

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

Kane County Government Center

Meeting Minutes - July 26, 2006

Members in Attendance:

Chairman Don Wolfe
Vice Chairman Frank Griffin
Larry Keller
Rick Dunlap
Marilyn Michelini (alternate)
Jan Carlson

Kane County Board
Kane County Economic Development Advisory Board
Village of West Dundee
Fox Valley Building Trades/Local 150
Village President for Montgomery
Kane County Board

Others Present:

Carl Schoedel
Tom Rickert
Jerry Dickson
Steve Coffinbargar
Heidi Files
Patrick Jaeger
Karl Fry
Phil Bus
Christy Sabdo
Dick Untch
Scott Buening
Greg Chismark
Michael Brown
Jerry Swanson
Scott Marquardt
Chad Pannucci

Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County State's Attorney
Intersect LLC, Consultant for Kane County
Kane County Development Department
Kane County Development Department
City of Geneva
Village of Sugar Grove
City of St. Charles
Village of Montgomery
City of Batavia
Village of Carpentersville
Centex Homes - Elgin

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wolfe called the Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Advisory Committee meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

II. ROLL CALL/ INTRODUCTIONS

A quorum was established with six (6) voting members present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

IV. MINUTES

May 24, 2006 Meeting Minutes - were approved on motion by Carlson, seconded by Keller. Motion passed by voice vote of 6-0.

V. RECEIVING COMMUNICATIONS - None

VI. REPORTS

A) Staff Presentations - Draft 2030 Plan Incentives. In reviewing a PowerPoint presentation, Sabdo discussed how the initial Road Impact Fee Ordinance, approved in January 2004, was not well received by some of the municipalities due to the large variation in fees from one service area to another. One of the goals of the current update of the program was to further investigate the issue of the variation in fees across the County. Staff is also working on a Road Improvement Impact Fee Discount Program that will reward developments that reduce the generation of new vehicle trips. Because it has been determined that the county will not have the \$3.3 billion necessary to accommodate the increased traffic from new planned development, the county is looking to alternative options to reduce travel demand and vehicle trip reduction and encourage increased alternative modes of transportation including transit, walking, and biking. Sabdo summarized that the proposed discount program involves two parts. The first, Part A, offers basic discounts to developers whose development meets all of the following criteria: 1) location; 2) mixed-use land uses; 3) compact development; 4) housing diversity; and 5) walkability. Examples of the Part A discount followed. The second, Part B, which is optional, focuses on 1) transportation efficiency and choice (10% additional discount); 2) increased housing diversity (10% additional discount); 3) Density x 2 from Part A (10% additional discount); and 4) Density x 4 from Part A (10% additional discount) in addition to the 40% discount available in Part A. Examples of Part B were presented. Sabdo reported that Part A discounts, if used, reduced trip generation by approximately 20%.

Griffin confirmed with staff that the discount program was more for redevelopment. He asked how more density would lower trip counts, wherein Sabdo explained that higher density next to commercial usually promoted walkability but the two uses had to exist. Mr. Fry added that the fees were based on a per housing unit cost for residential and the higher the density, the number of trips generated per housing unit was less even though the number of trips per acre was greater. Also, with more density, the trip length was lower. Mr. Fry clarified that the discount program was being limited to the Urban Corridor. Discussion was raised that the discount program should not be limited just to the Urban Corridor, wherein Exec. Dir. Bus explained that the concept alone would be difficult to promote within the corridor but staff would like to use the program successfully in the Urban Corridor first before using the program elsewhere. If the program was successful, then staff would encourage revisiting the ordinance, as required every five years, and to use the program in the Critical Growth area. Wolfe expressed concern about the timing of the program since the Critical Growth area was where most of the growth was occurring. Bus emphasized that the program must stand the test of time and must be supported by statute. Mr. Fry reiterated the same point but noted that in other such developments, such as redevelopment corridors, if another development meets some of the proposed criteria there would be nothing preventing the county from granting a discount based on traffic studies through an Individual Assessment. The discount being proposed, however, must be tied to reduction in the generation of vehicular trips. Staff asked for direction. Discussion arose as to whether the board could reconsider the discount program for other corridors in two years versus five years, which staff said it could be done. Dialog followed on how the proposed program would apply to the redevelopment taking place in downtown Aurora, to which Bus stated was a good example of what the county was seeking.

Should the advisory board recommend a response to staff, Bus explained that staff would assemble a meeting with the appropriate staff and municipalities and review the criteria. **Griffin moved to accept the discount program and move it forward as part of the final draft, seconded by Michelini.** Mr. Scott Buening, from the Village of Sugar Grove, also supported starting the program in the Critical Growth area since the opportunity may be gone in the future. He also supported the discount program in general, stating it made sense. Griffin saw the discount program as a living document and saw the opportunity for developers and the cities to see how the program could be applied. In support of the Urban Corridor, Bus interjected and explained that the Urban Corridor was much more defined than the Critical Growth area because the Critical Growth area changed daily due to municipal decision-making by 28 cities. He further noted that this same matter was discussed extensively among staff. Again, he recommended defining the discount program to the Critical Growth area and then possibly expanding it to the Priority Places. Keller was in favor of moving forward with the proposal but leaving the door open for any proposals outside the Critical Growth area to be considered within a year or two. **Motion carried.**

B) Consultant Presentations - CRIP Components and Status of current Projects. Mr. Fry reminded the board that he would like to focus on the Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan ("CRIP") over the next couple of months, which is a list of projects that will be necessary to accommodate the expected development, costs for the projects, and how the new development will finance that construction. Under the statute, the CRIP must include the following criteria: 1) include the current county roadway network; 2) commitment to cure existing deficiencies where practical, unless other SRA's are added; 3) land use assumptions; 4) proposed road improvements, intersections, lanes and their estimated costs (to improve level D on included routes); 5) identify the sources of funding, including county, state and federal monies; 6) identify intergovernmental agreements, if necessary, and identify cost allocations; and 7) define a road improvement schedule and the correction of existing deficiencies. More currently, staff has reviewed the first phase of the modeling. In August, staff will develop a project list from that modeling. Mr. Fry plans on having this board meet in August or September to review the CRIP. A tentative fee schedule will be reviewed once the project list and tentative service boundaries are identified. Wolfe was not convinced on the eligibility of SRA's and did not want not to see any state routes on the county's project list. A discussion followed. Addressing how the fee formula would be applied, Mr. Fry explained that fee options would be presented to the board and the board would see the effect of its decisions being made. Details of the formula followed. (Carlson leaves meeting at 8:50 a.m.)

Wolfe asked members for their input on the state SRA's and whether to include them in the projects or not. Keller indicated that the county did not have enough money to begin with and the county needed to tie the roads together. Coffinbargar noted that the SRA information would be retrieved through the modeling.

C) Schedule for Impact Fee Program Update. See above discussion.

VII. OLD BUSINESS - None

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

For the record, Griffin said he was protesting his impact fee charged for his new residence.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 a.m. on motion by Michelini, seconded by Keller. Motion passed, vote of 6-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt, Recording Secretary