



Meeting Minutes

Subject:	Richmond By-Pass TAG Meeting
Project:	Village of Richmond
Project Number:	RICH-070421
Meeting Date/Time:	January 15, 2013; 3:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
Meeting Location:	Village of Richmond, Village Hall

Attendees:

TAG Members
Mr. Charlie Eldredge, McHenry County Economic Development Corporation
Ms. Charlotte Hollenbach, Village of Richmond Trustee
Dr. Cindy Skrukud, Sierra Club and Friends of the Nippersink
Ms. Elizabeth Kessler, Executive Director, McHenry County Conservation District
Mr. Ernest Varga, MCDOT
Mr. Rick Gallas, Richmond Township Fire Protection District
Ms. Sandra Fay Salgado, McHenry County Board Member
Mr. Scott Lesser, Tamarack Representative
Other
Mr. Peter Koenig, Village of Richmond
Mr. Ram Wardanian, Village of Richmond Trustee
Mr. David Kielpinski, Village of Richmond Trustee
Mr. Craig Kunz, Village of Richmond Trustee
Mr. Mike Lee, Village of Spring Grove Trustee
Mr. Pat Mazzanti, Village of Spring Grove Trustee
Ms. Debbie Tiritilli, Resident
Mr. Gary Tiritilli, Resident
Mr. John Baczek, IDOT
Mr. Mark Peterson, IDOT
Mr. Steve Schilke, IDOT
Mr. Jim Novak, Huff and Huff
Mr. Sean LaDieu, HR Green, Inc.
Mr. Sean Murphy, HR Green, Inc.
Mr. David Johanson, HR Green, Inc.
Mr. Chad Kohlhoff, HR Green, Inc.

TAG Members Absent
Mr. Bruce Hunter, Village Business Owner
Mr. Christopher Hiebert, SEWRPC
Dr. Dan Oest, Richmond-Burton School District
Mr. Dave Bockelmann, Richmond Township Highway Commissioner
Mr. John Wrzeszcz, Village of Genoa City
Ms. Kathy Chernich, US Army Corps of Engineers
Mr. Mark Eisenberg, Village of Spring Grove
Mr. Shawn Cirton, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Mr. Soren Hall, US Army Corps of Engineers

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

David J. and Sean L. provided a 30-minute presentation with the following key points:

- The last TAG meeting presentation was April 24, 2012.
- The same presentation used at the April 2012 TAG meeting was made at the NEPA Merger Meeting (June 15, 2012). The USEPA, USACOE, and USFWS indicated that the alternative sections north of IL 173 and west of US 12 would not receive a permit and need to be removed from further consideration due to the high quality wetlands and upland bird habitat. As alternatives east of US 12 and those using US 12 north of IL 173 are viable, these need to be considered, including the possibility of using Illinois Nature Preserve Land.
- The Hackmatack Wildlife Refuge was authorized on July 10, 2012 and includes a core area of the refuge between Keystone Road and US 12 in the area bounded by IL 173 to the north and Glacial Park to the south. It is unclear how this will affect the project, as the USFWS will only acquire land from willing sellers.
- A meeting with MCCD and the Illinois Nature Preserves Commission (INPC) was held to discuss the project and the use of Illinois Nature Preserve land for highway right-of-way. The general response was that the INPC will do what it can to protect its land from development, including highway use.
- During the MCCD meeting, it was suggested by MCCD to reconsider the Keystone Corridor. It was previously removed due to the relative higher number of residential relocations; however, MCCD suggested this number of relocations might be overstated.
- A presentation was given to the McHenry County Transportation Committee (July 18, 2012) and the Village of Richmond Board (August 2, 2012). The Village Board was informed of both the resource agency's (USEPA, USACOE, and USFWS) position of not supporting the alternatives within the northwest section and the position of the INPC of not supporting any alternative using Illinois Nature Preserve land. The Board indicated they could not be supportive of any alternatives that impacted residences or businesses.
- Based on the input received to date, it became evident that the bypass alternatives would have to utilize the existing US 12 corridor at the northern end of the project. To better understand the potential impacts and opportunities associated with improvements to existing US 12, more detailed engineering was required. Through coordination with both IDOT and the Village of Richmond, preliminary geometry for improvements to US 12 north of IL 173 and the IL 173/US 12 intersection were developed for both an eastern bypass option and a western bypass option. The potential relocation impacts could then be assessed and discussed with the Village of Richmond. Opportunities for development and gateway opportunities could also be evaluated. Based on the preliminary engineering, the Village of Richmond would have a better understanding of impacts to determine if the use of existing US 12 is a viable option. If this turns out to not be viable, the information would be used to discuss the constraints of using existing US 12 with the resource agencies.
- The preliminary geometry was presented to the Village of Richmond Board (Nov. 15, 2012). Relocations based on the initial screening included 8 residential and 22 commercial buildings. Using preliminary geometry for the eastern bypass option, there were an estimated 4 commercial and 13 residential relocations, and 5 commercial and 8 residential relocations for the west bypass option. While not fully supporting the alternative, the Village regarded using the existing US 12 alignment as a viable option and recognized it might be

Meeting Minutes

the only option north of IL 173. Additionally, improvements to IL 173, as part of a separate study, may be considered in the future and relocations may be sustained as a result of that project regardless of the Richmond Bypass alternatives selected for advancement.

- Part of the evaluation conducted for the preliminary engineering included the consideration of floodplain impacts. Comparison of the alignments within the central project area, showed little to no floodplain impacts for the eastern and western alignments. The Central Corridor, however, due to its parallel alignment to the North Branch of the Nippersink, impacts approximately 24 acres of floodplain which would need to be mitigated with compensatory storage. For this reason, removal of the Central Corridor from further consideration is recommended.
- With consideration of the existing US 12 corridor as the only viable option north of IL 173, the alternatives analysis needs to consider the difference between the eastern and western bypass alternatives. With the removal of the Central Corridor and the addition of the Keystone Corridor (as per MCCD suggestions), there are generally three western bypass alternatives and two eastern bypass alternatives.
- In an effort to evaluate the five remaining alternatives, a comparison of the preliminary environmental impacts was performed for each. Environmental criteria included relocations, and impacts to MCCD property, wetlands, floodplains, oak trees, number of parcels, segmented parcels, number of ROW acquisition acres, number of stream crossings, and increase in impervious areas. Based on the impacts for the five alternatives, the overall differences between the alternatives was not profound. As a result, no clear favorite emerged from the remaining five alternatives. The numbers in the following table were presented.

(See Table, next page)

Meeting Minutes

Resource	East Bypass Options		West Bypass Options		
	Hunt Club	Hunt Club Shifted	FAP 420	Near West	Keystone
Relocations (Comm./Res.)	6/11	6/13	7/9	7/10	7/11
MCCD, acres	0	0	3.5	3.5	3.5
Wetlands, acres	2.5	2.3	5.6	4.7	2.0
Floodplain, acres	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.10
Oak Tree Stand, acres	0.5	1.1	8.3	1.1	0.9
Parcels, #	135	147	144	152	172
Segmented Parcels, #	6	4	3	10	7
ROW Acq., acres	102.6	94.8	59.3	103.2	92.6
Stream Crossings, #	1	1	1	1	1
Impervious Area Incr., Acres	60.7	60.6	66.1	71.0	70.6

- In addition to the environmental impacts, the opportunities for economic development were presented for a general western bypass option, and a general eastern bypass option. If maintaining open land was not an issue, the opportunities for economic development are likely greater for a western bypass due to the larger parcels and less existing development. Development for an eastern bypass option is limited by the smaller parcels and existing residential development between US 12 and North Solon Road and by residential development in Spring Grove. If open land conservation is observed more readily, mainly due to the Hackmatack National Wildlife Refuge, then the area east of Keystone Road is less likely to be developed, and the opportunities for economic development between the west and east land use scenarios will be more similar.
- The next steps of the process include an informal meeting with the resource agencies, a public meeting, and a NEPA merger meeting in June where we hope to receive concurrence for the Alternatives Carried Forward.
- The meeting was then opened for discussion.

Meeting Minutes

Cindy – A refuge parcel has been acquired by Hackmatack National Wildlife Refuge, making the refuge official.

Charlie – The eastern alternatives are inappropriate because they will not reduce traffic. The IL 53 Extension will shift US-12 traffic to IL 31 and, as a result, traffic will be flipped. The west alternatives present the greatest potential for economic growth. There is a lot of open space along these routes, which is good for tourism. Although there is no clear western preference, favor FAP 420 because the ROW is already owned, reducing the cost.

Cindy – Improvements are needed north of IL 173 first to accommodate larger traffic volumes, the East/West option is irrelevant.

Pete – Traffic north of 173 is not the issue here. The intersection of US 12 and IL 173 and south of it are the main concerns. The improvements along IL 173 will likely be a part of another project.

Dave – The east options present economic development issues. These routes have people on US 12 getting nowhere near Richmond, resulting in less “stop-in” business. Most of this type of potential business is captured on the northbound traffic since southbound weekend traffic will not stop on Sunday nights. Hackmatack NWR will not stimulate the local economy.

Cindy – People will not take existing US 12 because if they do not know the roads, they will follow the signs.

Sean M – Alternatively, people will follow whichever route is quickest according to their GPS.

Spring Grove – Interest in east or west option is limited to impacts on Spring Grove. Have no route preference at this point.

Elizabeth – The project has goals of eco-tourism rather than just bypassing the town.

John (IDOT) – From IDOT’s perspective, both routes are viable. Personally, the east route looks more viable from a traffic operations perspective. It is the more direct route on paper.

Dave – The intersection where the route departs would be improved to encourage people to head into Richmond to see what’s going on.

John (IDOT) – The bypass to the east will result in increased traffic on US 12. The goal would be to split traffic increases on IL 31 and US 12 to 50/50. From a land use planning perspective, sharing community infrastructure with Spring Grove, for example, would result in a sharing of funding for the infrastructure and maintenance in order to develop along the eastern bypass option.

Dave K. – Keystone is not viable; it is too far west.

Pete – The advantage of Keystone is the existing roadbed, which would result in lower construction costs.

Charlie – The current S-curve layout in the south section of the Keystone alignment should be revised.

Dave – One alternative to straighten the S-curve is using the same east-west alignment as FAP 420 and extend it to intersect with Keystone Road.

Spring Grove – What is the goal of the bypass?

David J – The goal is to alleviate congestion in Richmond by accommodating larger traffic volumes on other routes and achieving other purpose and need points established for the project.



Meeting Minutes

Pete – Several years back, the Village of Richmond was told that if a bypass wasn't established, they would widen Main Street to four lanes, displacing all impacted businesses and homes.

Cindy – What is the economic development portion of the bypass based upon?

Sean L – Based upon tendencies to develop along high volume routes. Businesses will develop where people are traveling frequently, such as at major intersections.

Pete – The goal of the bypass for Richmond is not to have traffic avoid the Village, but to encourage economic development while managing increased traffic volumes. Economic development will occur along the selected route.

Spring Grove – Which route does the Village of Richmond prefer?

Pete – The route of least opposition from public, environmental, etc. as well as having the greatest potential for growth will be preferred. Currently, there is no preferred route, so long as a decision to turn towards Richmond or Wisconsin from IL 173 can be made. The environmental barriers of the northwest routes make it a challenge.

Cindy – Does IDOT have plans to make improvements north of IL 173?

John (IDOT) – The bypass would have to take place first, as the route selection will dictate the types of improvements needed at the intersection. For example, an east option would require right turn lane improvements on 173 and left turn lane improvements on US 12 southbound. However, the more existing alignment is used, the more improvements can be made in stages when funding becomes available.

Sandra – There should be another TAG meeting soon after the NEPA meeting.

David J – This is a long process and there is a lot that needs to be accomplished between meetings.

John (IDOT) – There should be further studies on traffic impacts and economic development scenarios to resolve some of the issues between east or west alternatives.

Sean L – Are there any alternatives that are remaining on the table that anyone would recommend removing, or are there any alternatives that should be added back in? (There were no suggestions.)

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Not Scheduled

These minutes are assumed correct unless the author is notified within five calendar days of publication.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DCJ', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

David C. Johanson, P.E., HR Green, Inc.

Distribution: All people listed on Page 1 when valid email address was provided.

Matthew Tym

Tim Hartnett, HR Green, Inc.

Akram Chaudhry, HR Green, Inc.

Ed Coggin, HR Green, Inc.

DCJ/tcn