

Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee
Advisory Committee

Kane County Government Center
Meeting Minutes – February 24, 2012

Members in Attendance:

Tom Van Cleave
Cathy Hurlbut
Ron Ewing
Rich Guerard
Rick Dunlap
Jeffrey Schielke
Dale Berman

Others Present:

Patrick Jaeger, Kane Co. Division of Transportation
Jan Ward, Kane Co. Division of Transportation
Steve Coffinbargar, Kane Co. Division of Transportation
Jerry Dickson, Kane Co. Division of Transportation
Carl Schoedel, Kane County Engineer (Alt)
Tom Rickert, Kane Co. Division of Transportation (Alt)
Bob Getz, District 22 Candidate for County Board
Mark Koenen, St. Charles
Tom Talsma, EEI
David Patzert, Sho-Deen
Bob Schider, Sho-Deen
Melissa Taylor, Kane County Board Member

I. Call to order

Chairman Van Cleave called the Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

II. Roll call

A quorum was established with eight voting members present (including two alternates).

III. Public Comment – Bob Getz

Bob Getz presented his comments about the proposed Impact Fee Update. He stated his concerns that the Impact Fees may have negative impacts on new construction and provided a copy of his comments to the IFAC membership (attached).

IV. Approval of Minutes (January 20, 2011)

The minutes were approved on motion by Schielke, seconded by Berman – carried by a voice vote of 7-0.

V. Receiving Communications – None

VI. Reports

a. Consultant Report – Public Hearing Comments and Staff Responses

The consultant (CH2M HILL) presented an overview of the CRIP Public Hearing, detailing the adjustments made between what was previously presented to the IFAC and what was presented at the Public Hearing, and the comments received after the Public Hearing and the staff responses. Tom Rickert then passed out printed versions of two additional comments received after the public hearing comment period closed, one from Lily Lake and the other from Bob Getz. Bob Getz gave his comments earlier in the meeting. The Village of Lilly Lake comment primarily requested that the CRIP project at the intersection of Empire Road & IL-47 be completed sooner rather than later because of concerns with safety at the intersection.

b. Draft of Final Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan (CRIP)

A hard copy of the Draft Final CRIP document (including the Draft Final Ordinance) with staff recommended modifications was provided to the County Board members and those in attendance that requested a copy.

c. Recommendations to County Board to adopt, reject in whole or in part, or modify the recommended CRIP and Impact Fees.

The Consultant explained the statute requirements and then detailed the proposed modifications to the CRIP document that was presented at the public hearing.

A redline version of the Ordinance showing the modifications since the Public Hearing were provided to the County Board members and those in attendance that requested a copy. Tom Rickert announced that Pat Jaeger, from the State's attorney's office, is available to go over specific questions on the ordinance.

The following questions were raised:

Q: Why aren't the ITE standards applicable in the cases where the rates have changed?

A: The new ITE rates caused an increase in the fees for these two categories. Tom Rickert then explained that because one of the objectives of the CRIP update was to lower the impact fees, they felt that the previous rates should be kept for the two categories that went up based upon the direction of the Advisory Committee.

Q: Why was the project description changed to “grade separation” and not to “overpass” as requested?

A: In order to allow for flexibility in the future in the event that future engineering studies determine the need for an improvement different than an underpass.

Q: Did the total project cost come down?

A: In one case, a project cost went up due to a revision based up on more accurate information available. The portion of the Impact Fee eligible projects went down slightly due to removing Penny Road as IF eligible.

Q: What is included in the Longmeadow Parkway cost, is that the whole project?

A: Rickert replied that the project cost for Longmeadow Parkway included in the CRIP is the whole cost for the 2-lane facility the ten municipalities are pushing for, not the full blown out 4-lane facility project, because we are trying to focus on the project that needs to happen within the next ten or so years (\$165/\$167 for full blown out).

Q: The ordinance was amended to clarify that land is not always a credit, why is this?

A: Pat Jaeger clarified that if the contribution is not needed for the CRIP project, then it is not eligible for a credit. Therefore improvements to access and turn lanes added simply to improve a site and not to address capacity needs for a CRIP project would not be eligible for a credit. If the contribution addresses capacity needs for a CRIP project, then the contribution could be considered eligible for a credit.

Q: Incentives are based largely on high density in order to get credits for sustainability/walkability issues. Are those largely the incentives included in the Ordinance or are there more?

A: The additional incentives added are focused on Transit access, walkability, sustainability and infill/redevelopment.

Q: The developer has no control over if bus routes are intact in the future. If PACE discontinues service, then do they not receive a credit? They should be able to get entitlements on the existing conditions and have the entitlements be locked in for a certain amount of time for those incentives.

A: Tom Rickert explained that the county’s desire is to focus on the LEED elements, positive growth, and positive development activities in regards to impacts to the environment. Already the impact fees are reduced off the top by 50% and then if the developer does extra, we want to give an additional discount above and beyond what is already given to encourage “smart growth.” If a PACE route were to be discontinued in the next 5 years, the intention is not for the county to come after the developer for the

additional fees. The program is trying to encourage the developer to include positive attributes in their design.

Carl Schoedel pointed out that the incentives are all based upon the thought that smart growth is linked to actual trip reduction, which is why it qualifies as a credit. This is why transit service is important, but he agreed the hard part is actually creating a development that is transit supported. They are really trying to encourage smart growth within the county.

The staff recommendation to present the modified CRIP document to the County Board was approved on motion by Dunlap, seconded by Berman. After Guerard clarified that the modified CRIP would include the additional change to the Fee Schedule the IFAC committee vote was carried by a voice vote of 7-0.

VII. Old Business – None

VIII. New Business

- a. Following the presentation and vote, Schielke spoke about his involvement as the chairman of the Kane County Council of Mayors which distributes Federal Transportation funding across the county. As chairman of Kane County Council of Mayors, he also serves on the executive board of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning Council (CMAP) as the Chairman of the Council of Mayors which distributes the funding for transportation on a regional basis. He stated that the flow of transportation funding coming into the region is decreasing. The funding will be changing for the state and that the days of grants for state and federal transportation funding are coming to an end. He is concerned about the upcoming elections in Kane County and is not real sure the Impact Fee funding will continue, but transportation funding is a real issue as previous funding is no longer available.
- b. Next IFAC Meeting: TBD

IX. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 8:54. Motion to adjourn: Berman, seconded: Schielke