

IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
Thursday, November 12, 2009  
12:00 p.m.  
421 N. County Farm Road, Room 3500-A

**1. Roll Call**

Chairman - Don Puchalski

**2. Approval of Minutes**

Action Requested: Approval of October 21, 2009 minutes. See Attached Packet A.

**3. Land Use Assumptions Presentation**

- 3.1. Land Use Assumptions Document Discussion. Attached Packet B.
- 3.2. Presentation on Methods and Results

Action Requested: Committee Recommendation of Land Use Assumptions Document for Public Hearing. Recommendation would be to request Transportation Committee permit release of public hearing notice.

**4. Old Business**

**5. New Business**

**6. Adjournment**

Minutes  
Committee Meeting  
Ad-Hoc Impact Fee Advisory Committee  
October 21, 2009  
3:00 p.m.

**1. Roll Call**

Chairman Puchalski called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**Members Present at Roll Call:** Chairman Don Puchalski, Brent Coulter, Steve Davidson, Paul Hoss, Jeff Merrinette, Charles Tokarski. and Daniel Wennerholm

**Members Absent:** David Fagenal ; Mike McCarthy and Marcie Schatz

**Staff present:** John Loper, Economic Development and Planning and Robert Douglas, State's Attorneys Office.

*After roll call members introduced themselves:*

**2. Approval of Minutes of the November 20, 2008 Meeting**

Motion to approve the minutes of November 20, 2008 by Member Wennerholm seconded by Member Hoss, with all members voting aye, motion carried

**3. Updates and Status Reports**

**3.1 Annual Report**

Mr. Loper directed the members to packet B that contained the FY2008 and 2009 fiscal year to date impact fee reports. He summarized the 2008 revenues, expenditures and permit application figures. He also discussed the FY2009 year to date report and mentioned that there was an error in the Admin Section but that this number would be corrected before the report is filed in the first quarter of 2010. Mr. Loper explained where the County was using impact fees in 2008 and 2009 and then went on to discuss the effect of the current development climate on impact fee permits and the outlook for 2010. Mr. Loper informed the committee of the County's obligation to post the annual reports and requested committee approval to post the FY 2008 report.

**Action:** Motion was made by Member Hoss and seconded by Member Tokarski to approve the newspaper posting and on line posting of Table 1 FY 2008 Year to Date Impact Fee Report.

**Additional Discussion:** Member Tokarski requested clarification of the FY 2009 Report error. Additional discussion ensued on the expenditures in 2008 and 2009 and the impacts of those expenditures to district balances in Districts 7 and 9. Mr. Tokarski discussed present obligations on 75<sup>th</sup> Street in Naperville and in Downers Grove as well as at the Eola Road and I-88 interchange. Member Hoss asked if we (the impact fee program) can anticipate anything from Royce Realty development. Mr. Hoss and Mr. Loper explained the overall impact of that site in unincorporated York Township. Mr. Loper also discussed the estimated value of the property in terms of impact fee revenues. Member Hoss then asked if they (Royce) wouldn't be able to obtain credits. Mr. Loper responded that there are presently no credit banks available in that district and that credits for roadway improvement would need to be evaluated before

commenting further. Member Tokarski responded that it would have to be a capacity improvement on Meyers Road.

**Action Continued:** With all members voting aye. Motion carried.

#### **4. Division of Transportation Studies**

##### **4.1.1 Overview of Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan Process and Schedule**

Mr. Loper referenced a 10 page landscape style presentation packet that gives an overview of Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan and Land Use process. Mr. Loper discussed the requirements of State Impact Fee Law regarding the production of land use assumptions. Mr. Loper then discussed staff's approach to the land use project and contrasted the new approach to the approach taken in the past.

Mr. Loper then referenced page 2 in the packet stating that the goal is to produce a Land Use Assumptions document. He informed the committee that in order to do this, staff must have IFAC committee approval, Transportation Committee approval, County Board approval and we have to have a public hearing for this. Mr. Loper then discussed the uses of the document related to traffic forecasting and the comprehensive road improvement plan. Mr. Loper proceeded to discuss the basis for the land use assumptions; how the data was collected, municipal interviews, geographic information system techniques and other methods.

Member Tokarski requested a summary of the meetings and dates proposed for the committee related to this work and then a date for the public hearing and County Board approval. Mr. Loper reviewed this information from pages 9 and 10 of the packet and reminded the committee of the public hearing procedures set forth in the Impact Fee Law that caused this schedule. He stated that staff is looking at a public hearing in January and then County Board probably in February.

Committee discussion regarding the schedule ensued. Member Coulter then asked staff questions about trip generation and land use relating to regional population and employment. Mr. Loper responded that staff is using the regional data but that the basis of the work is different. Mr. Loper went on to cite some examples in the packet of how data was being assembled from different sources and used. He discussed that staff's method was three-tiered in that we are examining vacant existing development and enhancing that development with information on vacant property, existing vacancies in the built environment and redevelopment.

Mr. Loper proceeded to discuss existing land use and the findings from staff surveys. Staff and committee members were presented with the existing residential unit and commercial unit totals. Mr. Loper discussed the importance and unique nature of some of the land use categories such as the downtown retail and hospital, college and convention center categories. Member Coulter and Mr. Loper then discussed the trip generation impacts of these categories and how they would be used in the traffic model. Mr. Loper stated that the information that would come to the committee in November would be much more detailed and comprehensive.

The Committee was then consulted about the calendar and their availability for the next meeting. Mr. Merrinette requested two weeks to review the materials to be reviewed at the next meeting. It was decided that the committee next meet on November 12<sup>th</sup> at noon. The committee members generally concurred that a meeting in mid-January 2010 is feasible. Discussion ensued on municipal participation in the land use process. Mr. Loper discussed past and present participation and the role of the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference Planning Committee in the process. Committee members then asked if the communities would vote on or approve the document before going to a public hearing before IFAC met. Mr. Loper replied that he was not anticipating a vote with that and would expect that if they had comments they would review the information and write a letter of support and participate in the public hearing process.

Member Wennerholm asked staff what the future applications of this document might be and what it means to the municipalities. Mr. Loper replied that this work does not constitute an actionable "plan," but it does reflect what the communities and the County think will happen as of this date. He went on to say that the information would be useful in assembling a real adopted county-wide land use plan.

#### ***4.1.2 Current Deficiencies List and Travel Time Program***

Mr. Loper reported that over the summer, with the help of our seasonal interns, staff performed arterial travel time updates. He explained that this is part of the effort to identify the locations in the county that have existing capacity deficiencies and that Impact Fee Law prohibits use of impact fee revenues on at locations with deficient capacity.

Mr. Loper detailed the procedure for acquiring the data and the locations of the studies and referred the committee to pages 2 and 3 in the packet. Mr. Loper summarized the overall findings from the evening peak hour studies, and explained how the studies were segmented in a way that information could be produced in a variety of ways for different components of the road network. He then summarized the existing average speeds, levels of service and performance of various roads on the network. Discussion of the results and how they were collected ensued. Mr. Loper proceeded to discuss the list of County highways that appeared on the deficient corridor list and how to interpret the data from the Travel Time Index (TTI).

Member Wennerholm asked whether the 2004 average speed was measured in the same way as the 2009 study. Mr. Loper affirmed that it was though with a different program. Member Merrinette inquired about the practical applications of this study and whether this information might really have an impact on a decision to build a road. Mr. Loper replied that this information is simply useful to establish performance benchmarks.

Mr. Loper cited a number of examples familiar to the committee and discussed how these corridors were deficient and some of the reasons for longer travel times. Discussion ensued about Finley Road and Belmont Road and various rail crossings on the arterial system. The Committee was directed to a map that showed some of the detail of the deficient segments in the county.

Member Wennerholm asked if this ties into the CRIP. Mr. Loper clarified that this and other analyses would comprise a "chapter" in the CRIP, and would be used to help us validate our 2008 traffic model. Member Tokarski clarified an earlier comment about use of impact fee funds on projects or roads that were classified as deficient by saying that the DOT could perhaps spend a portion of the money on the project, but you have to spend a certain amount out of local gas or MFT to get the road up to what would be an acceptable level of service then anything above that you could use Impact Fees.

#### **5. New Business**

The next meeting date will be held at noon on Thursday, November 12, 2009 in room 3500 A and tentatively the following meeting to be held on January 15, 2010.

#### **6. Adjournment**

Motion was made by Member Tokarski to adjourn, seconded by Member Hoss, with all members voting aye, motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dixie Van Vorous, Committee Secretary