

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

**Kane County Government Center
County Board Room**

Meeting Minutes - November 15, 2006, 1:00 p.m.

Members in Attendance:

Chairman Don Wolfe
Vice Chairman Frank Griffin
Sharon Gorrell
Larry Keller
Dave Morrison
Christine Ludwiszewski
Heidi Files
Jan Carlson

Kane County Board
Kane County Economic Development Advisory Board
Fox Valley Association of Realtors
Village of West Dundee
Village of Elburn
Attainable Housing Alliance
Kane County Division of Transportation
Kane County Board

Others Present:

Carl Schoedel
Tom Rickert
Jerry Dickson
Steve Coffinbargar
Patrick Jaeger
Karl Fry
Phil Bus
Kai Tarum
Dick Untch
Charles Radovich
Chris Aiston
Phil Page
Katie Thornton
John Noble
Denny Wiggins
Mike Foroncak
Ron Naylor
Brian Townsend
Jim Bassett
Iris Ware
Scott Marquardt

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
Attorney, City of Geneva
City of Geneva
City of Geneva
Village of Algonquin
Attorney, City of Batavia
Fox Valley Home Builders
Village of Sugar Grove
Engineering Enterprises, Inc.
City of St. Charles
Village of Pingree Grove
R. A. Faganel Builders
Village of Carpentersville

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wolfe called the Kane County Road Improvement Impact Fee Advisory Committee meeting to order at 1:13 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL/ INTRODUCTIONS

A quorum was established with eight (8) voting members present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS (None)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the October 18, 2006 meeting were approved on motion by Keller, seconded by Griffin. Motion passed by voice vote of 6-0.

V. RECEIVING COMMUNICATIONS

Covered under Agenda Item 6A.

VI. REPORTS

A. Summary of Municipal Comments on Preliminary CRIP Project List- Mr. Fry indicated a number of comments were received from several municipalities as well as a November 10, 2006 letter from the Tri-Cities. (Gorrell and Carlson arrive). A review of each of the comments followed as well as the Division of Transportation's responses to those projects. Mr. Fry stated staff was not seeking approval of the draft CRIP project list currently, rather the County was looking for input on the projects in the CRIP. However, he intended to respond to the Tri-Cities letter. Chairman Wolfe asked that when staff responds to the Tri-Cities letter to copy members of this committee.

Chairman Wolfe opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Jim Bassett, Village of Pingree Grove, stated he had discussions with staff regarding a 500 feet section of Reinking Road from the railroad tracks to U.S. 20 which was the only county road that existed in the perimeter of the village. He stated the village would like the section of roadway included in the CRIP project list. He pointed out that much growth has occurred in the village and currently there was in excess of \$600,000 that developers in Pingree Grove had contributed in Impact Fees. Mr. Bassett explained the Village of Pingree Grove was willing to accept the Reinking Road jurisdictional transfer but, in return, that the portion of Reinking Road be placed into the current profile of the north section of the roadway. He did not understand how the section of roadway north of US 20 to Damisch Road did not qualify for the CRIP program. On another matter, he stated that because Routes 72, 47 and 20 are considered the same road in the village for approximately one mile and running with the railroad tracks, Mr. Bassett stated he has repeatedly requested that the county consider that location for the future train station; otherwise vehicles will travel straight through the village to get to the train station. Dir. Schoedel stated staff will continue to work with the village but he questioned whether it was appropriate to talk about the improvement as part of the CRIP program since there is ongoing coordination regarding a potential jurisdictional transfer of this section of Reinking/Damisch Road.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion - CRIP Project List - Mr. Coffinbargar referenced the latest draft CRIP Project List noting that revisions were made after receiving the municipal input and other staff input. Mr. Fry reviewed and compared the *Summary of Recommended Changes to the Preliminary CRIP Project List* to the similar summary provided at the October 18, 2006 meeting. A detailed review of the recommended changes followed, specifically, Project Nos. 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 22, 46, 47, 48, 52, 56, 65, 73, 79, 86, and 88. Those projects reduced by scope or revised included Project Nos. 9, 17, and 52. No. 88 (Dunham - Army Trail to Stearns Rd.) was a new project. Asked if the level of service is established when determining the cost for a project, Mr. Fry explained that in general, whenever improvements are made they are made with the consideration to bring up the facility to an acceptable level of service based on a 20-year design. A question was raised on the cost estimates from last month as compared to the new cost estimates, wherein Mr. Fry explained that the plan distributed at the October 18th meeting had an estimated cost of \$1,264,000.00. as compared to the current plan of \$1,247,000.00, or, slightly less. Asked whether the Randall Road construction projects could realistically be completed within the 10 year period, Mr. Fry conveyed that the program was ambitious and is hard to predict. In meeting that deadline, however, Mr. Fry stated the county would have to get its projects ready in the most expeditious way, prioritize the projects in a realistic manner, and consider funding availability. Ludwiszewski inquired how funding would be delegated to the projects since money would be flowing in continuously, wherein Mr. Fry explained that the county had the option to spend money which is collected in each service area on any project within the service area.

B. Discussion - Service Area Boundary Scenarios - The two criteria for service boundaries were once again reviewed by Mr. Fry: 1) the fee must be specifically and uniquely attributable to the traffic generated by a specific development; and 2) the developer must receive a direct and material benefit from paying the fee. Mr. Fry emphasized the importance of the two criteria and also having enough projects in each of the service areas. Recalling from last month, Mr. Fry said the committee discussed Alternates 4 and appeared to favor Alternative 5 since the cost per trip was more evenly spread between the four service areas. In reviewing Alternative 5, a slight revision was made to service zones 2 and 3 to follow the Fabyan/Main Street Corridor. (Morrison steps away.) In addition, it was pointed out that service area boundaries under Alternate 5, more closely follow the travel desire bands because of the east/west travel. From a transportation planning perspective, Mr. Fry believed Alternative 5 made sense and the cost per trip was more fair and met the requirements of the state statute. He further explained that the cost per trip figures in the table reflected the relationship between the fees from one service area to the next, or, within the current CRIP. Staff could justify the impact fee on a single-family home as much as \$5,102. Dir. Schoedel clarified that the draft figures being presented were not the actual fee schedule (Morrison returns). The draft figures represented projects costs and trip generation and not trip length.

Ludwiszewski supported the fair costs per trip between the three zones but still questioned how Criteria No. 1 for a service boundary met the goal due to not much development occurring on the western edge of the county. Mr. Fry agreed that the service areas under Alternative 5 were large, but that the entire picture and the distribution of the projects had to be considered. He pointed out that the advantages to having a facilities-driven approach was that the service fees would be fair and follow development. Chairman Wolfe expressed concern about the legalities of any proposed service boundaries, wherein Asst. State's Atty. Jaeger stated he was comfortable with what was being proposed under Alternative 5.

Dir. Schoedel, again, cautioned the committee that the draft figures being presented were not the actual fees but

the cost per trip and more work was still in order, with the final draft fee schedule to be discussed at this committee in the future. Mr. Fry explained the estimates of costs for the projects and what the statute will allow as the maximum fee based on a fee per trip. However, he noted from a public policy perspective, the County Board may not chose to follow it and this committee was charged with the responsibility of considering the policy and making a recommendation. Mr. Fry indicated that once an alternative was chosen, the committee would be discussing what an appropriate fee schedule would be based on the cost per trip. Wolfe suggested that in the future staff explain how the cost figures were derived for the needs-based approach as compared to the facilities-based approach. Coffinbargar explained that there were new projects added to the CRIP, along with some new costs. Mr. Fry pointed out the differences on the CRIP were based on the revision of the ordinance and how the fees were calculated. Ludwiszewski expressed concern that the projects along Randall Road were significant and most of the roof tops were already there. She said the county would be asking that new homeowners located in the middle of the county to pay for projects that were still along Randall Road which still had traffic issues. Rickert, however, pointed out that development to the west will still utilize Randall Road and the plan developed has began to address the actual traffic impacts and the facilities needed for the next 10 years. Ludwiszewski noted that the existing users of Randall Road will not be paying for the projects in the CRIP, wherein Mr. Fry stated the existing users would be paying for certain improvements through their property taxes, motor fuel taxes, etc. to address deficiencies that exist along Randall Road. **Griffin moved to forward Alternative 5 to the County Board for consideration, seconded by Keller. Motion carried by voice vote of 7-0.**

C. Discussion - Impact Fee Discounts Program- Dir. Tarum briefly summarized the discounts for Part A and Part B of the Impact Fee Program Discounts Program, explaining that new developments would receive a 40% discount for meeting all of the four criteria under Part A. A new development under Part B would be eligible for an additional 10% discount in addition to meeting the 40% discount under Part A. Details followed. Chairman Wolfe emphasized the importance of the discount proposals, noting that it was an incentive to drive certain types of development in addition to paying for some roads. Wolfe conveyed that it was up to the developers and the municipalities to become creative. Gorrell questioned why a fee for a redevelopment site would be imposed as well as staff's earlier comments about having difficulty with housing diversity. Dir. Tarum explained the correlation between housing diversity and the reduction of trip generation.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Ordinance Text Amendments - Review for Next Meeting - Mr. Fry explained that the committee had before them a series of draft ordinance amendments which did not include the Impact Fee Discount Program at all. Therefore, he asked if the committee would like for staff to put the language into the ordinance for next month's meeting. Members concurred. The committee was asked to review the ordinance text amendments, noting that a majority of the changes related to a facilities-driven formula and some housekeeping issues.

B. Recommendation for Public hearing Date - The committee was reminded that once the county board sets the public hearing date, the clock begins to tick. Mr. Fry suggested that if the committee was comfortable with a CRIP project list and a recommended fee schedule by January/February 2007, he recommended a February public hearing date. Concern was raised by some members to see the fees first before setting a hearing date. Carlson suggested meeting more often to address the figures prior to sending the matter to the county board. Members agreed not to recommend a public hearing date at this time, but to meet on December 6, 2006, 1:00 p.m. and then hold another meeting in the latter part of the month.

C. Next meeting - Wednesday, December 6, 2006 - Members agreed to meet on December 6, 2006, 1:00 p.m. in the County Board Room. Coffinbargar referenced the one-page *Project Milestones* handout. Ludwiszewski asked staff to provide in the future information on the transition from the old ordinance to the new ordinance. Mr. Fry would discuss it next month.

City Attorney for Geneva, Charles Radovich, asked for a copy of staff's PowerPoint presentation. Dickson would e-mail him a copy. Mr. Radovich stated he would like to meet with county staff to address the questions from the Tri-Cities.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. on motion by Ludwiszewski, seconded by Morrison. Motion carried.

Celeste Weilandt
Recording Secretary