

Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Program Update

Staff Response to Comments on Draft CRIP Project List

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Village of Hampshire – Requested addition of an intersection improvement at the intersection of Allen Road and US-20	At this time, it appears that this project is not justified based on traffic increases on Allen Road (CH-3) within the time horizon of this plan. This location will be reviewed with the next 5 year update.
46	Village of Hampshire – Requested addition of an intersection improvement at the intersection of Big Timber Road and US-20.	Staff concurs with this recommendation. The scope of Project 46 has been extended to include this location.
46	Village of Hampshire – Requested addition of an intersection improvement at the intersection of Big Timber Road and IL-47	Staff concurs with this recommendation. The scope of Project 46 has been extended to include this location
	Village of Pingree Grove – Requested addition of Rienking Road from US-20 to the Soo Line Railroad.	Staff considers Reinking/Damisch to be more of a local collector street and has been pursuing a jurisdictional transfer to the municipalities. The scope of potential improvements discussed with the Village do not include capacity improvements and would not be eligible for impact fee funding.
52	Village of Carpentersville – Requested that the project limits be extended north to Huntley Road.	Staff believes that improvements in this section will be needed strictly to accommodate direct access to adjacent developments and will therefore be the responsibility of adjacent developers.
50	Village of Carpentersville – Requested definition of “IN” improvement type.	This refers to an intersection improvement. The designation has been added to the current version of the project list.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
53	Village of Carpentersville – Requested information on the scope of work for this project.	Previous project addressed existing deficiency. Further improvements, including additional lanes on Huntley Road and permanent traffic signals are included in Project #84. Staff recommends that this project be deleted.
55	Village of Carpentersville – Requested that the full 4-lane section be included in the initial construction	While planning will proceed for an ultimate 4-lane cross section, it is likely that funding constraints will require initial construction to be for a 2-lane section.
49	Village of Carpentersville – Requested consideration of an adjustment in the speed limit.	The County routinely evaluates all routes for the appropriateness of speed limits. Both design speed and speed limits will be considered during Phase I engineering.
79	Village of Carpentersville – Requested consideration of an adjustment in the speed limit.	The County routinely evaluates all routes for the appropriateness of speed limits. Both design speed and speed limits will be considered during Phase I engineering.
27	Village of Lily Lake – Requested that this project be expanded to include realignment of Hansen Road to intersect Empire Road at a point further east of Route 47. The Village also noted that it is working on relocating the school entrance from Route 47 to IC Trail, and also has concerns regarding the pedestrian crossing of Route 47 at Empire.	Staff concurs with the Village’s recommendations. Prior to beginning Phase I Engineering on this project, the County will work closely with the Village to ensure that appropriate features are incorporated into the scope of work.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
68	Village of Lily Lake – Requested that the intersection of Route 47 and Silver Glen Road be eliminated from the plan.	After reviewing this project, staff believes that the principal benefits will accrue to Route 47 and not to the County Highway system, therefore, while justified based on traffic projections, it is probably not appropriate for impact fee funding. Staff recommends this project be eliminated.
4	Village of Sugar Grove – Suggested that this location is an existing problem and should not qualify.	Existing deficiencies are based on the 2003 CRIP, which did not identify this location as such. This project should remain in the CRIP
1	Village of Sugar Grove – Suggested that this project does not benefit County residents and should not be included, and that portions may be included in the Prairie Parkway project.	This project was included in the 2003 CRIP and has regional benefits. Staff recommends it remain in the CRIP. Even if the project becomes part of the Prairie Parkway project, it is likely that Kane County will have to fund a significant portion of the work on Granart. Impact fee funds would be used for that contribution.
3 and 10	Village of Sugar Grove – Suggested reducing the scope of this project to a 3 lane improvement.	Traffic projections indicate that a 4-5 lane section is warranted for the entire length by 2015, however staff agrees that other than the realignment at Fabyan/Main, this project is likely to be constructed late in the 10-year program. Staff prefers that the project remain a 4-lane widening.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities can not concur with the CRIP and service area boundaries until a number of questions are answered.</p>	<p>Staff was not requesting concurrence with the plan; rather, early input that could be considered well in advance of the public hearing. There will be several additional opportunities for all municipalities (as well as developers, other interested parties and members of the public, to comment on the plan before it is finally adopted by the County Board.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities -- The CRIP is one of several components of the Facilities-Driven impact fee approach that will directly determine the fee schedule. Tri-Cities cannot concur with the CRIP without first seeing other components of the plan, such as zone boundaries, and how they impact the final fee schedule.</p>	<p>The fact that the CRIP and other components of the plan are critical to the determination of the fee schedule with the facilities-driven approach has been acknowledged by staff since the beginning of this process. Therefore, it was critical to receive early input on CRIP projects in order to consider potential concerns. Several alternative boundary scenarios have been presented at past IFAC meetings along with the resulting cost per trip based on the then-current CRIP project list. All alternatives considered have resulted in much closer fees across the county, when compared with the current ordinance.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities -- What was the traffic modeling or capacity analysis process that led to the preliminary project list?</p>	<p>Traffic modeling was performed using the county's current traffic model, using land use assumptions previously adopted by the County Board. First, the model was recalibrated to the 2005 traffic. Then the 2015 trips were applied to the 2005 road network to identify potentially deficient segments. Segments on the County highway system with volume/capacity ratios greater than 0.8 were investigated further by comparing predicted link volumes to existing volumes and internal department projections. Projects already included in the existing adopted CRIP were first included in the preliminary CRIP, followed by the segments with V/C ratio greater than 0.8 and intersections with a deficient level of service.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities -- How was the scope of work defined and what does it include?</p>	<p>The need for add-lanes projects was based on projected link volumes. In all cases, widening to four or five lanes was only considered if the projected link ADT volume exceeded 20,000. Since the model does not project turning movements, the general scope of intersection improvements was estimated based on anticipated traffic patterns. Right of way needs were also estimated.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities -- How were project costs calculated?</p>	<p>Project costs for link improvements are based on the scope of the improvement and length of the improvement, with adjustments for significant cost elements such as bridges and any anticipated land acquisition needs.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities -- What financial obligations does the CRIP place on municipalities?</p>	<p>At this point, estimated costs for the projects include cross-street improvements, including turn lanes and normal tapers. We would anticipate that municipalities would be asked to reimburse the county for any enhancements to a project beyond those needed to make the County Highway intersection operate at an acceptable level of service.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities -- The CRIP is very ambitious in terms of the total number and cost of road improvements.</p>	<p>We acknowledge that the CRIP is ambitious and believe this is a matter that should be discussed by the IFAC and the County Board.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities -- Revenue for impact fees tends to come in under estimates. Overestimation of projects could lead to higher fees for early developers.</p>	<p>The County's current ordinance has generated fees in excess of those anticipated at the time of its adoption. Nevertheless, since the ultimate adopted fee schedule may actually be below the level at which they could be technically justified, we believe this concern should be largely alleviated.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities -- How is the County planning to prioritize projects?</p>	<p>Due to the likelihood that the final CRIP will be cost constrained, project priorities will be based upon the greatest need, projected congestion and safety concerns as determined by the County Board.</p>