Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Advisory Committee

Kane County Government Center

Meeting Minutes - January 11, 2006

Members in Attendance:

Chairman Don Wolfe Christine Klein Rick Dunlap Jeffrey Schielke Larry Keller Dave Morrison (alternate) Heidi Files (alternate) Jan Carlson (arrived late) Kane County Board
Fox Valley Association of Realtors
Fox Valley Bldg. & Constrc. Trades Council/Local 150
Mayor, City of Batavia
President, Village of West Dundee
Village of Elburn
Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County Board

Others Present:

Jerry Dickson
Carl Schoedel
Tom Rickert
Steve Coffinbargar
Karl Fry
Atty. William Chesbrough
Dick Untch
Michael J. D. Brown
Bill McGrath
Ron Naylor
Steve Super
Jerry Swanson
Mary Ann Wilkinson
Greg Chismark
Tom Armstrong
Jeff Mihelich
Scott Buening

Kane County Div. of Transportation
Intersect LLC, Consultant for Kane County
Kane County State's Attorney
Director, Geneva Community Development
Village of Montgomery
City of Batavia
EEI
Village of South Elgin
City of Batavia
Village of Burlington
City of St. Charles
City of Elgin
Village of Algonquin
Village of Sugar Grove

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wolfe called the Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Advisory Committee meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL/ INTRODUCTIONS

A quorum was established with 8 voting members present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

IV. MINUTES

<u>December 6, 2005 Meeting Minutes</u> - were approved on motion by Dunlap, seconded by Morrison. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

A change in the agenda followed:

VI. REPORTS

- a) Staff Report Public Hearing on Land Use Assumptions and Summary of Comments Received Coffinbargar reported that approximately 12 individuals attended the December 20, 2005 public hearing. A description of the hearing followed. Comments received from the public were included in an Executive Summary in the members' packets and also a response to the comments written in a Question/Answer format. Subsequently, staff received written comments from the municipalities and public which were included on page 3 of the document.
- b) <u>Consultant Report Recommended Land Use Assumptions</u> Mr. Karl Fry, with Intersect LLC, explained that at the public hearing, current land use assumptions for Kane County were presented for both population and employment, mainly consisting of estimates pulled from the U.S. Census Bureau for years 2000 to 2004. The 2015 figures were based on municipal input, Kane County data, and projections from the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission ("NIPC"). Since the public hearing, much input has been received from the municipalities and public

regarding the figures, and, as a result of the input received, adjustments were made to the 2015 land use assumptions. Much of the population figures remained the same, but Mr. Fry noted that significant population projection increases (compared to the original 2015 projections) were made in Hampshire Township while significant decreases in population projections, as compared to the original 2015 projections, occurred in Sugar Grove Township. Overall, the countywide 2015 population projections increased by approximately 5,000, as compared to the original 2015 population projections. He understood that the county would be meeting with NIPC and that meeting could result in some adjustments of NIPC's projections. Mayor Schielke voiced comments about the forecasting in general and the impact of the county's water study. Mr. Fry continued, explaining the same exercise was done for the employment figures. A large increase in 2015 employment projections, as compared to the original 2015 population projections, was seen in Big Rock Township. However, after working with a number of municipalities, there was very little increase in employment figures (in addition to the original 2015 projections) expected. Other figures followed for the townships, noting a significant decrease in employment projections, as compared to the original 2015 projections, was expected to occur in Sugar Grove Township. Lastly, Mr. Fry reviewed the non-residential development and residential development figures and how they would impact and factor into the county's impact fee calculation. In closing, Mr. Fry stated the tables presented would have to either be approved, modified, or rejected at the committee's January 18, 2006 meeting.

VII. OLD BUSINESS - None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- a) <u>Discussion Issues for Next Advisory Committee Meeting</u> Mr. Fry emphasized that voting will take place on the land use assumptions next week. He believed it was necessary that staff and he receive guidance from the committee as to what issues it wanted addressed as it relates to more general changes to the impact fee ordinance. (Carlson arrives)
 - b) Next Advisory Meeting January 18, 2006

V. RECEIVING COMMUNICATIONS -

Chairman Wolfe referred members to the January 9, 2006 letter received from Mayor Schielke from the City of Batavia. Mayor Schielke summarized that his letter was to basically avoid the same issues that were raised during the last process and that the city was getting the questions on the table to discuss. He agreed that state statute constrained much of what the county could do but he agreed it was important to keep the process open and to look at all issues prior to voting of the final fee structure. Chairman Wolfe concurred, adding that staff was in the process of addressing the questions. Mayor Schielke asked to address the issues written in the letter at the committee's next meeting. Chairman Wolfe asked that members be prepared to ask questions at the next meeting as well. Morrison suggested that staff e-mail its responses to the letter to the committee members prior to the next meeting. Mr. Schoedel stated every effort would be made to do so.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 a.m. on motion by Klein, seconded by Morrison. Motion passed unanimously.

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