

**MINUTES  
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL  
PLAN COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 2019**

---

Members Present: Chairman Wallace  
Vice Chairman Kessler  
James Holderfield  
Jeffrey Funke  
Tom Pretz  
Jennifer Becker  
Peter Vargulich  
Laura Macklin-Purdy  
Sue Melton

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Rita Tungare, Community & Economic Development Dept.  
Director  
Russell Colby, Community Development Manager  
Ellen Johnson, Planner  
Rachel Hitzemann, Planner  
Monica Hawk, Development Engineer  
Court Reporter

**1. Call to order**

Chairman Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Vice Chairman Kessler called the roll. A quorum was present.

**3. Presentation of minutes of the February 19, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission.**

**Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler, seconded by Mr. Pretz, and unanimously passed by voice vote to approve the minutes of the February 19, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.**

**4. 1812 Riverside Subdivision (Bob Rasmussen)**

Application for Final Plat of Subdivision (Minor Subdivision)

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

**Motion was made by Vice Chairman Kessler and seconded by Ms. Purdy to approve the Final Plat of Subdivision for 1812 Riverside Subdivision, subject to resolution of outstanding staff comments.**

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Ayes: Holderfield, Funke, Becker, Vargulich, Pretz, Purdy, Wallace, Kessler, Melton**

**Minutes – St. Charles Plan Commission**  
**Tuesday, March 5, 2019**  
**Page 2**

**Nays:**

**Absent:**

**Motion carried: 9-0**

**5. Presentation of Economic Impact Analysis of the Fox River Corridor Master Plan**

The attached transcript prepared by Planet Depos Court Reporting is by reference hereby made a part of these minutes.

**6. Additional Business from Plan Commission Members or Staff**

**7. Weekly Development Report**

**8. Meeting Announcements**

a. Plan Commission

Tuesday, March 19, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers –To be cancelled

Tuesday, April 2, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Tuesday, April 16, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

b. Planning & Development Committee

Monday, March 11, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

Monday, April 8, 2019 at 7:00pm Council Chambers

**9. Public Comment**

**10. Adjournment at 8:20 p.m.**



**Planet Depos**<sup>®</sup>  
We Make It *Happen*<sup>™</sup>

---

# Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision

**Date:** March 5, 2019

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

**Email:** [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto:transcripts@planetdepos.com)

**www.planetdepos.com**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x  
In Re: :  
1812 Riverside Subdivision :  
(Bob Rasmussen), Application :  
for Final Plat of Subdivision :  
(Minor Subdivision). :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, March 5, 2019  
7:00 p.m.

Job No.: 218459A  
Pages: 1 - 10  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

15 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

16 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

17 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

18 Development Director

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

4

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: The City of St. Charles  
Plan Commission will come to order.

Tim, roll call.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

MEMBER BECKER: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

MEMBER FUNKE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.

MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.

MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.

MEMBER VARGULICH: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.

MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.

MEMBER MELTON: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Here.

VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, here.

CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Presentation of the  
minutes of the February 19th, 2019, Plan  
Commission. Is there a motion to approve?

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

5

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

2 MEMBER PRETZ: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and  
4 seconded. All in favor.

5 (Ayes heard.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Motion passes unanimously.

9 Laura, I'm going to call on you to  
10 introduce our new member.

11 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Oh, I'd like to  
12 introduce Sue Melton to the Plan Commission. I've  
13 known Sue for six years maybe, and knowing what  
14 she does for a living, when a vacancy became  
15 available on the Commission, I thought that Sue  
16 would be an excellent candidate.

17 So she interviewed and -- sorry -- it  
18 wasn't a good time to call on me. Anyway, I'd  
19 like to welcome Sue.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Welcome.

21 MEMBER MELTON: Thanks. I'm excited to  
22 be here.

23 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Item No. 4 on the agenda  
24 is 1812 Riverside Subdivision (Bob Rasmussen)



1 Application for Final Plat of Subdivision (Minor  
2 Subdivision).

3 MR. COLBY: I will provide a short  
4 presentation.

5 This application is a minor subdivision to  
6 subdivide an existing parcel into two building  
7 lots for the purpose of constructing two houses on  
8 a lot on South Riverside Avenue. The applicant is  
9 Bob Rasmussen. This application qualifies as a  
10 minor subdivision, and, therefore, it does not  
11 require submittal of engineering plans. That  
12 information will be submitted at the time of  
13 building permit.

14 The subdivision plat that's been submitted  
15 has been reviewed by City staff. We verified that  
16 the lots that are shown comply with the zoning  
17 district that the property is located in. We also  
18 provided some information regarding notes on the  
19 plat that need to be revised, but otherwise,  
20 there's no further City comments.

21 We also documented the inclusionary  
22 housing, school, and park fee in lieu contributions  
23 that would be due at the time of permit for the  
24 construction on the lot.

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

7

1           So staff is recommending approval subject  
2 to resolution of staff comments prior to City  
3 Council approval of the final plat application,  
4 and we have the applicant present for any  
5 questions.

6           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Any Plan  
7 Commissioners have any questions?

8           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So I maybe have a  
9 couple questions.

10          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Go ahead.

11          MR. RASMUSSEN: Bob Rasmussen.

12          MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. So you're  
13 going to go subdivide the unit or the plot into  
14 two different units. Is it going to have  
15 two separate driveways, and sidewalks, and  
16 everything?

17          MR. RASMUSSEN: Yes, it will be two separate  
18 single-family homes.

19          MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Okay. That was  
20 really all I wanted to know, two separate  
21 driveways or one. There's two; right?

22          MR. RASMUSSEN: Yep.

23          CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

24          (No response.)

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

8

1           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Well, if  
2 there are no further questions, I'll just note  
3 that this is not a public hearing. So it's not  
4 something where we follow the procedure of  
5 swearing in people that are giving testimony,  
6 which is our normal procedure when we conduct a  
7 public hearing. So that's why it seems that this  
8 procedure on this particular application is a  
9 little shorter than most.

10           Tim, did you want to make a motion?

11           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I can make a  
12 motion to recommend approval of the 1812 Riverside  
13 Subdivision (Bob Rasmussen) application for final  
14 plat of subdivision subject to resolution of all  
15 outstanding staff comments.

16           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I'll second.

17           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and  
18 seconded. Any discussion on the motion?

19           (No response.)

20           CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Tim.

21           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Becker.

22           MEMBER BECKER: Yes.

23           VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Funke.

24           MEMBER FUNKE: Yes.

Transcript of 1812 Riverside Subdivision  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

9

1 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Pretz.  
2 MEMBER PRETZ: Yes.  
3 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Holderfield.  
4 MEMBER HOLDERFIELD: Yes.  
5 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Vargulich.  
6 MEMBER VARGULICH: Yes.  
7 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Purdy.  
8 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Yes.  
9 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Melton.  
10 MEMBER MELTON: Yes.  
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Wallace.  
12 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Yes.  
13 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Kessler, yes.  
14 (Off the record at 7:05 p.m.)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 11th day of March, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois



**Planet Depos**<sup>®</sup>  
We Make It *Happen*<sup>™</sup>

---

# Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan

**Date:** March 5, 2019

**Case:** St. Charles Plan Commission

**Planet Depos**

**Phone:** 888.433.3767

**Email:** [transcripts@planetdepos.com](mailto:transcripts@planetdepos.com)

[www.planetdepos.com](http://www.planetdepos.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

BEFORE THE PLAN COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF ST. CHARLES

-----x  
In Re: :  
Presentation of Economic :  
Impact Analysis of the Fox :  
River Corridor Master Plan. :  
-----x

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
St. Charles, Illinois 60174  
Tuesday, March 5, 2019  
7:05 p.m.

Job No.: 218459B  
Pages: 1 - 57  
Reported by: Paula M. Quetsch, CSR, RPR

Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

1 Report of proceedings held at the location of:

2

3 ST. CHARLES CITY HALL

4 2 East Main Street

5 St. Charles, Illinois 60174

6 (630) 377-4400

7

8

9

10 Before Paula M. Quetsch, a Certified Shorthand

11 Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, and a

12 Notary Public in and for the State of Illinois.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

1 PRESENT:

2 TODD WALLACE, Chairman

3 TIM KESSLER, Vice Chairman

4 JENNIFER BECKER, Member

5 JEFFREY FUNKE, Member

6 JIM HOLDERFIELD, Member

7 LAURA MACKLIN-PURDY, Member

8 SUZANNE MELTON, Member

9 TOM PRETZ, Member

10 PETER VARGULICH, Member

11

12 ALSO PRESENT:

13 RUSS COLBY, Planning Division Manager

14 ELLEN JOHNSON, Planner

15 MONICA HAWK, Development Engineer

16 RACHEL HITZEMANN, Planner

17 RITA TUNGARE, Community and Economic

18 Development Director

19

20

21

22

23

24

Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

4

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. No. 5 on  
3 the agenda is Presentation of Economic Impact  
4 Analysis of the Fox River Corridor Master Plan.

5 MS. TUNGARE: Good evening members of the  
6 Plan Commission. Thank you.

7 So last fall the City engaged HVS Convention,  
8 Sports and Entertainment Facilities as a consultant  
9 to conduct an economic impact analysis of the Fox  
10 River Corridor master plan. Our City Council's  
11 intention in doing so was to understand what kind  
12 of economic impacts and costs and benefits would  
13 be available and opportunities for redevelopment  
14 if we decided to move forward with implementing  
15 the various projects that are outlined in the  
16 master plan.

17 So I know the Plan Commission has been in  
18 discussions on the comprehensive plan update for  
19 downtown, and Russ Colby has given you some  
20 background on the master plan itself. We felt it  
21 would be beneficial to bring this economic analysis  
22 before the Plan Commission because that information  
23 will be useful as you move forward with actually  
24 looking at options for riverfront development and

1 conducting some exercises for those parcels as  
2 part of the comprehensive plan update.

3 So Tom Hazinski and his associate Anthony  
4 are here to give you a presentation on the  
5 economic impact analysis. This is a draft. There  
6 are certain elements, as the cost-benefit analysis  
7 component of the master plan that have not yet  
8 been completed.

9 So if there are no other questions, I would  
10 like to turn it over to Tom Hazinski at this time.

11 MR. HAZINSKI: Thank you, Rita.

12 Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thanks  
13 for the opportunity to present our study results.

14 First of all, I'd like to say that we owe  
15 a debt of gratitude to Russ and Rita for all the  
16 assistance they've given us. They've been  
17 wonderful to work with, and there's been a lot of  
18 information exchanged and meetings, and that's all  
19 run very smoothly thanks to their efforts.

20 As she just said, our job is to estimate  
21 economic impact, and that word can have a lot of  
22 definitions, and it does in the study.

23 It can mean quantifiable things like how  
24 much new spending is important to the community.

1 It can also mean the level of additional development  
2 this probably might encourage, and it also has  
3 some intangible or unquantifiable impact on the  
4 quality of life of the residents.

5 So we are about 90 percent done with our  
6 study at this point, and we have quantified what  
7 we can, and I want to present that to you today  
8 and show you how we got to that point to provide  
9 these estimates.

10 So I also trust that you've also received  
11 a copy of our draft report, and everything I'm  
12 going say -- most everything I'm going to say  
13 tonight is in that report with a couple minor  
14 changes, so you can always refer back to that.  
15 And as I speak, if you have questions, please  
16 interrupt me and ask them. I think it will take  
17 me about an half hour to run through this, and  
18 then I'm going to turn it over to Anthony.

19 So first of all, this is where we are in  
20 our study. We already made -- we first of all  
21 did -- at midpoint did some comparable analysis  
22 market analysis and we presented that. Then we  
23 met with the City Council to do a workshop a few  
24 weeks ago, and now we're here today to talk with

1 you, and we have our financial projections and our  
2 fiscal economic impacts done. We still have to do  
3 some work on cost-benefit analysis.

4 So let's talk about how we get to where we  
5 did. First of all, we did a market area analysis,  
6 and that's to understand what kind of population  
7 and propensity to use the proposed facilities are  
8 within this driving distance. Maybe I should back  
9 up. We're talking about the river path/riverfront  
10 project, developing -- moving the dam and replacing  
11 it with a step-down rapids system that involves  
12 construction of an island, and I'll show you some  
13 pictures of that as it's being proposed.

14 So we want it look at the population that's  
15 likely to use it. For most activities they come  
16 from within a 15-minute, 30-minute, or 60-minute  
17 driving time. So we looked at all the economics  
18 and demographics within those drive times, how  
19 rich people are, how old or young they are. We  
20 also looked at a database to capture lifestyle.  
21 We looked at -- there's data available of what  
22 people spend on recreation, so we looked at that,  
23 as well. And we looked at the logical supply  
24 within the immediate area which is necessary to

1 support some of the activities.

2           And I'm not going to through each one of  
3 those demographics -- they're in the report --  
4 just to say that they're very favorable. High  
5 median income, very high propensity to spend on  
6 recreation, so very encouraging demographics in  
7 all of those radii that we talked about.

8           In this life mode tapestry segment, the  
9 segment you're really interested in is these  
10 affluent states. These are people who are active  
11 in sports, they have money to spend, they like to  
12 travel, and they're homeowners. These are the  
13 percentage of the population that fall into that  
14 category within St. Charles and a 30-minute drive  
15 time compared to all U.S. households, you can see  
16 that in St. Charles 40 percent fall into that  
17 category and within a 30-minute drive time 25 percent  
18 do. Whereas, 10 percent do nationally. So that's  
19 a very strong indicator of a population that's  
20 available to utilize the proposed development.

21           We also looked at national water recreation  
22 trends based on some national surveys that were  
23 done by SFIA, and please don't ask me what that  
24 acronym stands for. But they looked at outdoor

1 recreation participation by population and what  
2 the trends are, and most things are on the rise.  
3 Walking for fitness has fallen somewhat, but  
4 hiking and bicycling has grown over this period.  
5 Water sports, everything is growing except for  
6 canoeing, but that's partly because paddle  
7 boarding and kayaking are normally very fast, and  
8 it's a substitute, so people are migrating to  
9 those other water sports, and these are sports  
10 that would be played on the development.

11 We also found or learned that the trail  
12 activity is extremely important, not only on our  
13 own but also people told us this was very important.  
14 And, fortunately, Trails of Illinois does a  
15 survey. They use sensors and a couple years ago,  
16 2012 or 2013 they actually counted the number of  
17 people using the trails at certain points.

18 So both the Fox River trail and the  
19 prairie path which feeds into it just south of  
20 St. Charles really would be an avenue to bring  
21 recreation users to St. Charles. And we found a  
22 really high level of utilization of the trails,  
23 and you'll see in our report that they're quite  
24 different for the prairie path, Fox River Trail.

1 And this is a picture of how the Fox River Trail  
2 is used on a seasonal database. It's mostly used  
3 at midday in the afternoon and mostly on weekends.  
4 If you look at the prairie path, it's used for  
5 commuting and used a little bit differently. They  
6 also provided data on age, gender, and income, and  
7 how far they travel to get to the trail, and so we  
8 have all that information to understand utilization  
9 of trails that are feeding into the project.

10 It's also highly seasonal. This is a very  
11 seasonal project. On a day like today, people  
12 aren't going to be out there. And so you can see  
13 the prairie path is used very seasonally. Even  
14 though it's used for commuting, in the wintertime  
15 nearly half the people don't use it at all, but in  
16 the summertime 40 percent use it roughly 30 days  
17 during the summer.

18 So we also interviewed a lot of potential  
19 stakeholders and people that informed us about the  
20 project, including we have a steering committee  
21 we're working with that involves various public  
22 officials, City, park district, and elsewhere.  
23 And we talked with St. Charles public works and  
24 WBK Engineering which did the study on the



1 proposed development and the recommendations --  
2 building program applications, the park district,  
3 the CVB, Downtown St. Charles Partnership, the  
4 mayor, Chicago Whitewater Association, St. Charles  
5 Canoe Club, and St. Charles Rowing Club. And from  
6 some of these we were able to obtain some valuable  
7 data and information about their participation in  
8 these sports or current utilization of the  
9 riverfront in St. Charles.

10           The main takeaways from these interviews,  
11 themes emerged that connectivity is going to be  
12 really important, bringing Pottawatomie Park and  
13 river activities closer to downtown. Everyone  
14 understands that these paths under Main Street  
15 connect this to the rest of the river. Everyone  
16 is concerned -- and this is part of the plan that  
17 river levels north of the railroad tracks will be  
18 maintained, and so that pool of water that people  
19 enjoy today is not going to go away. But when  
20 people think of rapids, they think of that  
21 disappearing and that's not the case. This would  
22 be structured so it would maintain the river level  
23 north of the railroad trestle, and that's very  
24 important to people. But they also want increased

1 utility of the river south of the trestle; they  
2 want more recreational opportunities; they want  
3 increased visitation and interest in the river.

4 And then there are a lot of stakeholders --  
5 we also talked to a lot of business owners, as  
6 well, and they're interested in improved development  
7 opportunities in adjacent parcels, and I'm going  
8 to go over that in quite a bit of detail later on  
9 in the presentation.

10 There are a lot of questions about well  
11 this could be operated and maintained, and that's  
12 not been determined yet. I will show you some  
13 other models in other cities in operation that  
14 could be used here.

15 Overall there's very enthusiastic reaction  
16 to this project. There is a little bit of  
17 wariness from some downtown property owners about  
18 what kind of benefit there would prove to be for  
19 their business, but hopefully our study will  
20 demonstrate what some of that improvement is.

21 So we also looked at some comparable  
22 destinations which were very informative because  
23 these were cities that had in short term or long  
24 term done some very serious riverfront development.

1 So I want to walk through some of these.

2 I put this one first in Columbus, Georgia,  
3 Chattahoochee Riverwalk. This is a project that's  
4 perhaps most like what's being anticipated in  
5 St. Charles. None of these projects are quite  
6 alike, but this one resembles it more closely. It  
7 was built -- it's part of a very -- the whitewater  
8 activity is part of the much longer 22-mile  
9 riverfront, and it was built in phases beginning  
10 in 1992. It has a 2 1/2 mile stretch of whitewater  
11 and a zip line across, which is something that's  
12 proposed for this project, and historical markers  
13 along the way.

14 In 2013 -- you know, it's been a long-term  
15 development. In 2013 they opened up a whitewater  
16 facility that has between Class 1 and Class 5 rapids.  
17 So Class 1 is a recreational user would feel  
18 comfortable using; in Class 5 you're competitive  
19 and you need to know what you're doing to go down  
20 those rapids.

21 It's maintained -- the riverwalk is  
22 maintained by the City of Columbus itself, but a  
23 nonprofit oversees the whitewater and the zip  
24 course lines, and they use a third-party vendor,

1 which is something we recommend here is that  
2 there's some third-party vendors involved in  
3 providing the zip lining and perhaps some other  
4 rental activities along the project.

5           So it was funded by 1 percent sales tax,  
6 and we asked, "What impact has it had on your  
7 downtown," and they said since 2013 there's been a  
8 50 percent increase in the downtown area's gross  
9 receipts from retail/restaurant sales, and 17 new  
10 downtown businesses opening. Now, all of those  
11 can't be attributed to this project, but it's  
12 clearly part of the larger downtown redevelopment.

13           In Greenville, South Carolina, Falls on the  
14 Reedy Park, this is more of a passive recreation  
15 venue. It was obscured by a bridge. They took this  
16 bridge down and opened it up as a park. It's a  
17 32-acre park, and it was a \$32 1/2 million initiative  
18 that transformed the whole area and provided use  
19 to the river. They claim it caused a lot of  
20 neighborhood revitalization, and since 2004 there  
21 has been \$550 million in related development.

22           Going to a larger city, in Denver is  
23 whitewater rapids facility on Cherry Creek and the  
24 South Platte River, and it's in Denver's lower

1 downtown or lower district. It was originally a  
2 warehouse district. It was down and out, and this  
3 has been part of an overall effort to bring the  
4 city back. This project was initiated in 2015 and  
5 reopened the park in 2017. It was part of a  
6 larger vision for redevelopment of the whole area.

7 So biking and hiking trails connect it,  
8 just as we're anticipating here. There's grassy  
9 areas and overlooks, and then there's opportunities  
10 to do fishing, kayaking, tubing, and swimming right  
11 in the heart of the city in a major metro area.  
12 As you can imagine, this would have a lot higher  
13 attendance and utilization than it would in  
14 St. Charles just because the surrounding population  
15 is so much larger.

16 The City funded it with a \$9.3 million  
17 parks and rec capital project, and they say that  
18 there's been 70 million in improvements in and  
19 adjacent to the river and it's -- they say it's  
20 attracted 10 billion in reinvestment, which,  
21 again, it's a larger development.

22 South Bend is the first city actually to  
23 develop whitewater, South Bend, Indiana. This is  
24 a channel, a man-made channel has rapids in it.

1 You pay a fee to get on and use it. That's not  
2 what we're anticipating here. But it has become  
3 extremely popular. It was initiated in 1984. It  
4 cost about \$4 1/2 million with some grant money  
5 and a bond issuance. There's been a lot of --  
6 they say 78 million in nearby economic development  
7 since the raceway opened. So it has been a  
8 feature of South Bend for a long time and is  
9 something that the citizens really have enjoyed.

10 In Boise, another urban center, there's a  
11 25-mile pathway that runs through the city. They  
12 had an ordinance way back in the late '60s, early  
13 '70s that created offsets to the riverfront. So  
14 it created this opportunity for parkway all along  
15 the riverfront. And then in 2012 they opened a  
16 whitewater park, the first phase of it, and they  
17 replaced the dam, irrigation dam with a  
18 multifunctional dam with different wave shapes that  
19 you can control individually. So they control the  
20 levels of the rapids, and then a second phase with  
21 another run was completed.

22 So you can do all the things that people  
23 could do on the Fox River, fishing, kayaking,  
24 paddle boarding, surfing -- well, surfing, no --

1 swimming, hiking, and biking. All those  
2 opportunities are there. It restored 2 miles of  
3 riverfront and 107 acres of the parks.

4 So finally, in Wausau, Wisconsin, again,  
5 this is a very different model than what we're  
6 anticipating. This is for hardcore, serious  
7 whitewater people. They have to open a dam in  
8 order to run it, and they have to pay back the  
9 utility company for the energy that they take out  
10 of it when they use it. So it's only open very  
11 short periods for whitewater kayaking tournaments  
12 which draw people from all over. The point of  
13 this is it draws people from all over the country.  
14 It's a highly prized destination; it's challenging  
15 and what serious rafters want.

16 Finally, Yorkville is your neighbor that  
17 has a whitewater channel, and it has a fishing  
18 pier, playground, picnic shelters. But it is --  
19 it's a 1100-foot-long bypass shoot that has Class  
20 1 and Class 2 rapids, so pretty tame, relatively  
21 tame rapids. So they have an annual festival, and  
22 they do competitions on it, but it's not the  
23 serious whitewater competitions that could occur  
24 if you have more challenging rapids.

1           So its utilization -- they spent about  
2   10 million on that project, and they dredged the  
3   river and added borders to create safe passage  
4   along the dam. And they say that several new  
5   businesses have opened since.

6           So those are some of the comps we looked  
7   at, and I think there's lessons to be learned from  
8   each one that may apply to St. Charles. As you  
9   can see, they're pretty diverse in what they  
10  offer. So this is kind of a summary of the length  
11  of them, when they were initiated, and whether  
12  they have hiking and biking, splash pads or  
13  playgrounds, whitewater, zip lines. So, actually  
14  all of those features are anticipated in the  
15  project, proposed project. It would be a project  
16  that sees all of these in terms of the mix of  
17  offerings that we have.

18           MEMBER VARGULICH: Excuse me. How long is  
19  St. Charles' roughly?

20           MR. HAZINSKI: It's from the railroad  
21  trestle to Main Street bridge.

22           MR. RABCHUK: 1200 feet.

23           MEMBER VARGULICH: Just under a quarter mile?

24           MR. RABCHUK: Of course, the entire project



1 also includes underneath Main Street bridge doing  
2 the bike paths on both sides, so you could almost  
3 say it's the entire city limits of -- the river  
4 within the city limits is the entire project.

5 MR. HAZINSKI: And then above the trestle  
6 that pool would be made, and so that remains a  
7 recreational area.

8 So we did a comparison of these  
9 destinations -- St. Charles to these destinations.  
10 So it's a little bit of a convoluted analysis, and  
11 the details are in the report. But, basically, we  
12 rank each of these destinations on this list of  
13 qualities that you see. Some are citywide like  
14 how many hotel/lodging businesses they have, food  
15 service and drinking businesses -- well, some of  
16 are within walking distance. Like food service  
17 and drinking businesses are like within a half an  
18 hour of the site, but the canoeing and kayaking  
19 participation, we look at that -- because people  
20 travel for that, we look at a larger radius.

21 Interestingly, we have data on how many  
22 people participate in mountain biking, road  
23 biking, freshwater fishing, and hiking, and all  
24 these activities within those radii. So we rank

1       them on each one of these, and then we weight  
2       their reports and then create the score. You can  
3       see St. Charles falls third in the list only  
4       behind Boise and Denver. Boise and Denver are  
5       driven by these larger populations. So compared  
6       to cities smaller or even other larger cities like  
7       Columbus, Georgia, the potential participation  
8       here is higher. So this is a really very positive  
9       result in my mind of an indicator of the  
10      likelihood that people will use this facility.

11                So the building program, there were  
12      two alternatives. One was a single-channel  
13      alternative. It would be cheaper to build. It  
14      would be more like Yorkville; it would not have as  
15      much flexibility.

16                Our study focused and all our attendance  
17      estimates focused on Alternative 2, and there's  
18      two versions of this that are very similar.  
19      There's small differences between them. But you  
20      can see there's -- the whitewater channel is a  
21      thinner channel that runs between the island, and  
22      that's where the heavy-duty rapids are, and the  
23      other stepdown rapids are in the wider channel.

24                So you can see the railroad trestle is on

1 the left and Main Street which is on the right.  
2 You can see all the paths also go under the Main  
3 Street bridge, and there are bridges connecting  
4 the island to -- it's very well thought out.  
5 There's put-in spots and take-outs for rafters to  
6 get back up and do it again. There's landscaping  
7 along the river. There's a nice connection to  
8 Potawatomie Park, as well. So this is what we're  
9 looking at, and you can see a cross section of it.

10 We are -- you know, we took this program  
11 from WBK Engineering that developed it, and we  
12 said, okay, what kind of attendance would this  
13 generate. This is a third alternative of that  
14 second rapid. So we don't think there's any way  
15 to distinguish between potential utilization of  
16 Alternatives 2 and 3, so our numbers would apply  
17 to either 2 or 3.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Excuse me. What's  
19 the difference between 2 and 3?

20 MR. HAZINSKI: It's hard to see. It's just  
21 a little bit different placement of the island.  
22 You can see here is 2, and 3 you see how the island  
23 is used a little bit, and in its shape there's  
24 some differences in where you take out and put in.

1           In terms of our analysis, we don't see  
2           that the differences are that material between the  
3           two. There may be some more physical planning  
4           things that we're not expert in that might have --  
5           you prefer one alternative, but that's more an  
6           engineering question.

7           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: So is this  
8           proposing paths underneath Main Street on both the  
9           west and the east side?

10          MR. HAZINSKI: Yes. It also connects bike  
11          paths to the Fox River Trail.

12          There is also a difference, too, in -- you  
13          see on the upper left-hand side is where those  
14          splash pads are. There also would be picnic areas --  
15          well, let's go through some of these features.

16          With the two channels you can do advanced  
17          freestyle or you can do traditional whitewater  
18          kayaking and canoeing. The design of the channel  
19          is really crucial to its success. The whitewater  
20          community is pretty insular, and it's a relatively  
21          small community, and destinations are passed out  
22          by word of mouth and social media, and users will  
23          travel long distances to get to a high-quality  
24          park, and they'll ignore a low-quality park to get

1 to a third alternative.

2 But there also needs to be support spaces.  
3 Users need shelters; they need changing areas.  
4 There also needs to be kayak equipment rental  
5 places that could be run by a third-party vendor.  
6 The clear entry and exit points are necessary to  
7 stay; they're necessary to connect the bike path.  
8 And all these things -- the support spaces  
9 influence a user's propensity to use it, the  
10 convenience is there. So this plan takes into  
11 account all of those concerns and I think very  
12 effectively.

13 Oh, the other thing is -- you know, I think  
14 I said most of this on this slide -- you know,  
15 equipment requirements. So, you know, serious  
16 kayakers bring their own stuff, but more  
17 recreational users don't, so you need to have that.  
18 There's improved trail connectivity and a nature  
19 play area, water elements, and any support spaces.

20 So that's the plan and I can probably  
21 answer questions if you have any questions.

22 MEMBER VARGULICH: How does the population  
23 area that you've been looking at in St. Charles  
24 compare with a number of these places that you

1 were using as comparisons?

2 MR. HAZINSKI: It superiors all but Denver  
3 and Boise in terms of the population. The  
4 propensity to use recreational facilities is on  
5 top of all the destinations. So those  
6 participation numbers that we have, they were --  
7 that's what puts St. Charles up to the top, that  
8 propensity for participating in these recreations  
9 is as high or higher than any other area that we  
10 looked at, including Denver and Boise.

11 MEMBER VARGULICH: And how many events are  
12 you anticipating would drive some of the dollars?  
13 You're talking about generating hotels and  
14 restaurants and all that kind of stuff.

15 MR. HAZINSKI: That's the next thing.  
16 I'll walk through that right now. If there are no  
17 other questions on the program, I'll go through that.

18 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I have a question.  
19 What about the economic impact? In the beginning  
20 I believe it was Chattahoochee that they indicated  
21 that there was a 50 percent increase in revenues  
22 in downtown businesses over that -- quite a long  
23 period of time, but over a period of time -- and  
24 you also qualified it by saying you understand it

1 might not all be a direct result of this. But  
2 what about the economic impact in St. Charles?

3 MR. HAZINSKI: Let me answer the demand  
4 question, and then we'll go on to the economic  
5 impact. So let me walk through that.

6 The economic impact flows out of our demand  
7 analysis. At least a big part of it flows out of  
8 the demand analysis.

9 So first of all, we started out with how is  
10 the riverfront used today. So we got good  
11 information from the park district and from the  
12 festivals, and, actually, you have about 183,000  
13 people coming. There's no recreational channel  
14 whitewater or zip line now in use, but you've got  
15 boating, fishing going on; you've got parks and  
16 playgrounds, and you've got the trail utilization,  
17 river competitions, and festivals and events which  
18 draw most of the people. So most of the riverfront  
19 utilization today is driven by festivals and events.

20 So we then asked ourselves, well -- okay,  
21 look at these categories of events or weeks of  
22 availability. So we went -- for each type of  
23 activity, for whitewater channel, for recreational  
24 center, we did a separate demand estimate for each

1 one of those characteristics of this project.

2 So here's what we did for whitewater  
3 estimation. So we used those participation rates.  
4 Within the 15 minutes, 8.43 percent participate in  
5 whitewater. And within these certain ranges we  
6 know what the population is, so we know how many  
7 potential users there are. So the question is how  
8 many of those would you capture, and this is where  
9 some of that judgment comes in. In 15 minutes we  
10 said you could capture 25 percent of those visitors;  
11 within 15 to 30, 10 percent, and then it falls off  
12 as the distance increases. So that amounts to about  
13 22,000 annual visits by whitewater users. So that's  
14 what our projection is for that particular item.

15 We went through and did a similar analysis  
16 for recreational channels, zip lining, boating.  
17 So right now you're at about 183,000 users. By --  
18 some of the uses will have what we call a novelty  
19 effect. Like the whitewater channel will be a big  
20 splash, and every whitewater user will want to try  
21 it out. We think that will be more highly  
22 utilized when it first opens, and then it will  
23 trail off to a stabilized level.

24 Other uses will grow over time, parks and



1 playgrounds as awareness grows. We also think  
2 there could be some important additions to  
3 festivals and events. There would be different  
4 kinds of festivals, like Yorkville doing their  
5 whitewater festival. As a matter of fact, some of  
6 the whitewater activities in Yorkville could move  
7 here. So that's a big number, increase in flow.

8 So total attendance we think is going to  
9 generate about over 260,000 attendees per year  
10 after about a four-year period. So we don't think  
11 it all will happen at once. Most of that is day  
12 visits. Almost all of it is day visits, but the  
13 whitewater channel will generate some overnight  
14 utilization for people that come to use it.

15 MEMBER VARGULICH: Excuse me. When you  
16 say stabilized in three years, what does that mean?

17 MR. HAZINSKI: Well, okay. So we have to --  
18 when we do our projections, we say, okay, if things  
19 were fully utilized, if it achieved its participation  
20 rates that we expect, you know, what would -- what  
21 would the demand be. And that's the 262,000 number  
22 of attendees, and then we have to ask ourselves  
23 the question, well, how long is it going to take  
24 to get there?

1           So this is really kind of a judgment call,  
2           what we call this ramp-up period. So, you know,  
3           in any given year depending on weather -- if the  
4           season is cut short, these numbers could vary year  
5           to year, but we think it's going to float around  
6           260,000 attendees per year once it's stabilized.

7           MEMBER VARGULICH: So you're not making an  
8           economic projection like return on investment?

9           MR. HAZINSKI: No, we're just talking  
10          about stabilized demand.

11          So that's the demand projections. That's  
12          what you were asking about. So let's jump into  
13          economic impact. This part of the economic impact  
14          analysis focuses on well, now all these people are  
15          coming to visit. What are they going to spend?

16          Here's a description of our methodology.  
17          It's kind of a bit of a complicated methodology,  
18          so I found this is the best way to explain it. So  
19          we want to talk about what's called net demand.  
20          So we don't count every person that would come.  
21          This is really like an import/export model. So if  
22          it's importing new income to St. Charles, we count  
23          it. If it's income that's already in St. Charles,  
24          we're not counting it.

1           So if a St. Charles resident comes to use  
2     it, we don't think that's an impact because that  
3     disposable income is here, and they would spend it  
4     elsewhere in St. Charles or maybe somewhere else.  
5     So we're only talking about the net new demand and  
6     the percent that are actually new to the market.

7           So we're not counting those 183,000 that  
8     come today. We don't count them. And if they  
9     come from within St. Charles, we don't count them.  
10    So it's a net analysis. So it's not counting  
11    every dollar that's spent in association with this  
12    project because that's a lot more than what the  
13    actual impact is.

14           Does that make sense? It's -- you see a  
15    lot of impact studies that don't do that. They  
16    just say, oh, this much is being spent. So once  
17    we know what that demand is, we attach -- we  
18    attach numbers about how much they spend while  
19    they're here, and that's different for overnight  
20    visitors and day trip visitors, and that gives us  
21    gross direct spending.

22           Then we use what's called an input/output  
23    model. It's a nationally recognized model, and  
24    what we do is we buy data that models how all the

1 economic sectors in St. Charles work, what's the  
2 relationship between them. So if you spend a  
3 dollar in hospitality, how does that affect the  
4 other segments of the park? So it's these large  
5 tables that show all these relationships.

6 So you bring in your gross direct spending  
7 as the input into that model, and the output is  
8 what is called net direct spending, indirect  
9 spending, and new spending. Net direct spending  
10 is if the dollar is spent here; it doesn't  
11 actually land here. So that net direct spending  
12 counts for what actually lands in St. Charles.

13 The indirect spending is the business  
14 spending that's associated with it. So let's say  
15 someone goes to a restaurant and they buy a meal.  
16 That restaurant has to buy food and supplies. To  
17 the extent that that's bought in St. Charles,  
18 that's consider an indirect spending estimate, and  
19 it happens in a lot of different sectors of the  
20 economy.

21 And then induced spending is the new income  
22 that's generated. So the waiter or waitress,  
23 server that has more income as a result of that  
24 person being here, to the extent that that's spent

1 in St. Charles, that's induced spending and that  
2 flows to the economy.

3 So we get total impacts to the sum of those  
4 three, net direct, indirect, and new spending.

5 Also, this model tells us how much labor which you  
6 need to support that spending. So if you spend  
7 X number of dollars at a restaurant, or the  
8 restaurant has X dollar amount of output, we know  
9 how much labor is associated with it, what's the  
10 labor for that output. So we generate an estimate  
11 of full-time equivalent jobs associated with it.

12 So that's the method we used. So here's  
13 what we think is the new visitation by these  
14 different -- we have overnight whitewater visitors.  
15 Some whitewater people, they camp, so they have a  
16 different profile than those who use hotels, so we  
17 separated those people out. Then we have about  
18 1500 whitewater day-trippers that are net new to  
19 the market. Most of the recreational channels are  
20 going to be local people, so there's not a lot of  
21 net new in that compared to the overall utilization.  
22 And then we have shore users that are day-trippers,  
23 that are boaters, and so on, and that's about 800.  
24 And then trail users, we have a couple hundred

1 that are new trail users.

2 So that's new visitation that goes into  
3 the model, and these are the spending parameters.  
4 So if it's an overnight visitor that uses a hotel,  
5 they spend about 170 bucks a day; if they camp,  
6 they spend about 88 bucks a day and so forth.  
7 We're able to generate these numbers from various  
8 other studies. There was an economic impact from  
9 a whitewater park in Cascade, Iowa, in Trails for  
10 Illinois that gave us some spending data. So we  
11 used those sources and adjusted them for the cost  
12 of living in St. Charles.

13 We have gross direct spending of about  
14 1.6 million annually that would occur, again,  
15 stabilized.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Can I ask --  
17 you're talking about gross direct spending. Is  
18 that gross direct margin?

19 MR. HAZINSKI: No. That's gross before  
20 that, yeah.

21 So if we go on, the net direct is 775,000.  
22 The net direct, plus the indirect, plus induced is  
23 about 1.3 million a year. So in order to produce  
24 1.3 million of spending in all those different

1 sectors of the economy, you need about 15 -- and  
2 the full-time equivalent jobs associated with that  
3 would be 15. You're going to have more jobs  
4 associated with running this thing than 15, but,  
5 again, these are net. Some jobs are here anyway  
6 because the park is already being utilized. So  
7 there's many more jobs associated with the  
8 project, but this is what's new.

9           And then we also looked at fiscal impacts.  
10 Since part of fiscal impacts involves property  
11 taxes, I'm going to ask Anthony to go into some  
12 property tax analysis that we did.

13           So we have 3 percent sales tax between the  
14 local sales and use tax home rules tax, then  
15 alcohol tax, local fuel, and hotel tax, all those  
16 impacts. So, again, it's, you know, a fairly  
17 small fiscal impact because we're looking at a tax  
18 base that's very small in a lot of these different  
19 taxes.

20           So that's -- that's the spending impact.  
21 I think you should view that as one slice of the  
22 economic impact of this project. So I'm going to  
23 ask Anthony to come up -- so we had to ask  
24 ourselves the question, well, what would be the

1 impact? We looked at all these other parks, and  
2 they said there was tremendous impact on surrounding  
3 development. So we had to ask ourselves, what is  
4 the potential impact on surrounding development?  
5 So I'd like Anthony to walk us through that  
6 analysis. He's done a lot of really great work.

7 MR. DAVIS: All right. Thank you. Hello  
8 everyone. I hope everyone is enjoying their night.

9 So we looked at the impact that this could  
10 have on property tax and property tax collections  
11 in the downtown area. What you'll see is the area  
12 that we focused on that was -- working with Rita  
13 and Russ, that was the boundary and area they  
14 wanted us to look at the impacts. It's the most  
15 immediate area to the development, and so we  
16 identified 150 parcels within that region.

17 We zoned those areas, each individual  
18 parcel, but how they're used, mixed use, parking,  
19 residential, retail, et cetera. So looking at  
20 those 150 parcels we identified 51 that in our  
21 opinion were underutilized and would gain the most  
22 in utility and taxable value for redevelopment.  
23 And we acknowledged that some of those were  
24 surface parking lots that are currently publicly



1 owned, and so to replace those lost spots we  
2 reserved nine parcels for multilevel parking that  
3 could replace the surface lots. We worked with  
4 Russ to identify those locations.

5 So here's a map of the parcels. The green  
6 ones -- I'm sorry -- let's go back. So  
7 51 underutilized parcels and 13 we did not  
8 consider in the analysis because they were too  
9 small; they're currently used for public utility  
10 and will not be replaced easily, so those were  
11 removed from the analysis. So we're left with  
12 38 parcels that we identified as being underutilized.  
13 That was either because they are old, they're  
14 surface parking, or they could be enclosed into  
15 the development. You see in yellow those are the  
16 multilevel parking structures or possible  
17 locations of those. And then the black zones are  
18 the fully utilized parcels.

19 So that is how those parcels are used.  
20 The 38 parcels are to the right. The 150 are to  
21 the left. You can see most of the underutilized  
22 parcels are parking lots currently, but in terms  
23 of the actual size of the acreage there's also a  
24 relatively large portion of retail and restaurants

1 and that could be redeveloped.

2 So of the 38 underutilized parcels we  
3 identified and kept in our analysis, 25 are  
4 privately owned and 13 are publicly owned. The  
5 private ones are in green. The municipal or  
6 publicly owned ones are in blue. And this is  
7 through conversations with some business owners  
8 and with the City to identify what would be open  
9 potentially for redevelopment. And, once again,  
10 the multilevel parking is in the yellow.

11 And so we first looked at what the market  
12 value has been in St. Charles in the past  
13 four years. As you can see, it's been relatively  
14 flat. It's gained about a million in four years'  
15 time.

16 So what we decided was, okay, we have these  
17 38 parcels that have a certain amount of acreage,  
18 and we want them to be developed to downtown  
19 standard. So of the 67 fully utilized parcels in  
20 the larger 150-parcel area, we averaged the market  
21 value as assessed by the Kane County assessor.

22 So we said if there are 14 acres of fully  
23 utilized land in the downtown area, and the total  
24 market value of those parcels is about 40 million,

1 the per-acre market value is 2.8. So if we  
2 substitute that value for market value for the  
3 underutilized parcels, which as you can see, the  
4 market value is much lower for the privately owned  
5 and zero for the municipally owned because they  
6 don't have any assessed value, if we replaced  
7 those per-acre market values for the underutilized,  
8 that would be a potential gain in development in  
9 these 150 parcels.

10 So as you can see, we also found the  
11 taxable value of the property taxes collected.  
12 And so this is how we calculated the estimated  
13 change in market value for a development that  
14 could potentially happen because of this project.  
15 So the projected market value per acre would stay  
16 the same for the fully utilized parcels of  
17 2.8 million, and if we replaced the market value  
18 for the underutilized parcels, the privately owned  
19 parcels would gain in value by approximately  
20 14 million, and the municipally owned parcels  
21 would gain value of about 16 million, for a total  
22 gain of 30 million projected.

23 So we did the same type of analysis with  
24 the property tax collections. We looked at how

1 much you collect per acre for the fully utilized  
2 parcels and projected that on the two sets of  
3 underutilized parcels, and we found that the gain  
4 would be approximately a million dollars in  
5 property tax collections.

6 Of course, the property tax is levied by,  
7 I think it's 12 different entities in St. Charles,  
8 and so we broke out the total increase in  
9 collections by which district would get the most.  
10 The school district, of course, gets the larger  
11 amount, and the city and parks, which were the  
12 two areas we were asked to focus on, would gain  
13 about 150 million in collections.

14 I'd just like to note that the total you  
15 see there is different than the total we showed  
16 you earlier just because of rounding errors, so  
17 please ignore that total and use the 980 instead.

18 So this then shows that if we projected  
19 the market values as we did what would happen  
20 compared to 2017. You see a lot of the gain is in  
21 municipal and parks because they didn't have any  
22 value, so that's going to be a lot of the  
23 30 million, but also gain a lot of retail and  
24 especially in parking because those went from

1 municipally owned to privately owned.

2 So here's our summary. If you include  
3 property tax gain, as well as the fiscal impact  
4 with the economic impact, you get about 1.2 million  
5 in economic impact, and a little over 1 million in  
6 fiscal impact.

7 Any questions?

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Without getting into  
9 all the maps, did your analysis take into account  
10 that many of these parcels are technically in the  
11 100-year floodplain?

12 MR. HAZINSKI: The floodplain issue came  
13 up, and we actually have to defer to WBK Engineering.  
14 My understanding is that the -- this probably  
15 would actually reduce the floodplain, the size of  
16 it potentially. So we -- we assumed that all these  
17 parcels were developable and that the floodplain  
18 change would actually be an improvement. So it  
19 did factor into our analysis.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Does that mean that the  
21 City and/or this project is going to initiate a  
22 formal process of going through the LOMRs, and  
23 CLOMRs, and all that stuff?

24 MR. COLBY: I can speak to the floodplain

1 issues.

2 I know, Peter, you did ask about this at  
3 the previous meeting, and we weren't sure if  
4 WBK had prepared that analysis. They have prepared  
5 some preliminary maps to show the area of property  
6 that would likely be removed from the floodplain  
7 based on the existing topography that's out there  
8 today. Obviously, depending on the extent of how  
9 the topography is modified adjacent to the river  
10 along the project could change the boundaries  
11 of that.

12 So I think for the purposes of this  
13 analysis our assumptions are that most of the  
14 parcels that are -- exist today that some of them  
15 are in the floodplain, some are out. They all  
16 could be developable, and the area of floodplain  
17 if it needs to be relocated would likely be  
18 relocated in conjunction with the project and  
19 incorporated into the project in some manner.

20 That's an assumption that there may be  
21 some additional costs to construct within the  
22 project to be able to accomplish that, but based  
23 on the preliminary analysis that WBK did, the  
24 impact is that it's a significant enough area that

1 it may be able to accommodate those remaining  
2 floodplain areas in some of the site design  
3 features of both this project or if there's a  
4 corridor along the State Street Creek, for  
5 example, it can be worked into the open space  
6 layout of however the parcels may be redeveloped.

7 MR. HAZINSKI: I just want to say we have  
8 a little more work to do. Actually, a couple of  
9 numbers that you saw here are slightly different  
10 than what you would see on a report. That's  
11 because we learned a little more about a couple  
12 parcels and we reclarified them. So the overall  
13 results are pretty close, but there's these little  
14 refinements that we're still doing as we get more  
15 information.

16 Also, part of our scope is to really address  
17 a question that many of the City Council had,  
18 which is, well, what's the cost of this thing, and  
19 how do you compare that to the benefits?

20 So in that discussion we have to talk --  
21 we have to rely on WBK Engineering, and we're  
22 going to work up some numbers on operational  
23 costs. Fortunately, maintenance of this is not a  
24 really heavy cost. Like the zip line activity,

1 that's a fairly expensive operation to run, and  
2 we've talked to other zip line operators to figure  
3 out how those things are run, so we need to  
4 include those kind of operating expenses and  
5 revenues into our analysis. And then we also need  
6 to talk about in addition to the potential for  
7 redevelopment some of the intangible benefits. So  
8 it's not going to be a clear ROI investment; you  
9 invest this, you're going to get this back.  
10 That's not possible in this kind of study.

11 This is, you know, infrastructure and it  
12 resembles -- road infrastructure also resembles  
13 park infrastructure and school infrastructure. So  
14 it's really a public amending; right? So I think  
15 in assessing -- how I would recommend assessing is  
16 to think in those terms, as well, and not as a  
17 hard ROI. Because you would be contributing to  
18 your residents and their enjoyment of the city,  
19 their pride in it. You would probably attract  
20 more millennials to downtown.

21 There's a lot of these intangible benefits  
22 that a really great environment offers, and it  
23 really does improve the quality of life. So how  
24 do you value families coming down to use this more



1 frequently? How do you value larger attendance at  
2 festivals in terms of what benefit people gain  
3 from that? How do you value the physical fitness  
4 they gain? All those things are kind of intangible  
5 benefits that I think are important to discuss but  
6 we can't really quantify.

7 So when we do this cost benefit analysis,  
8 it's going to include all the numbers that you've  
9 seen, plus more, but it's also going to include a  
10 discussion of the larger benefits of this project  
11 that we are not able to value.

12 So that's where we are at this point. We  
13 are also very receptive to comments. This is  
14 still a draft. Nothing is etched into stone here  
15 on this study, so we like input from anybody that  
16 can provide it to us to help improve the work that  
17 we do.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

19 Any questions, further questions?

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: I would just comment  
21 that -- thank you for that. I mean, it seems  
22 pretty thorough and it is understandable when you  
23 go through it. We don't -- there's more information  
24 out there that we don't have to -- we don't have

1 anything to compare or judge this against, so it  
2 is interesting.

3 So we're looking at a total economic  
4 impact of about \$3 million and that's annually?

5 MR. HAZINSKI: Yes.

6 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So when you do a  
7 cost benefit analysis, obviously, the most  
8 important thing is what's this going to cost,  
9 what's it going to cost to build it. So I don't  
10 know if that's a good number or bad number, but it  
11 does seem thorough. So thank you for that.

12 MR. HAZINSKI: We need to circle back with  
13 WBK Engineering and get their cost estimates.  
14 They're starting to get a little stale, and they  
15 need to bring those up to date because there's  
16 escalation in costs I'm sure.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Do we have that?

18 MR. HAZINSKI: There's a number floating  
19 around.

20 MS. TUNGARE: There's a range.

21 MR. COLBY: WBK back in 2017 had provided  
22 an estimate in the range of 20- to \$22 million for  
23 construction of the river park, which is  
24 essentially the portion between Main Street and

1 the trestle.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Any other questions?

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: Is it possible for  
5 John Rabchuk to answer a couple questions?

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: If he wants to.

7 MR. RABCHUK: John Rabchuk, 914 Ash Street  
8 here in St. Charles.

9 MEMBER VARGULICH: So, John, for the whole  
10 project, the whole -- let's just say from Main  
11 Street to the trestle, is it the intent that -- if  
12 the estimates are 20 to 30 million, is that the  
13 project ready to go, or are there other parts of  
14 that that WBK didn't focus on because it wasn't in  
15 what they were asked to do.

16 MR. RABCHUK: Well, there are other pieces  
17 to the project, bike trails, for example, we were  
18 in front of government services last week talking  
19 about the possibility of cantilevering a bike  
20 trail down Route 25 out over the river a little  
21 bit so it can come underneath Prairie Street  
22 bridge because that is so narrow. So those costs  
23 are not included in the estimate that WBK had done.

24 A big portion of the WBK costs were the

1 permitting, you know, because there's a bunch of  
2 different agencies, and you know how involved that  
3 can be, and it is also dependent on doing some  
4 engineering work. We're at the concept plan  
5 stage, so we haven't done drillings or any of the  
6 rock formation stuff.

7 I did want to make a comment. You had  
8 talked about floodplain stuff. Just to give you a  
9 perspective, when WBK did their presentation, they  
10 estimated that the floodplain now on the west side  
11 of the river, which carries over to about 5th or  
12 6th Street, would come all the way this side of  
13 31, just to give you an idea.

14 So those people that are paying extra now  
15 for insurance and other things in those areas even  
16 if those buildings just stayed exactly the same  
17 would realize significant savings there.

18 MEMBER VARGULICH: Okay. Any sense of the  
19 east side, how that would change?

20 MR. RABCHUK: It's substantial but I don't  
21 remember what the dimensions were. I just remember  
22 specifically because that was so dramatic on the  
23 west side.

24 But the essential thing was -- I think

1 that Russ pointed out was that the assumption that  
2 all of that land could be built is probably pretty  
3 close and accurate.

4 MEMBER VARGULICH: And then as far as  
5 crossing underneath Main Street, is that still  
6 part of the engineering cost?

7 MR. RABCHUK: That's part of this 20 million  
8 or the number that you had just heard.

9 It's important to realize that those  
10 arches underneath the Main Street bridge right now  
11 are facades. They can all come off and be  
12 realigned and a different facade put on. So by  
13 narrowing the river down and going back to its  
14 original channel, which is what this is or the  
15 proposal is, it gives us room on both sides. It  
16 potentially would flood just like underneath  
17 Prairie Street now on the west side, you know, a  
18 few times of year with high water conditions or  
19 whatever and then go back down.

20 MEMBER VARGULICH: Have WBK or you through  
21 the conceptual state, did you share any of this  
22 with like DNR or people like that? Obviously,  
23 they're not approving anything.

24 MR. RABCHUK: WBK took it to DNR and

1 showed it to them at that time. What they told me  
2 was that the DNR was very interested. They had no  
3 discouraging comments at all, but, obviously,  
4 without engineering, without everything else, they  
5 can't say, "We bless this."

6 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Who is DNR?

7 MR. RABCHUK: Department of Natural  
8 Resources owns the river, and they also own the  
9 dam here in St. Charles, so they would have to  
10 concur. Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife,  
11 EPA gets involved, lots of different things.

12 And I think to Tom's points about the  
13 intangibles, I mean, one of the things that's  
14 happened in all these other towns, and I think his  
15 final report will reflect that, is that it's  
16 really changed the character of the downtown in  
17 terms of attracting a lifestyle.

18 In Boise, Idaho, for example, it's really  
19 a high-tech center now. So people that don't want  
20 to pay the rent and the housing costs in San Jose,  
21 California, are moving to Boise, Idaho, as one of  
22 their top destinations. That kind of business and  
23 people that enjoy doing that also tend to like  
24 these kinds of sports and things. So it's become

1 a high-use area.

2 The proposal that we have, either  
3 Drawing 2 or 3 would incorporate -- or as  
4 envisioned anyway would incorporate a movable dam  
5 so you could adjust the whitewater features on a  
6 database if you wanted, make it for a competition  
7 or for whatever. So it's proven to be very good.

8 MEMBER VARGULICH: Has the park district  
9 indicated their interest in taking on the  
10 facilities that would interface with them from an  
11 operations standpoint?

12 MR. RABCHUK: I don't want to speak for  
13 them. The park district has been a partner in  
14 this all along. They've shared a lot of the  
15 costs, along with the River Corridor Foundation,  
16 and the City, and also to some extent the County.

17 There's a lot of different ways to go at  
18 the features. For example, zip lining, almost  
19 none of the facilities that I'm aware of run those  
20 by the City government. It's usually a third party.  
21 So when I've talked to the park district  
22 commissioners, they have suggested that they would  
23 look at those as opportunities to license that  
24 through a third-party organization.

1           Same way, you know, like at Maggie Daley  
2 Park down in Chicago, the climbing walls are  
3 extremely popular. It would not be a stretch of  
4 the imagination at all to put a climbing wall or  
5 facility like that up against the railroad berm  
6 either inside Potawatomie Park or -- because the  
7 berm is 40 feet high or something, it would be  
8 natural to build something up against that in  
9 certain locations. Again, that could be a  
10 third-party group.

11           So the park district is very interested in  
12 the project because it would expand recreational  
13 activity; it would expand lifestyle things, offer  
14 a lot more opportunity for citizens of St. Charles,  
15 people within the park district boundaries to  
16 enjoy that.

17           MEMBER VARGULICH: Thank you.

18           MEMBER PRETZ: John, I had a question.  
19 How are you doing?

20           MR. RABCHUK: What's that?

21           MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: How are you doing?

22           MR. RABCHUK: Good.

23           MEMBER PRETZ: Once in a while we come  
24 across some noise out there that other cities are



1 thinking about dam removal. Has there been any  
2 thought about if other entities remove their dams  
3 what effect that potentially could have on the  
4 water level? I understand the adjustable, you  
5 know, if those things were in, but, you know, a  
6 longer term effect on what the height of the water  
7 level would be coming down as well as down to the  
8 south?

9 MR. RABCHUK: Let me answer that with a  
10 number of answers because it's not just one  
11 answer. There's groups in the area that have  
12 proposed for quite a number of years, including  
13 the DNR, of just taking out all the dams up and  
14 down the whole Fox River, turn it all back to its  
15 natural state. And that has been proposed; there  
16 have been a number of studies on that; there are  
17 proponents of that approach.

18 Now, if that were to happen here, the river  
19 would be substantially -- well, you can think of  
20 it everything above the dam would be roughly 7 feet  
21 lower than it is today. That river is not that  
22 deep, and it would be approximately the same south  
23 of here because half of the dam, that's what it is.

24 So it would substantially change the

1 river. There would be no boating, power boating  
2 whatsoever. You know, the river -- the paddlewheel  
3 boats at Potawatomie Park would not be able to  
4 operate whatsoever. That boat ramp at Boy Scout  
5 Island would be pretty much useless.

6           Anyway so that's one approach. I will  
7 tell you, too, that if you remember back a number  
8 of years ago -- and you and I are the same age, so  
9 I'm sure you remember this, but when the City of  
10 Chicago was very excited about or trying to entice  
11 the Olympics here, and that eventually ended up  
12 going to Rio, I think, the Fox River was the  
13 choice for all the whitewater sports, and they  
14 were going to invest a substantial amount of money  
15 mostly just north of Aurora for that facility, and  
16 that would have been building all of that under  
17 the Olympic umbrella to make that.

18           I will also tell you that the other  
19 communities up and down the river that are closest  
20 to us are all watching to see what we do. They  
21 all have plans to do things. Like in Batavia, for  
22 example, their dam is going to fall apart. I mean,  
23 if you go down and take a look at it, there's  
24 huge chunks of it that have already fallen out,

1 and that dam is coming out one way or another.  
2 They are very interested in tying in and having  
3 the Fox River Valley be a destination and for a  
4 lot of people. Geneva, it's got a much smaller  
5 dam; it's only about a 3-foot height; it would be  
6 very simple for them to do some things to  
7 accommodate through traffic, not whitewater but  
8 numerous kayaks, et cetera. So you could see more  
9 things happen up and down the river that could  
10 have a benefit.

11 We have some beautiful natural resources,  
12 and this is by far our biggest natural asset that  
13 we have, and it just seems a shame not to use it a  
14 little bit more.

15 MEMBER PRETZ: Thank you.

16 MR. RABCHUK: Any other questions?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. RABCHUK: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Thank you.

20 Anything further from Plan Commissioners?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. There isn't  
23 any action that we're taking on this. So is there  
24 anything -- Rita, do you have anything else?

Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

54

1 MS. TUNGARE: No. You're correct that  
2 there is no action required from the Plan Commission.  
3 It is for information only. The full report will  
4 be presented to the planning and development  
5 committee of our City Council on April 8th.  
6 That's the plan right now.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Thank you.  
8 Thank you, gentlemen, appreciate it.

9 Any additional business from Plan  
10 Commission members or staff?

11 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Yes. You know, at  
12 our next meeting on the 19th four of us will not  
13 be here, and I know that having that item with the  
14 DMV is on the agenda. I wonder if we could hold  
15 that to a later meeting so we can all be there.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Are there other items  
17 that we have on that date?

18 MR. COLBY: I believe they're all City-  
19 initiated items that are not necessarily time  
20 critical. Those could be rescheduled.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Would you have a  
22 problem with just proactively canceling the  
23 meeting?

24 MR. COLBY: Yes, we could.

Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

55

1 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Okay.

2 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: Great.

3 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Weekly  
4 development report you've seen, and the upcoming  
5 meetings -- oh, actually, if we're canceling the  
6 19th, the April 2nd meeting, Election Day,  
7 typically on the general election days we cancel  
8 the meetings. I don't know if we have canceled  
9 them in the past on the local election days.  
10 Have we?

11 MR. COLBY: I think we have but it's  
12 really at the Plan Commission's discretion.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Well, I guess I'll poll  
14 the Plan Commission. What do you think? If we're  
15 canceling the meeting on the 19th, should we have  
16 the meeting on April 2nd?

17 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: I say yes.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: I think there's general  
19 agreement that we should have it on April 2nd unless  
20 staff disagrees. Does that sound okay?

21 MR. COLBY: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Then  
23 March 19th is not happening but April 2nd is.

24 Is there any public comment?

Transcript of Fox River Corridor Plan  
Conducted on March 5, 2019

56

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: All right. Is there a  
3 motion to adjourn?

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KESSLER: So moved.

5 MEMBER MACKLIN-PURDY: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: It's been moved and  
7 seconded. All in favor.

8 (Ayes heard.)

9 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: Opposed.

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN WALLACE: This meeting of the  
12 St. Charles Plan Commission is being adjourned at  
13 8:20 p.m.

14 (Off the record at 8:20 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Paula M. Quetsch, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 084-003733, CSR, RPR, and a Notary Public in and for the County of Kane, State of Illinois, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the proceedings, that said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision, and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 11th day of March, 2019.

My commission expires: October 16, 2021



-----  
Notary Public in and for the  
State of Illinois