

Email received from mlarso@msn.com on Tuesday, 4/28/26:

Please accept this correspondence for inclusion in the public record for the upcoming discussion and vote regarding the South Rockford Industrial TIF.

These comments are focused on hydrology, transparency, Environmental Justice considerations, cumulative land-use impacts, potential methane migration concerns associated with nearby landfill sites, and the financial implications of developing land already identified as having water-related constraints.

The City's own TIF eligibility materials reference chronic flooding and an undesignated tributary as factors affecting the redevelopment area. Publicly available USGS National Map data also shows marshy and ponded areas on the site, indicating naturally wet soils and recurring water retention.

In response to FOIA Request No. 26-1785, I was informed that Public Works does not possess hydrological reports or conclusions for this site area. Given that response, the public record should clearly identify the specific technical basis used to support the hydrology-related findings contained in the eligibility report. In light of the recent flooding in the area, this further underscores the importance of a clear and comprehensive hydrological review.

Because drainage and groundwater conditions do not necessarily stop at parcel boundaries, the public record should also consider whether any changes in runoff, grading, groundwater movement, or stormwater management could affect nearby residences along Condon Road, the Woodcrest subdivision, or connected downstream areas extending toward Levings Lake.

Environmental Justice considerations are also relevant when publicly supported redevelopment decisions may affect surrounding neighborhoods, private well users, nearby waterways, or communities downstream of industrial expansion. Where public funds, infrastructure changes, or environmental impacts are involved, transparency regarding potential burdens and benefits is essential.

The proximity of nearby landfill sites, including Pagel Pit/Winnebago Landfill and Orchard Hills, further supports the need for cumulative environmental review, including consideration of groundwater oversight, drainage interactions, traffic impacts, landfill gas management, and long-term land-use compatibility. Landfills can generate methane gas through decomposition, and if not adequately controlled, methane may migrate underground through soils, utility corridors, or subsurface pathways beyond landfill boundaries. Because methane is flammable and can accumulate in enclosed or below-grade spaces, the public record should reflect whether any methane monitoring, migration studies, or protective engineering measures have been evaluated for nearby development areas.

The financial implications of these known site conditions should also be fully considered. When development occurs on land with high groundwater, saturated soils, drainage limitations, recurring ponding, or where added methane mitigation infrastructure may be necessary, project costs often increase as plans move from concept stage into engineering, site preparation, infrastructure installation, and final construction.

Potential added costs can include:

- Additional geotechnical and drainage studies
- Soil stabilization or imported fill
- Dewatering during excavation
- Expanded stormwater detention or pumping systems
- Stronger road base and utility trench protection
- Specialized foundations, waterproofing, or structural reinforcement
- Methane monitoring systems or gas barriers where warranted
- Ongoing drainage and environmental maintenance after construction

This does not mean development cannot occur. It means that known water constraints and nearby landfill-related conditions can materially affect cost, risk, and long-term maintenance obligations. Because public financing tools may be involved, these issues warrant transparency before commitments advance further.

These comments are not submitted in opposition to redevelopment, but in support of decisions grounded in clear technical support, realistic cost expectations, equitable consideration of surrounding communities, and full public accountability.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please include these comments in the official record.

Mark Larson