

## PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS

Following is a summary of the comments regarding the Draft Comprehensive Road Impact Fee Plan and Impact Fee Ordinance that were received during the comment period. Comments have been edited for brevity; however, the source of the comments is identified for individuals who desire to read the full text. Similar comments by different individuals or organizations have been grouped. If a particular comment was made at the public hearing, the page and line numbers of the public hearing transcript are identified as follows: (page#/line#). If the same individual made essentially the same comment both in writing and orally, the written version is referenced. Written comments and the full hearing transcript are attached. Responses to comments were prepared by the Division of Transportation Staff and Project Consultant.

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Developers should be given credits against Kane County impact fees for all road improvements that have regional significance regardless of jurisdiction or whether the project is in the CRIP</i></p> <p>Sugar Grove Economic Development Corporation (Resolution #2007-03)</p> <p>Sean Michels, McCue Builders (63/11)</p>	<p>The impact fee statute requires that impact fees be spent only for road improvements that are included in the CRIP (605 ILCS 5/5-914)</p>
<p><i>Kane County should explore other funding options for roads, such as a sales tax</i></p> <p>Sugar Grove Economic Development Corporation (Resolution #2007-03)</p> <p>Perry Clark, Sugar Grove Economic Development (61/15)</p> <p>Sean Michels, McCue Builders (63/11)</p>	<p>Due to statutory limitations, the Kane County Board does not have the authority to raise other taxes or fees for transportation purposes. The County Board could seek approval of a Transportation Sales Tax through a referendum, but voter approval is not assured</p>
<p><i>Developers should be allowed to “pre-pay” impact fees on specific projects</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen, Inc. (letter dated 4/10/07)</p>	<p>Provided a development has site specific development approval, the Division of Transportation has allowed pre-payment of impact fees through a Fee Payment Agreement</p>
<p><i>Any development that has site-specific development approval prior to January 1, 2008 should be allowed to choose whether it wishes to be assessed under the current or the revised ordinances</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen, Inc. (letter dated 4/10/07)</p>	<p>The IFAC previously considered including this provision and recommended against it; however, this is a policy matter that may be reconsidered by the IFAC and County Board</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>“Brownfield” development should be added to the discount program as an additional 10% discount so that the maximum discount would be a total of 80%</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen, Inc. (letter dated 4/10/07)</p>	<p>As this is not really a traffic management or reduction measure, staff would prefer that if the advisory committee wishes to address brownfields, that they be addressed separately from the discount program</p>
<p><i>Impact fees associated with redevelopment should be assessed on the basis of net traffic impact</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen, Inc. (letter dated 4/10/07)</p>	<p>The current ordinance addresses this issue in terms of demolition credits (Section Thirteen)</p>
<p><i>Higher impact fees will have a negative impact on future commercial development and will cause such development to locate elsewhere, therefore impact fees should be imposed in such a way as to minimize the adverse impact on commercial development in the county.</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Metro West Council of Governments (Resolution No. 2007-003)</p> <p>City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)</p> <p>James Allen, Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (56/18)</p> <p>Sugar Grove Economic Development Corporation (Resolution #2007-03)</p> <p>Perry Clark, Sugar Grove Economic Development (60/3)</p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>Impact fees support new development by ensuring that needed infrastructure improvements are completed in a timely manner. Traffic gridlock is also a disincentive to new development. Even with the new fee schedule, the County’s impact fees represent a very small percentage of the total cost of development. Location, availability of efficient transportation infrastructure, property tax rates, and land prices are much greater factors in the decision to construct a non-residential development than the county’s impact fees which represent only about 1% of development costs. This position is supported by DuPage County’s experience following adoption of their impact fee ordinance in 1989.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>If the proposed ordinance is adopted, the following elements are supported:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Phase-in of the fees over a five-year period</i></li> <li>• <i>Graduated implementation with a cap of 64% of the calculated impact</i></li> <li>• <i>The proposed grandfather clause for developments approved by 1/1/08.</i></li> </ul> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Metro West Council of Governments (Resolution No. 2007-003)</p> <p>City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)</p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Resolution 07-002)</p>	<p>All these provisions are included in the draft ordinance.</p>
<p><i>The Discount Program requirements should be separated so that the discounts are based on each individual element, rather than requiring four elements as a prerequisite</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Metro West Council of Governments (Resolution No. 2007-003)</p> <p>City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)</p> <p>Perry Clark, Sugar Grove Economic Development (59/20)</p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen Incorporated; (Letter dated 4/12/07)</p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Resolution 07-002)</p>	<p>While the availability of transit is the single most important factor in reducing the traffic impacts of new development; when combined, the four individual elements of the discount program have been shown to provide measurable reductions in traffic generation and therefore should remain prerequisites for this discount. Developments that include traffic reduction measures but are located in communities without transit, or cannot meet one of the other requirements, may be assessed a reduced fee through an individual assessment in accordance with Section Eleven of the ordinance.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Municipalities should receive credit that can be applied to developers' fees as determined by the municipality for municipally funded road improvements</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)</p>	<p>The impact fee statute requires that impact fees be spent only for road improvements that are included in the CRIP (605 ILCS 5/5-914)</p>
<p><i>The ordinance should require that individual assessments be granted if studies show a development will have a lesser impact on county roads</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Metro West Council of Governments (Resolution No. 2007-003)</p> <p>City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)</p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Resolution 07-002)</p>	<p>Section Eleven of the proposed ordinance states: <i>"Any Person who initiates New Development may choose to provide an Individual Assessment of the impacts of the proposed New Development upon the road, street and highway systems in the County....The County Engineer shall approve the proposed Impact Fee if the County Engineer determines that the traffic information, traffic factors, and methodology used to determine the proposed Impact Fee are professionally acceptable and fairly assess the costs for capital improvements to the road, street and highway systems in the County in accordance with the formula set out in Subsection 1 of this Section (emphasis added.)</i></p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>“Brownfield” sites should be fully exempted from impact fees</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Metro West Council of Governments (Resolution No. 2007-003)</p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p> <p>Aurora Economic Development Commission (Letter dated 4/17/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Resolution 07-002)</p> <p>City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)</p>	<p>Other than schools and other public buildings, all exempt uses are listed because of a lack of, or significantly reduced, traffic impacts from the development. The exemption of “brownfields” is problematic for a number of reasons: (a) the presence of a small amount of soil contamination on a site should not exempt an entire project from payment of the impact fee, (b) in many cases, site contamination is reflected in land cost, (c) grant programs are available to assist with remediation of contaminated sites, and (d) many “brownfield” sites are located in proximity to transit and could be eligible for the discount program.</p>
<p><i>The maximum duration of an impact fee discount allowed to be extended beyond ten years if both the County and Developer agree</i></p> <p>City of Elgin (Letter dated 4/11/07)</p>	<p>A limit is needed to ensure that benefits of the traffic control elements of the new development accrue earlier rather than later. A provision has been added to the recommended ordinance that would allow such an extension, provided that enough of the development was constructed within 10 years to ensure that the entire development qualified for the discount.</p>
<p><i>The discount program should provide up to a 100% discount at the request of the municipality, if the municipality finds that the project is consistent with its comprehensive plan</i></p> <p>City of Elgin (Letter dated 4/11/07)</p>	<p>The percentage discounts in the Discount Program are based on measurable traffic reduction techniques. Further reductions in impact fees on a more or less arbitrary basis are not advisable.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>The advisory committee should perform an annual analysis of the impact fee program to determine whether changes in growth and development patterns as they impact the county transportation system require amendments to the CRIP and resulting impact fees</i></p> <p>City of Elgin (Letter dated 4/11/07)                      City of Geneva (Resolution #2007-07 adopted 4/11/07)                      James Allen, Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (58/20)                      City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>The following additional language has been added to Section Nineteen of the ordinance (Duties of the Advisory Committee):</p> <p>“1.f. Review trends in economic development in the county and make recommendations to the County Board as appropriate”</p>
<p><i>The planned fee increases should require annual adoption by the County Board</i></p> <p>City of Elgin (Letter dated 4/11/07)                      City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>The County Board has the ability to amend the ordinance at any time. The Advisory Committee will report annually to the County Board with respect to the implementation of the Ordinance</p>
<p><i>Several communities have their own definitions of “Affordable Housing” and the ordinance should provide some flexibility so that a developer is not caught between conflicting definitions.</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen, Inc. (27/15) and letter dated 4/12/07                      Perry Clark, Sugar Grove Economic Development (59/14)</p>	<p>The definition used in the draft ordinance references affordability standards established by the Illinois Housing Development Authority for the Chicago Metro area. These provisions were developed in consultation with the Metropolitan Planning Council.</p>
<p><i>Is there a plan to grant credits to developers who construct improvements to County highways as a part of a development?</i></p> <p>David Faganel, Faganel Builders (31/3)</p>	<p>Section Twelve of the ordinance provides for credits to developers who construct improvements identified in the CRIP.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Attainable housing is a problem right now in Kane County and increased impact fees will only make that problem worse, as housing is a very price sensitive industry.</i></p> <p>David Faganel, Faganel Builders (34/3)</p>	<p>While attainable housing may be an issue, it is more a result of other factors, such as the cost of vacant land, zoning decisions by municipalities, and interests of other units of local government, such as school districts. Even in the final year of the ordinance, the impact fee represents only 1% of the cost of a \$300,000 home and 1.3% of the cost of a \$150,000 condominium.</p>
<p><i>The Village of Sycamore commissioned a study that basically said that new development paid its own way through higher tax revenues</i></p> <p>David Faganel, Faganel Builders (39/18)</p>	<p>The fiscal impacts of new development on the County Highway system were specifically excluded from the analysis contained in the Sycamore study. The CRIP considers new tax revenue generated by new development.</p>
<p><i>Higher impact fees will disproportionately affect lower cost housing, resulting in higher traffic as employees have to travel further to find affordable housing</i></p> <p>David Faganel, Faganel Builders (40/12)</p>	<p>While it is true that the fee is not directly related to the value of the home for residential development, state law requires that the fee be proportional to the traffic generated, not the price of the development.</p>
<p><i>Existing deficiencies in the highway network should be excluded from the impact fees</i></p> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (45/14)</p>	<p>Deficiencies that existed at the time of the adoption of Kane County's original ordinance are excluded in accordance with the State statute.</p>
<p><i>The statute requires that developers receive a "direct and material benefit" from payment of the fee. Contends that dividing the county into three districts does not satisfy that requirement</i></p> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (46/1)</p>	<p>The division of the county into three service areas, when considered in conjunction with the wide distribution of projects in each service area and typical trip lengths for home to work trips, assures that each fee payer will receive a direct and material benefit from the payment of the impact fee.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Fees under the proposed ordinance are increasing from 3 to 50 times the current ordinance, bringing into question the validity of the proposed fee schedule</i></p> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (46/6)</p>	<p>The two ordinances use different methodologies, both of which are in common use in the impact analysis field. Furthermore, the statute requires that impact fees do not exceed the calculated impact. Comparing an ordinance that charges much less than the calculated impact with one that only charges 32% of the calculated impact is not meaningful.</p>
<p><i>The CRIP has so many projects that the County will be unable to spend the impact fees in the time required by law [5 years from collection]</i></p> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (46/14) City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>Even with the increase in fees, there will still be a significant shortfall in funding, resulting in many projects not being constructed within the 10-year plan horizon. The County will be able to implement enough projects to efficiently spend the impact fees within the required time limits.</p>
<p><i>Due to the complexity of the CRIP and ordinance, the public hearing should be continued until such time as interested parties can review the analysis upon which they are based.</i></p> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (47/1)</p>	<p>A previously advertised public hearing regarding the impact fee update was held in December, 2005, at which time the county's schedule was announced. Draft versions of the CRIP project list and ordinance, including the fee schedule, have been posted on the County's website for months. All meetings of the IFAC have been held in public; several have been reported on in the press. The entire process has been extremely open and public and there is no benefit from continuing the public hearing. Even after the official close of the public comment period, any concerned party has the ability to provide input in writing to the IFAC and County Board, and may provide public comment at any County Board meeting.</p>



Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Houses of worship should be considered as an exempt use.</i></p> <p>Robert Kessler, Lord of Life Church (49/5)</p>	<p>This issue has been considered by the IFAC, which recommended against exempting houses of worship; however, it is a policy matter that could be considered by the County Board at any time.</p>
<p><i>New impact fees should be distributed equitably around the county</i></p> <p>James Allen, Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (54/21)</p>	<p>The recommended CRIP project schedule provides a reasonable balance between equity and response to need. One of the reasons projects have not been funded under the existing impact fee ordinance is the size of the service areas and the fact that some service areas have very low impact fees.</p>
<p><i>The ordinance should address senior housing.</i></p> <p>Perry Clark, Sugar Grove Economic Development (59/14)</p> <p>Dan Nagel (64/11)</p>	<p>A new land use category for “age restricted housing” has been added in the recommended ordinance. Impact fees in this category are approximately one third of those for a single family detached residence, reflecting lower traffic impacts of age restricted developments</p>
<p><i>The housing market is dropping. Increased impact fees will only drive development to Will, DeKalb and LaSalle Counties</i></p> <p>Perry Clark, Sugar Grove Economic Development (61/1)</p>	<p>Will County is also considering the adoption of impact fees. Location and other factors have a greater impact on decision-makers than a fee that represents only about 1% of total development cost.</p>
<p><i>The CRIP should be scaled back to be in line with expected future development</i></p> <p>Sean Michels, McCue Builders (63/11)</p>	<p>The CRIP was based on anticipated new development in consultation with municipalities and anticipates a slowing of the growth rate over time.</p>
<p><i>IFAC look closely at the CRIP in terms of improvements that developers are providing in a major way for off-site road improvements that affect a smaller region than proposed CRIP projects.</i></p> <p>Richard Young, Kimball Hill Homes (65/6)</p>	<p>The draft CRIP and ordinance address the issue of developer funded road improvements to the maximum extent consistent with state law and sound transportation planning concepts.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Questioned when the CRIP would be opened up to consider new projects</i></p> <p>Richard Young, Kimball Hill Homes (65/12)</p>	<p>The IFAC and County Board have the ability to amend the CRIP at any time, provided the aggregate net change represents less than 10% of the eligible cost of projects in a service area. Additional changes would require a full update to the land use assumptions and CRIP</p>
<p><i>Is the revenue from the additional 2 cent per gallon gas tax considered in the development of the ordinance and fee schedule?</i></p> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (65/20)</p>	<p>The 2 cent per gallon county option gas tax will be used for maintenance, safety improvements, bridge repair, and other needed projects that are ineligible for impact fee funding. The funding from this tax is reflected in Section 5 of the CRIP.</p>
<p><i>Impact fees are scheduled to increase rapidly over the 5 years of the ordinance and there doesn't seem to be an overall cap to the impact fees</i></p> <p>John Milne (66/23)</p>	<p>The rapid increase is due to a phase-in of the fees recommended by the IFAC. Future increases in the impact fee beyond those that would result from an increase in the Impact Fee Multiplier to 80% and increases from inflation are not anticipated.</p>
<p><i>The requirement for seven units per acre in the discount program be reduced to five units per acre</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen Incorporated; (Letter dated 4/12/07)</p>	<p>The seven units per acre requirement is based on the generally accepted requirement for a housing density that supports efficient public transit.</p>
<p><i>Transit oriented development and developments in Priority Places should also be given a 40% discount</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen Incorporated; (Letter dated 4/12/07)</p>	<p>The purpose of the Discount Program is to encourage developments that meet goals for specific traffic reduction measures. There is no guarantee that the suggested development types will achieve similar reductions in traffic. If a traffic study can demonstrate that similar goals are achieved, an appropriate impact fee reduction can be granted through an individual assessment.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Collector and arterial roads and ROW dedications to state and county government should not be included in density calculations</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen Incorporated; (Letter dated 4/12/07)</p>	<p>This provision has been added to the recommended ordinance.</p>
<p><i>Due to their disproportional benefit toward traffic reduction, developer contributions toward transit improvements should be granted impact fee credits.</i></p> <p>David Patzelt, Sho-Deen Incorporated; (Letter dated 4/12/07)</p>	<p>The impact fee statute requires that impact fees be spent only for road improvements that are included in the CRIP (605 ILCS 5/5-914)</p>
<p><i>Municipalities should be informed of any financial commitment for proposed improvement projects as soon as possible to allow for proper planning and budgeting.</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>The CRIP does not presume any level of financial commitment on the part of municipalities. If a municipality desires to expand the scope of a project, either as a matter of convenience, or to add additional features, such as roadway lighting or other amenities not normally constructed on county highways, these can be addressed through intergovernmental agreements at the time projects are initiated. The County will work cooperatively with all municipalities to coordinate construction of all CRIP projects.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>The impact fee program should be audited regularly to determine whether the rate of implementation of projects requires a reexamination of the CRIP scope and schedule, and resulting impact fees.</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>The current ordinance address the City’s stated concerns by providing that the duties of the IFAC are to: (a) Report to the County on all matters relating to the imposition of impact fees; (b) Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan and the assessment of Impact Fees; (c) Report annually to the County with respect to the progress of the implementation of the Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan; and (d) Advise the County of the need to update or revise the land use assumptions, Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan, or impact fees.</p>
<p><i>New development should be responsible for only its fair share of road costs.</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>This is required by statute and provided for in the recommended ordinance.</p>
<p><i>Impact fees should be the sole form of compensation mandated by the County</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>Under the amended ordinance, the county’s practice of exacting improvements will be modified somewhat. Any improvement included in the project scope as published in the CRIP will be eligible for credit, regardless of whether the improvement is directly required as a result of the specific development. Improvements solely needed to provide access to the development, such as turn lanes and traffic signals at private entrances, however, will continue to be ineligible, since they are not included in the CRIP costs.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Fees should be equal across the County</i>                      City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>The statute requires that impact fees be specifically and uniquely attributable to the impacts of new development within each service area; therefore, fees may not necessarily be equal across the county. Staff believes that the recommended fee schedule provides for <i>essentially</i> equal fees across the County.</p>
<p><i>A discount program should be developed that encourages developments with reduced traffic impacts.</i>                      City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>This provision is included in the recommended ordinance</p>
<p><i>The following corrections should be made to the public hearing transcript:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>P. 43, Line 18, 6th word: The word I spoke was "<u>would</u>"; it was not "can" as in the document.</i></li> <li>• <i>P. 44, Line 3, 7th word: The word I spoke was "<u>legal</u>"; it was not "evil" as in the document.</i></li> </ul> <p>Colin McRae, Attainable Housing Alliance (e-mail message sent 4/17/07)</p>	<p>According to the court reporter, Mr. McRae was difficult to understand during his testimony. The transcript reflects her best interpretation of what she heard. Staff believes Mr. McRae's comments accurately reflect his actual statement.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>The definition of affordable housing should be revised to require that the development meet the affordability index for a minimum period of ten years</i></p> <p><i>The affordable housing exemption should apply on a unit-by-unit basis, or possibly a percentage of the units of each type in a development.</i></p> <p>Metropolitan Planning Council (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>The following language has been added to Section Seventeen, paragraph 8 (Exemptions): “Each housing unit (or a designated percentage of the housing units in multi-family housing developments) meeting the definition of AFFORDABLE HOUSING and the requirements of this Section shall be exempt from payment of the Road Improvement Impact Fee. The County Engineer shall establish procedures to ensure that developments qualifying for this exemption continue to meet the minimum affordability requirements for a period of ten years. If a development fails to meet the affordability requirement in any year, the impact fee that would otherwise have been due shall be paid in full.”</p>
<p><i>The service area boundaries should be revised so that projects 13, 16, 17 and 90 are moved to the Central Service Area</i></p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>In the current draft, the cost of those projects is shared between the South Service Area and the Central Service Area on the basis of traffic generation. This is an appropriate location for the dividing line as it reflects traffic patterns in that portion of the County.</p>
<p><i>Add another table that separates projects by service area</i></p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>Project cost allocations have been added to the CRIP (Table 4-3)</p>
<p><i>Spend impact fees collected prior to the effective date of the new ordinance in the previous service areas</i></p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>Language has been added to the proposed ordinance so that impact fees collected under the previous ordinance <u>and</u> fees collected under the grandfather clause may be spent on any project in the updated CRIP, but <u>only</u> within the service areas identified in the previous ordinance.</p>

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>Orchard Road from Jericho Road to US 30 should be assigned the highest priority for improvement due to its high existing traffic volumes</i></p> <p><i>Collect and analyze 2007 traffic data for Orchard Road from Jericho Road south to and including the US-30 intersection</i></p> <p><i>Identify the calendar year for construction to start on the remaining widening of Orchard Road.</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Marilyn Michelini, Village of Montgomery (50/24)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Resolution 07-002)</p>	<p>Due to the long lead time in developing highway construction projects, the anticipated year of construction contained in the CRIP, at least for the next three years, largely depends on the status of current engineering and right of way acquisition on each project, current fund balances, outside funding sources, and anticipated impact fee revenue in the service area, along with traffic volumes and other need measures.</p> <p>The following language has been added to Section Nineteen (Duties of the Advisory Committee) in the recommended Impact Fee Ordinance.</p> <p>“1.e. Review and advise the County Board with respect to project priorities and the recommended program for impact fee expenditures.”</p>
<p><i>Priority should be placed on the improvement of the intersection of Randall Road and Keslinger Road, due to high accident rates and access to the hospital (Project #19)</i></p> <p>City of Geneva (Testimony dated 4/11/07 by Philip Page, City Administrator)</p>	

Comment	Staff Response
<p><i>The project to widen Randall Road from Keslinger Road to IL-64/Main Street should be moved up in the CRIP project schedule</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>Due to the long lead time in developing highway construction projects, the anticipated year of construction contained in the CRIP, at least for the next three years, largely depends on the status of current engineering and right of way acquisition on each project, current fund balances, outside funding sources, and anticipated impact fee revenue in the service area, along with traffic volumes and other need measures.</p> <p>The following language has been added to Section Nineteen (Duties of the Advisory Committee) in the recommended Impact Fee Ordinance.</p> <p>“1.e. Review and advise the County Board with respect to project priorities and the recommended program for impact fee expenditures.”</p>
<p><i>Municipalities should be consulted in prioritization of projects</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	
<p><i>A temporary traffic signal should be installed at the intersection of Orchard Road and Rochester Road</i></p> <p><i>Add the intersection of Orchard and Rochester Roads as a CRIP project for 2007 to utilize already collected impact fees</i></p> <p>Montgomery Economic Development Corporation (Resolution adopted 4/10/07)</p> <p>Marilyn Michelini, Village of Montgomery (50/24)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Resolution 07-002)</p>	<p>It is inappropriate to expend impact fee funds for improvements with a useful life of less than 10 years.</p> <p>This intersection falls within the limits of project #4 and could be constructed as a stand-alone improvement; however, it would be inadvisable to install traffic signals at this location without the addition of left turn lanes on Orchard.</p> <p>Currently, there are insufficient funds in the impact fee account for this service area to construct these improvements, even if engineering plans were available.</p>



<p><i>The Red Gate Bridge should be eligible for impact fee funding</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	<p>The IFAC previously recommended that only county highway improvements be eligible for impact fee funding. While addition of this project could be possible, it would cause a significant increase in the level of fees in the central service area.</p>
<p><i>Impact fees should be available for any project that provides regional benefits.</i></p> <p>City of St. Charles (Resolution 2007-21 adopted 4/16/07)</p>	
<p><i>The currently drafted grandfather clause should include projects with preliminary plan approval.</i></p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>The definition of “Site Specific Development Approval” is identical to that provided in the state statute. Developments frequently change significantly between preliminary and final plat approvals</p>
<p><i>Gordon Road should be included in the CRIP as soon as possible.</i></p> <p>Village of Sugar Grove (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>Gordon Road is not on the County Highway system at this time. If it is added at some point in the future, the IFAC could consider adding it to the CRIP.</p>
<p><i>Add the intersection of Orchard Road and US-30 as a CRIP project</i></p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>Deficiencies at this intersection are a result of a need for additional through lanes on US-30. Additional improvements on the north and south approaches would result in only a marginal improvement in intersection operations.</p>
<p><i>Add the intersection of Montgomery Road and Douglas Road as a separate CRIP project</i></p> <p>Village of Montgomery (Letter dated 4/18/07)</p>	<p>As this intersection is included within the project limits for project #58, the intersection improvement could be constructed as a separate project, depending on impact fee collections in the service area.</p>