

Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Program Update

Staff Response to Comments on Draft CRIP Project List

NOTE: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ADDED SINCE THE LAST DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT (1/15/07) ARE IN **BOLD TYPE** AND ARE LISTED WITH THE MOST RECENT COMMENTS FIRST

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Sugar Grove (2/6/07) Gordon Road should be added to the County Highway system and be included in the CRIP</p>	<p>Staff agrees that at least portions of Gordon Road may make sense as an addition to the County Highway system and suggests that the Village make a formal request for a Jurisdictional Transfer. If the County Board agrees with the transfer, then the improvements could be considered for addition to the CRIP.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (2/6/07) The fee schedule should be phased in over a five year period increasing from 32% of the calculated impact to a maximum of 64% of the calculated impact. The increased fees should not go into effect before 1/1/08.</p>	<p>This is in line with the preliminary IFAC recommendation adopted at the January meeting.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (2/6/07) The transit requirement in the Discount Program should be more flexible.</p>	<p>Staff is working on final recommended language for several elements of the discount program and welcomes any specific suggestions the Village may wish to provide; however, staff strongly believes that availability of some form of public mass transit must be an essential component of the discount program if it is to achieve its goal of reduction in travel on the County Highway system.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Sugar Grove (2/6/07) The ordinance should continue to provide a mechanism for developments that provide trip reduction benefits (even though they may not meet the strict requirements of the discount program) to receive an appropriate discount in their fees.</p>	<p>Staff supports retaining the option of an Individual Assessment of Impact (Section 11) as written in the current draft ordinance. This option has been used successfully several times on projects.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Add construction of Gordon Road to the CRIP.</p>	<p>The Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) previously determined that non-county projects would be excluded from the CRIP. If Gordon Road is added to the county highway system, the County Board could consider amending the CRIP at that time.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Add completion of the Route 47/I-88 Interchange to the CRIP</p>	<p>The Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) previously determined that non-county projects would be excluded from the CRIP.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Add the construction of Municipal Drive to the CRIP</p>	<p>The Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) previously determined that non-county projects would be excluded from the CRIP. If Municipal Drive is added to the county highway system, the County Board could consider amending the CRIP at that time.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Add the widening of Galena Boulevard from Gordon Road to Route 47 to the CRIP</p>	<p>The Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) previously determined that non-county projects would be excluded from the CRIP. If Galena Boulevard is added to the county highway system, the County Board could consider amending the CRIP at that time.</p>
	<p>Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Reduce the scope of the Bliss Road improvements in the CRIP</p>	<p>Staff is considering this request and will advise the IFAC of its recommendation prior to the public hearing</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – The fee schedule should max out at 60% and be phased in.	The IFAC has previously recommended that the fee schedule be phased in from 32% in the first year to 64% in the fifth year.
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Projects/Parcels platted prior to 1/1/09 should be grandfathered	The IFAC has previously recommended that developments receiving “Site specific development approval” prior to 1/1/08 be grandfathered for up to two years.
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Full credit should be given for all project costs for projects included in the CRIP	Staff believes that if fees are reduced from the calculated impact, then credits should be reduced by a like amount.
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Developers should receive credit up to the amount of their fees for developer funded improvements	The current draft ordinance limits credits to the fee for a specific development.
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Municipalities should receive credit that can be applied to developers fees as determined by the municipality for municipality funded improvements	Staff is unsure how this would work in practice, but would be willing to discuss the matter further
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) – Road improvements that make regional benefits, but not on County Roads, should be eligible for credits.	The state statute limits expenditure of impact fees, and by reference, granting of credits, to projects listed in the CRIP.
	Sugar Grove (1/18/07) The fee discount program should not include a mass transit component	Staff strongly believes that availability of transit is the single greatest factor in reduction of vehicle trips and is critical to achieving the goals of this program. Projects that have other trip reduction features may be granted discounts based on the results of an Individual Assessment of impact as provided for in Section Eleven of the ordinance.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Attainable Housing Alliance (1/9/07) – Projects needed to alleviate existing deficiencies in the highway system should be excluded from the CRIP.	Numerous projects identified as existing deficiencies at the time the original ordinance was adopted in 2003 are not eligible for impact fee funding.
	Attainable Housing Alliance (1/9/07) – The ordinance should adhere to the “specifically and uniquely attributable” requirement in the state statute	The statute states that the fee may not exceed the amount “specifically and uniquely attributable” to new development. Staff contends that the fees contemplated in the draft fee schedule meet this requirement, and that lower fees in the current ordinance also meet the requirement.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Fees should be capped at 60% of maximum, based on the “Discussion Points” document.	As has been consistently stated by the County’s consultant, fees should be capped at 80% of the calculated impact. Further reductions from that level could be considered as a policy matter, but also should consider the availability (or lack thereof) of additional revenue sources to cover the unfunded cost of CRIP projects.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Additional consideration should be given to further reductions based on bullet points 2-4 of the “Discussion Points” document.	Consideration of the factors in bullet points 2-5 of the “Discussion Points” document would be adequately covered by a reduction from 80% to 60% of the calculated impact.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Implementation of the fees should be phased in due to substantial increases	A phase-in of the fees was suggested by staff and is being considered by the IFAC.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Fees are not equal, since there is a variance of 3% between areas 2 and 3 in the current draft fee schedule.	Fees need to have a sound technical basis, and need to be “specifically and uniquely attributable” to the conditions in each service area; therefore, it is not realistic for them to be equal. The fees in the current draft fee schedule are certainly much closer than those in the current ordinance.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Is the concept of “Super Projects” that benefit the entire county still being considered?	This concept was considered, but ultimately discarded due to legal concerns regarding the “Direct and Material Benefit” requirement.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – An implementation schedule with phased in fees from 30% to 60% should be used.	This is largely a policy matter. The IFAC may present this or another schedule for public comment at the Public Hearing, and later in its final recommendation to the County Board.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Any parcel that has an approved preliminary plat prior to 1/1/08 should be “grandfathered” under the existing ordinance.	This is largely a policy matter. The IFAC may present this or another schedule for public comment at the Public Hearing, and later in its final recommendation to the County Board.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Developers should be given the option to pay under the old or new ordinances for grandfathered projects.	This is largely a policy matter. The IFAC may present this or another schedule for public comment at the Public Hearing, and later in its final recommendation to the County Board.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – The discount program should be made available immediately.	This is largely a policy matter. The IFAC may present this or another schedule for public comment at the Public Hearing, and later in its final recommendation to the County Board.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Developers should receive \$1 credit for every \$1 expended on CRIP eligible improvements made as a part of a development.	If fees are reduced based on a percentage of the cost of the CRIP, then the credits for CRIP improvements should be reduced by a like percentage, as provided in the draft ordinance that was previously distributed.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Road projects with regional benefits should be eligible for funding, even though they may not be on the County Highway system.	Illinois law requires that impact fee funds may only be expended on projects included in the CRIP. The IFAC has previously determined that only County Highway improvements will be included in the CRIP.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Municipalities should also be able to earn “credits” for improvements made that provide benefits.	We are not sure exactly how that would work, or who would ultimately receive the “credits,” but any improvements would have to be CRIP eligible.
	Tri-Cities (1/11/07) – Project priorities in the final CRIP should be reviewed by IFAC and be made available to the public before the CRIP is finalized.	We expect to provide initial recommendations to the IFAC for discussion prior to the Public Hearing.
	St. Charles (1/9/07) – The widening of Randall Road should be extended north of Route 64 through the intersection of Randall and Dean Street	The current project was designed to accommodate projected traffic volumes. This section of Randall will be revisited with the next program update.
	St. Charles (1/9/07) – The widening of Randall Road should be extended south of Route 64 through the intersection of Randall Road and Bricher Road.	These improvements are included in CRIP Project #76.
	St. Charles (1/9/07) – The construction of the Red Gate Bridge should be included in the CRIP	The Impact Fee Advisory Committee has previously determined that only County Highway improvements should be included in the CRIP and therefore eligible for Impact Fee funding. The County has previously provided financial support for the Bridge Feasibility Study, and obtained \$6 Million in state funds and \$360,000 in developer contributions for the project.
	Batavia (1/2/07) The CRIP should include a center turn lane on Fabyan from Randall to Kirk and intersection improvements at IL-25 and IL-31.	Staff concurs with the installation of turn lanes from Western to Kirk and will await a recommendation from the IFAC Committee concerning the proposed CRIP changes.
75 & 76	Geneva (12/19/06) Do these projects include the widening of the Randall Road bridge over the UP Railroad?	Yes. Project 75 (Randall Road, Main to Keslinger) includes widening of the UP Railroad overpass.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
19	Geneva (12/19/06) With all the development west of Peck Road, shouldn't the widening of Keslinger Road west of Peck be included in the CRIP	Traffic modeling indicates that widening of Keslinger Road to four lanes between Bunker Road and Peck Road may be justified in 2015; however, the County Board in coordination with the City of Geneva agreed to focus traffic to IL 38 and Fabyan Parkway.
	Geneva (12/19/06) Will Kirk Road be utilized more once the Stearns Road bridge is constructed?	Traffic modeling indicates that construction of the Stearns Road bridge will have little net impact on Kirk Road traffic. Furthermore, as a result of the limited available developable land east of the Fox River, traffic growth on Kirk Road will be much slower over the next ten years compared to recent historical trends.
	Geneva (12/19/06) The CRIP should reflect the recommendations of the 2003 Fabyan Parkway Feasibility Study; including, improvements at the intersection of IL-31 and Fabyan to include double left turn lanes and right turn lanes on the east and west approaches.	Staff concurs with this comment and will await a recommendation from the IFAC Committee concerning the proposed CRIP changes.
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) I. Overview -- Project need, scoping and cost estimates are much more critical in a Facilities Driven ordinance.	While this is true in general, and the County will provide documentation of the traffic modeling and project scoping, we believe that potential reductions to the full facilities-driven fees will reduce the need for extremely detailed project cost estimates.
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) I.1. Municipal Review should not be construed as support for a specific project prior to completion of all applicable engineering and environmental studies.	The CRIP does not in any way pre-empt the public process required for project development. Typical municipal coordination will proceed once PE is initiated on specific projects. Detailed project scoping is outside the scope of this study.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>I.2. Tri-Cities can not concur with the CRIP and service area boundaries until the impact on the fee schedule is demonstrated.</p>	<p>Staff was not requesting concurrence with the plan; rather, early input that could be considered well in advance of the public hearing. The fact that all components of the plan are critical to the determination of the fee schedule 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. The draft fee schedule resulting from the preliminary CRIP has been provided to the advisory committee. Staff expects significant additional discussion on the fee schedule, if not individual CRIP projects, before the CRIP is adopted by the County Board.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>II.A. 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 segment 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 segments with V/C ratios greater than 0.8 and intersections with a deficient level of service. Because the traffic model provides daily volumes, detailed capacity analysis of both intersections and segments requires too many assumptions to be meaningful. The need for add-lanes improvements was based on what we believe is conservative estimates of daily traffic volumes. In all cases, widening to four or five lanes was only considered if the projected segment ADT volume exceeded 20,000. Need for a center turn lane is based on adjacent land use. Intersection improvements are likewise based on reasonable and conservative estimates of lane requirements to accommodate total entering volume and anticipated traffic patterns.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>II.B. How were project costs calculated?</p>	<p>Project costs for segment improvements are based on the general scope of the improvement and length of the improvement, with adjustments for significant cost elements such as bridges and anticipated land acquisition needs. If PE has already been initiated on a project, the latest cost estimates and anticipated outside funding were factored into the CRIP.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>II.C. Some cost elements such as sidewalks and street lighting should be excluded from the cost calculations.</p>	<p>Staff would suggest that the cost of providing for alternative modes of transportation (sidewalks, bike paths, transit access) is not only permitted by law, but an appropriate use of impact fees. The issue of street lighting may be a valid point, which could be excluded. As indicated above, a potential reduction in the full fees compared to the calculated impact reduces this concern.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>III-1. Scope of Work Issues – Mainline dual left turn lanes.</p>	<p>Generally, the CRIP assumes that most arterial/arterial intersections will have dual lefts on all four legs, provided the approaches have at least two through lanes.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>III-2. Scope of Work Issues – Median Cross Section</p>	<p>The median cross section is anticipated to reflect existing or anticipated adjacent land use. If a need for turn lanes is not expected for a reasonable distance, the median will be tapered down between access points. A bidirectional turn lane is anticipated in areas where there are frequent access driveways for adjacent land use.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>III-3. Scope of Work Issues – Right turn lanes on six lane roads</p>	<p>Most of these have been provided at developer expense as a site access improvement. When a segment is improved, the need for deceleration lanes will be evaluated based on through lane and access driveway volume.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) III-4. Scope of Work Issues – Bridge widening or reconstruction	At this time, we have assumed that the Randall Road bridge over the UPRR will be reconstructed.
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) III-5. Scope of Work Issues – Previous right of way dedications	Anticipated ROW needs are based on dedicated rights of way as depicted in the County’s mapping system.
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) III-6. Scope of Work Issues – Stormwater Management Requirements	The County expects to fully comply with stormwater management requirements for all projects. This is a reason project costs, especially for segment improvements, are high. The need for ROW for detention, or in the alternative, extensive in-line pipe storage of stormwater, is both extremely expensive.
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) III-7. Scope of Work Issues – Staging of major improvements	We anticipate that a large number of the listed projects will be ultimately broken down into multiple construction contracts for a number of reasons. Naturally, intersection improvements are likely to have a high priority.
	Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06) III-8. Scope of Work Issues – Impact of external trips	While we agree that the number of external trips is significant on a number of routes slated for improvement, it is our belief that the need for the listed projects, with few exceptions, is justified solely based on anticipate Kane County growth. Again, potential reduction in the full fees makes this less of a concern.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>III-9. Scope of Work Issues – Financial Obligations of Municipalities</p>	<p>At this point, estimated costs for the projects include all 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 overall acceptable level of service.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>III-10. Scope of Work Issues – Cost of Randall from Main to Keslinger</p>	<p>This project includes the replacement of the railroad bridge as well as three major intersections. When engineering, ROW, and stormwater management requirements are included, we believe this is a realistic cost estimate.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>IV.A.1. Potential for existing development to subsidize future development</p>	<p>We acknowledge that some of the projects will result in roadway capacity that can be utilized by future development, although we believe the need for the entire project can be shown to be “specifically and uniquely attributable” to new development in the County. Nevertheless, a potential reduction in the full fees will be justified by this consideration.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>IV.A.2. Potential to create surplus capacity that benefits existing users.</p>	<p>Projects needed to address existing deficiencies on the highway system as of the date of adoption of the original ordinance are not included in the eligible CRIP costs. Also see above response.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>IV.A.3. Potential to extend useful roadway life for benefit of all users.</p>	<p>Because of the extensive additions to the network in terms of lane miles, it is a possibility that the County will need an increase in the maintenance budget to meet new needs. We do not believe this issue is a valid concern as far as the fee calculations.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>IV.B. 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 County Board.</p>
	<p>Tri-Cities (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>IV.B. (Cont.). 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 (Coulter Transportation Consulting – 11/8/06)</p> <p>IV.B. (Cont.). 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>
	<p>Tri-Cities (11/10/06) 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 (11/10/06) 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 all components of the plan are critical to the determination of the fee schedule has been acknowledged by staff since the beginning of this process. Alternative zone boundary scenarios have been presented at two IFAC meetings along with the resulting cost per trip based on the then-current project lists. All alternatives considered have resulted in much closer fees across the county when compared with the current ordinance.</p>

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) What was the traffic modeling or capacity analysis process that led to the preliminary project list?	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 links. Links on the County highway system with v/c's greater than 0.8 were investigated further by comparing predicted link volumes to existing volumes and internal department projections. Projects already included in the adopted CRIP were first included in the plan, followed by selected projects in the adopted 2030 plan, and finally by a very few additional projects.
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) How was the scope of work defined and what does it include?	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. Need for a center turn lane is bases on adjacent land use. 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. A more detailed description of each project will be distributed prior to the next IFAC meeting.
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) How were project costs calculated?	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. Further, we would suggest that the cost of providing for alternative modes of transportation (sidewalks, bike paths, transit access) is not only permitted by law, but an appropriate use of impact fees.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) What financial obligations does the CRIP place on municipalities?	At this point, estimated costs for the projects include all 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.
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) The CRIP is very ambitious in terms of the total number and cost of road improvements.	We acknowledge and share this concern, and believe this is a matter that should be discussed by the IFAC. At this point it is unlikely that the adopted fee schedule, supplemented by any additional revenue, would be sufficient to complete all projects in the plan.
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) Revenue for impact fees tends to come in under estimates. Overestimation of projects could lead to higher fees for early developers.	The County's current ordinance has generated fees far in excess of those anticipated at the time of its adoption. Nevertheless, since the fees are likely to be substantially below the level at which they could be technically justified, we believe this concern should be largely alleviated.
	Tri-Cities (11/10/06) How is the County planning to prioritize projects?	Project priorities will be part of the final CRIP, and will be determined in consultation with municipalities. Because the CRIP is likely to be cost-constrained, this element will be especially important.
4	Village of Sugar Grove (11/9/06) 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

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
1	Village of Sugar Grove (11/9/06) 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 (11/9/06) 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.
27	Village of Lily Lake (11/9/06) 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.
68	Village of Lily Lake (11/9/06) 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.
52	Village of Carpentersville (11/9/06) 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.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
50	Village of Carpentersville (11/9/06) 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.
53	Village of Carpentersville (11/9/06) 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 (11/9/06) 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 (11/9/06) 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 (11/9/06) 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.
	Village of Pingree Grove (11/10/06) Requested addition of Reinking 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 does not include capacity improvements and therefore the improvements would not be eligible for impact fee funding.
	Village of Hampshire (11/8/06) 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.

Project #	Comment	DOT Staff Response
46	Village of Hampshire (11/8/06) 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 (11/8/06) 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

DRAFT