thereby forcing businesses out of the county. Attorney Chesbrough stated he was aware of the matter and was working through the issues raised by the manufacturer. As to future development, KDOT Dir. Schoedel stated staff would be reviewing those types of matters on a case by case basis. Lastly, Griffin mentioned that an existing use in a facility could move out, while a similar use could move in, with no impact fee being imposed.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 a.m. on motion by Rickert, seconded by Klein. Motion passed unanimously.

\s\ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt, Recording Secretary