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2019 Agency Scoping Meeting Summary
Agency Scoping Meeting, December 11, 2019
South Bridge Connector, 4556-02-00

ATTENDEES:
Paul Fontecchio/Brown County
Cole Runge/Brown County
Nick Uitenbroek/Brown County
Tony Saccoman/Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Midwest
Alice Halpin/Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer (DATCP)
Marilyn Weiss/DATCP
Ian Chidister/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Daniel Holt/FHWA
Charlie Webb/Jacobs Engineering Group Inc. (Jacobs)
Ben Goldworthy/Jacobs
Rob Hook/Jacobs
Jill Kramer/Jacobs
Christine Norrick/Jacobs
Doug Cox/Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin
Tana Aguirre/Oneida Nation of Wisconsin
Stacie Cutbank/Oneida Nation of Wisconsin
Darren Fortney/SEH, Inc.
Jeff Saxby/SEH, Inc.
Joey Shoemaker/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
Mike Sedlacek/U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
Ken Westlake/USEPA
Scott Thoresen/Village of De Pere
Brad Lange/Village of Allouez
Jim Doperalski/Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)
Bryan Lipke/Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)
Matt Halada/WisDOT
Jonquil Johnston/WisDOT
Jill Michaelson/WisDOT
Kathie Van-Price/WisDOT

DATE: December 11, 2019
MEETING LOCATION: Brown County Highway Department, Green Bay, Wisconsin
ATTACHMENTS: Sign-In Sheet
Meeting Agenda and Handouts

After introductions, the Lead Agencies’ reviewed their roles and responsibilities.

Cole Runge/Brown County presented the background of the project and explained that, as part of the County’s earlier study efforts, agencies had concurred with the purpose and need, as well as alternatives studied and alternatives to be carried forward. In addition, various stakeholder meetings and public involvement meetings were held. The study was put on hold in 2012.

Charlie Webb/Jacobs then briefly discussed the purpose of the study, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and its various components. He explained that a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared and will identify a preferred corridor for transportation improvements rather than a detailed alignment. Corridors that will be evaluated will be several hundred feet wide; working alignments that will be evaluated will be based on a narrower cross-section.

There was discussion regarding WisDOT’s commitment to fund design and construction of an interchange (from ramp terminal to ramp terminal) if this Tier 1 study were to conclude that an interchange was part of the preferred alternative.
There was discussion about the overall purpose and need for the project as well as alternatives that will be evaluated. Ian Chidister/FHWA pointed out that this study will revisit the previous purpose and need and range of alternatives considered as prepared under the County’s earlier efforts. He noted that there will be formal review opportunities for agencies to review the purpose and need and range of alternatives considered.

Jim Doperalski/WDNR asked if the Tier 1 study will look at alternative segments that could potentially be combined in different ways to create different alternatives. Charlie explained that the range of alternatives considered will document all the alternatives previously studied in earlier evaluations, which included some mixing and matching of segments, as well as any new alternatives suggested by the public or agencies.

The Agency Coordination Plan and the Impact Assessment Methodology Plan were reviewed and will be disseminated to agencies in December for review and comment. These documents outline coordination efforts, as well as specifics of impact analyses for the study.

Charlie Webb reviewed the overall schedule for the project, and highlighted various meetings, concurrence points, and release of the Draft EIS and Final EIS/Record of Decision (ROD). Issues discussed on this schedule and Agency Coordination Plan included:

- It was noted that the project schedule is aggressive; however, agencies will be given their customary 30-day timeframe to review and comment on documents.
- Ian Chidister noted that agencies that may eventually need to provide an approval, permit, or formal agreement for the project will be invited to be Cooperating Agencies. The following will be requested from Cooperating and Participating Agencies:
  - Response to the invitation to be a participating or cooperating agency
  - If “yes,” concurrence on the schedule
  - Review and comment on the Agency Coordination Plan and the Impact Analysis Methodology
  - Any additional scoping items

Charlie Webb then gave an overview of the impact assessment methodologies, noting that, in general, impact analyses at the Tier 1 level will rely on published data. He gave examples, using agricultural and cultural resources, of what would and would not be done as part of the Tier 1 study. The following items on this topic were discussed:

- Jim Doperalski/WDNR and Joey Shoemaker/USACE asked what wetland data the study team will use, noting that data from previous study efforts may be better than that from the Wisconsin Wetland Inventory. It was noted that the analysis will review and build on previous studies, which included a field review of potential wetlands sites by USACE. Joey Shoemaker also suggested including a review of Natural Resources Conservation Service crop slides to determine potential wetlands, in addition to other federal and state mapping databases that are often inaccurate. A field (windshield) review will be included in Tier 1 to verify that previously identified wetlands still exist.
- Scott Thoresen/City of De Pere asked questions about whether soils data would be used to determine wetlands. Published soils data will be used if needed to supplement wetland data developed during the previous study.
- Doug Cox/Menomonee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin asked how the tribes would be coordinated with, given his understanding that Section 106 coordination would not be undertaken as part of the Tier 1 analysis. The project team will be seeking the assistance of the tribes in learning about resources of importance. There will be outreach to the tribes, but not through formal Section 106 consultation.
Following these discussions, each attendee was asked if they had any statements or comments that they wished to make during the meeting. Responses were as follows:

- **Village of Allouez** – no additional comments beyond that which was discussed at the local officials meeting.
- **Oneida Nation of Wisconsin** – no additional comments.
- **DATCP** – no additional comments.
- **WDNR** – Jim Doperalski/WDNR noted that because the Tier 1 level is based on broad corridors, they expect that their comments will be very generalized. For instance, regarding the Fox River crossing and potential impacts, a few hundred feet could make a big difference in terms of what is being impacted.
  - Charlie Webb suggested that a separate meeting be held to discuss Fox River issues. WDNR agreed to this.
- **City of De Pere** – no additional comments.
- **USEPA** – Mike Sedlacek/USEPA asked if the Final EIS and ROD were going to be a combined document. They were told that it would be a combined Final EIS/ROD.
  
  Mike Sedlacek also asked whether this project was subject to “One Federal Decision.” Ian Chidister stated it was not, because the project does not satisfy the definition of the major infrastructure requirement and because funding has not been determined.
- **USACE** – no additional comments.
- **BIA** – no additional comments.
- **Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin** – no additional comments.

In closing, Ian Chidister stated that this will be the first Tier 1 EIS completed by WisDOT in more than a decade. He urged agencies to reach out to FHWA, WisDOT, or Brown County if things are not clear, if they do not agree with something.
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Meeting Agenda and Handouts
1. Introductions

2. Lead Agency Roles/Responsibilities
   a. Brown County
   b. WisDOT
   c. FHWA

3. Background on the Project

4. Purpose of the Study
   a. Tier 1 EIS
   b. WisDOT commitment re: interchange with I-41

5. Purpose of the Project; Need for the Project

6. Review Agency Coordination Plan and Impact Assessment Methodologies
   a. Tier 1 EIS schedule
      i. Public Information Meetings in December and March
      ii. Tier 1 Draft EIS in June
      iii. Public Hearing in July
      iv. Tier 1 Final EIS/Record of Decision in October

7. Agency Comments, Questions, Issues
November 27, 2019

Project ID: 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector
Brown County, WI

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and Brown County, as joint-lead agencies, invite you to attend an Agency Scoping Meeting to discuss the South Bridge Connector Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study in Brown County, WI (see attached Project Location Map). The study area includes the City of De Pere, the Villages of Allouez, Bellevue, Hobart, and Ashwaubenon, and the Towns of Glenmore, Ledgeview, Rockland, and Lawrence.

Brown County South Bridge Connector
Tier 1 EIS

Agency Scoping Meeting:
Wednesday, December 11, 2019
3:00 p.m.

Brown County Duck Creek Center
2198 Glendale Avenue
Green Bay, WI 54303

Your agency has been identified as an agency that may have interest in the study or have information or expertise concerning potential issues. The objectives for this meeting are to brief you on the study and obtain your input on the issues you consider important to the successful completion of the Tier 1 EIS.

FHWA, WisDOT and Brown County initiated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to study transportation improvements in the study area in 2007. The NEPA process was put on hold in 2012. The EIS will now be prepared as a Tier 1 document to comply with federal fiscal constraint requirements that were introduced after the previous NEPA process was initiated. The study team will assess traffic operations, capacity, and safety of the transportation infrastructure along with existing and planned development in the area, system linkages, and local planning efforts. The study will identify the most appropriate corridor and associated transportation improvements for addressing existing and future transportation demand generated by the planned development in the southern part of the Green Bay metropolitan area. It is anticipated that the Tier 1 Draft EIS document will be available for agency review in the summer of 2020. The Final Tier 1 EIS/Record of Decision (ROD) is expected to be approved in fall 2020.
The study team is developing a Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement and an Impact Analysis Methodology to describe proposed analysis procedures and responsibilities during the environmental review process. We plan to provide these documents for your review and comment at the scoping meeting.

For your information, a Public Involvement Meeting (PIM) is also scheduled for Wednesday, December 11, 2019 at the Altmayer Elementary School in De Pere, WI (3001 Ryan Road) from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. (presentation at 6:45). You are invited and encouraged to attend this meeting as well.

We look forward to working with you on this important transportation study. If you have any questions, please contact:

- Cole Runge, Principal Planner/MPO Director, Brown County Planning Commission, at (920) 448-6480, Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov;
- Ian Chidister, Environmental Program Manager, FHWA, at (608) 829-7503, ian.chidister@dot.gov; or
- Bryan Lipke, Project Manager, WisDOT, at (920) 492-5703, Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov.

Thank you.

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
Project Manager
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Local Officials Meetings Summaries
Local Officials Meeting, December 5, 2019

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheets
DATE: December 5, 2019
MEETING LOCATION: Brown County Highway Department, Green Bay, Wisconsin
ATTACHMENTS: Sign-In Sheets
Meeting Agenda and Handouts

After introductions, Cole Runge/Brown County and Bryan Lipke/WisDOT explained Brown County’s, WisDOT’s, and the Federal Highway Administration’s role as lead agencies in the study.

Cole Runge/Brown County explained the County’s previous efforts regarding the study.

Charlie Webb/Jacobs explained NEPA and its various components, as well as what a Tier 1 EIS process involved. He discussed the overall study schedule and highlighted the various public meetings that will be held, including:

- Agency Coordination Plan and Impact Assessment Methodology will be disseminated to agencies in December. These documents outline coordination efforts, as well as specifics of impact analyses for the study.
- Agency scoping meeting and first public involvement meeting (PIM) is next week. The invite postcard for the PIM was sent to 3,600 people.
- The second PIM will be held in March 2020, and the preferred alternative will be presented and vetted.
- A public hearing will be held in July 2020, following release of the Tier 1 Draft EIS in June.
- The Final EIS/Record of Decision will be completed in October 2020.

There was a question about whether the alignment options were going to be expanded, or if the Tier 1 document would study in detail the three alternatives that had been previously selected to be retained for further study. Charlie Webb noted that as part of the County’s previous study efforts, numerous alignments were developed and the options were screened down to three alternatives to be studied in detail. He explained that the study team wants to know (from local officials and the public) whether there are other alternatives that were not considered that should be added and studied, if alternatives that were eliminated from consideration should be reconsidered, and if the alternatives that were selected for further study are still favored. Bryan Lipke noted that this environmental process must validate both alternatives that were retained for detailed study as well as rationale for alternatives that were dropped.

The overall project schedule was discussed, including a discussion of how the I-41 NEPA study and improvements would tie in with this study. There was discussion about general timing of construction of the I-41 improvements, and how this could affect the phasing of the South Bridge Connector improvements. Bryan Lipke noted that WisDOT’s reconstruction of I-41 may begin in Appleton and work its way north. However, WisDOT’s study has not yet begun, and no construction phasing decisions have been made. Several local officials stated that they favored constructing the South Bridge interchange at I-41 at or near the beginning of WisDOT’s I-41 reconstruction, rather than at the end.
Further discussion noted that if I-41 construction was phased from south to north and was delayed, then all other segments would also be delayed—which would affect construction of the new South Bridge interchange. Paul Fontecchio/Brown County explained that the preliminary construction phasing for the South Bridge Connector was set up to occur from west to east, but there are many unknowns. If the interchange construction was delayed, the County would revisit how it would phase the arterial construction.

There were questions regarding funding for the actual construction of the project beyond the interchange (which would be constructed by WisDOT). Paul Fontecchio explained that the County is evaluating funding scenarios. It was explained that locally funded projects area usually a 50/50 cost share with municipalities. However, if funding were to be available through the state or federal government, the County and municipalities would split the remaining cost 50/50. It is intended that the South Connector will be a County Highway.

Charlie Webb noted that during the previous study efforts, the communities provided formal resolutions supporting or opposing different alternatives. He asked communities to update their formal positions regarding the project. Further, this documentation could be in any form, such as a letter reconfirming the community’s previous resolution, a new resolution, etc. Several representatives acknowledged this and agreed that they will send written documentation reconfirming their support. The Oneida Nation stated that it supports the project and will send a resolution.

There was discussion about any developments currently under review or in the planning stages in the area. The municipalities stated that they would coordinate with Cole Runge to get him the most current information. Allouez representatives said that they are in discussions with the Department of Corrections about relocating the Green Bay Correctional Institution at Webster and WIS 172 on the east side of the Fox River and redeveloping the site.

Charlie Webb asked how the current bridge crossings affect emergency service response times. The City of De Pere’s Administrator stated that when the WIS 172 bridge has a closure or incident, the Claude Allouez Bridge becomes very congested and this affects emergency response times. De Pere’s police and fire service providers have concerns regarding congestion on these two bridges and the effect on emergency service response times. The Town of Ledgeview’s representative stated that its community has shared services with De Pere, so any problems that De Pere has regarding emergency service response affects their community. De Pere also provides ambulance service to the southern part of Ashwaubenon, so slow response times in the event of congestion on Claude Allouez Bridge also affects Ashwaubenon. De Pere supports the Rockland Road corridor; other alternatives that had been previously studied were too far south to effectively help congestion in De Pere and would not help emergency response times. A new sheriff station was built at the WIS 172/County GV interchange.

The City of De Pere’s Administrator brought up conditions and issues on both sides of the river. He explained that on the west side of the river, one-way roadway pairs provide access to and from the Claude Allouez Bridge (Main Avenue going west and Ried Street going east). This is their downtown area which contains retail and other uses as well as on-street parallel parking. It is also near St. Norbert College, so there is a lot of pedestrian activity through this area. He noted that through-traffic leads to conflicts with pedestrians who are crossing the streets throughout the downtown as well as for people trying to parallel park. He said the City is going to be installing another mid-block crossing to try to create a safer pedestrian environment along Main Avenue (there is already one mid-block crossing). He further stated that, to a certain degree, the same is true for the other retail on the east side of the bridge (on N. Broadway, north of Main Avenue). He noted that this east side commercial area is a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) district, and there are issues and effects due to heavy truck traffic and large vehicles rumbling through that area.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY, STATE/ZIP CODE</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>PHONE/NUMBER</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathie VanPruu</td>
<td>941 Vandurpuren Way 54134</td>
<td>WIS DOT</td>
<td>920-492-7115</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathie.vanpruu@dot.wi.gov">kathie.vanpruu@dot.wi.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Michalek</td>
<td>2674 Allure Ave, Bollarme 54311</td>
<td>Village of Bollarme</td>
<td>920 543-5509</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jill.michalek@dot.wi.gov">jill.michalek@dot.wi.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Rowell</td>
<td>416 Reid St, De Pere</td>
<td>West DePere School Dist</td>
<td>920-337-1475</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amrowell@ville.wdpere.wi.us">amrowell@ville.wdpere.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Krueger</td>
<td>416 Reid St, De Pere</td>
<td>West DePere School Dist</td>
<td>920-337-1032</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkrueger@village.depere.wi.us">dkrueger@village.depere.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Villarreal</td>
<td>1700 Chicago St, De Pere</td>
<td>De Pere School Dist</td>
<td>920-339-4060</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ben.villarreal@depere.k12.wi.us">ben.villarreal@depere.k12.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Rakers</td>
<td>225 S. Sixth St, De Pere</td>
<td>City of DePere</td>
<td>920-339-8075</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erakers@de-pere.org">erakers@de-pere.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Therese</td>
<td>925 S. Sixth St, De Pere</td>
<td>City of DePere</td>
<td>920-339-8075</td>
<td>s.therese @mail.de-pere.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Linsen</td>
<td>500 S. 4th St, De Pere</td>
<td>Brown County Board</td>
<td>920 617-2213</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.linsen@gmail.com">aaron.linsen@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2
Meeting Agenda and Handouts
Local Officials Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Study Team Roles/Responsibilities
   a. Brown County (including consultants SEH and Jacobs)
   b. WisDOT
   c. FHWA

3. Background on the Project

4. Purpose of the Study
   a. Tier 1 EIS, what is it
   b. WisDOT commitment re: interchange with I-41

5. Schedule
   a. Overall South Bridge Connector schedule
   b. Tier 1 EIS schedule
      i. Public Information Meetings in December and March
      ii. Tier 1 Draft EIS in June
      iii. Public Hearing in July
      iv. Tier 1 Final EIS/Record of Decision in October

6. Purpose of the Project; Need for the Project [historical / preliminary]

7. Alternatives Under Consideration [historical / preliminary]
   a. Corridors rather than specific alignments
   b. Alternatives previously developed will be re-evaluated

8. Local Officials Comments, Questions, Issues
   a. Request for input on planned development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Milestone or Concurrence Point</th>
<th>Information Provided or Action Taken</th>
<th>Contact/Participant</th>
<th>Information or Action Requested</th>
<th>Number of Days to Complete Activity</th>
<th>Estimated Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Process Initiation Letter</td>
<td>Update funding scenarios, schedule NOI and proposed project scope</td>
<td>WisDOT/Brown County prepare, send to FHWA</td>
<td>FHWA acceptance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notice of Intent (NOI) and proposed project scope</td>
<td>State and federal review agencies through Federal Register Notice</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOI to prepare Tier 1 EIS and proposed project scope published in Federal Register</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies Identified</td>
<td>Letters of invitation sent to potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies by Brown County</td>
<td>Potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Written acceptance or written reason for non-acceptance of agency role</td>
<td>Agencies have 30 days to respond</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft Coordination Plan (CP) and Impact Assessment Methodology (IAM) Distribution</td>
<td>Draft CP circulated for review Timeframes for agency reviews and project schedule Have available in draft form at Public Involvement Meeting (PIM) #1</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Agency comments and concurrence on draft CP and IAM, including schedule</td>
<td>Agencies have 30 days to comment on CP and IAM and 90 days to respond to study schedule</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agency Scoping Meeting Local Officials Meeting</td>
<td>Project background, study history, past purpose and need (P&amp;N), range of alternatives, etc.</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Input and coordination with resource agencies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>December 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local elected officials and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December 5, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PIM #1</td>
<td>Information on project history, background, past P&amp;N, corridor alternatives and impacts; Draft CP and IAM also made available</td>
<td>Public, local officials, Cooperating and Participating Agencies, Indian Tribes and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Provide comments on P&amp;N, preliminary alternatives and impacts, and CP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>December 11, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step No.</td>
<td>Milestone or Concurrency Point</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action Taken</td>
<td>Contact/Participant</td>
<td>Information or Action Requested</td>
<td>Number of Days to Complete Activity</td>
<td>Estimated Date of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Concurrence Point #1 and 2:</strong> Purpose and Need statement AND Range of Corridor Alternative and Corridor widths to be carried forward for detailed study</td>
<td>Draft final P&amp;N Statement and Range of Alternatives Considered</td>
<td>Cooperating Agencies and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Written comments or response on issues to be resolved</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PIM #2</td>
<td>Information on alternatives including Preferred Alternative to be included in Draft Tier 1 EIS; updated P&amp;N; Range of Alternatives</td>
<td>Public, local officials, Cooperating and Participating Agencies, Indian Tribes and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Comments on alternatives, including preliminary Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Concurrence Point #3:</strong> Identification of Preferred Corridor</td>
<td>Identification of Preferred Corridor</td>
<td>Cooperating Agencies and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Written comments</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tier 1 Draft EIS approval</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT approval</td>
<td>FHWA, WisDOT</td>
<td>Document approval</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Public availability of Tier 1 Draft EIS and review and comment</td>
<td>Tier 1 Draft EIS</td>
<td>Public, local officials, Cooperating and Participating Agencies, Indian Tribes and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Written comments</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>June-July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Conduct Public Hearing</td>
<td>Information from Tier 1 Draft EIS on P&amp;N, Alternatives, Preferred Alternative, anticipated impacts and potential mitigation measures</td>
<td>Public, local officials, Cooperating and Participating Agencies, Indian Tribes and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Provide comments on P&amp;N, alternatives, recommended alternative, anticipated impacts and potential mitigation measures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tier 1 Final EIS/ROD approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Document approval</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example South Bridge Connector Schedule

The schedule depends on availability of funds.
This is an example schedule. Time frames associated with each item will vary based on selected alternative.
The interchange from ramp terminal to ramp terminal will be eligible for the Majors Highway Development Program funding as part of the I-41 Mega Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTH EB/F - CTH GV/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I-41 Interchange Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH EB/F - Lawrence Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Railroad Crossing Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Dr. - CTH D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Railroad Crossing Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH D - STH 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fox River Bridge Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STH 57 - CTH PP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH PP - CTH GV/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 EIS &amp; Draft IAJR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 env document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 env document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 env document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12/5/2019

F-23
These alternatives were developed during previous project development and will be reviewed by the study team, the public, and agencies to determine whether and how they will be incorporated in the Tier 1 EIS. The Tier 1 EIS will evaluate corridor alternatives rather than specific alignments.
Local Officials Meeting, March 4, 2020

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheets

DATE: March 4, 2020

MEETING LOCATION: Brown County Highway Department, Green Bay, Wisconsin

ATTACHMENTS: Sign-In Sheets
Meeting Agenda

Schedule. After introductions, Charlie Webb briefly reviewed the schedule, noting that the milestones provided at the December 2019 Local Officials Meeting are still accurate (Tier 1 Draft EIS in June, hearing in July, combined Tier 1 FEIS/Record of Decision in October 2020).

PIM 1 summary. Charlie provided a summary of PIM 1, noting the attendance and common themes of the 40 or so comments received:

- Support for Alternative 2
- Support for a Fox River crossings further south near Little Rapids
- Questions about design (which the lead agencies cannot answer at this stage because we are looking at corridors rather than alignments)
- Questions about property values, mostly from people that live near one of the alternative routes.

Concurrence point 1 and 2. Charlie explained Concurrence Point 1 and 2, noting how they fit into the Federal Highway Administration’s agency coordination process. He noted that many of the communities represented at today’s meeting, participating agencies, would have received the concurrence point 1 and 2 material in an e-mail from Bryan Lipke on March 2. Comments are requested by April 1.

Alternatives retained for detailed study. Charlie reviewed the results of the lead agencies’ alternatives analysis to date. The lead agencies initial determination, subject to input from participating and cooperating agencies and the public at the March 19 PIM, is that Alternatives 1 and 2 should be retained for detailed analysis. The lead agencies propose to drop from consideration the other corridors as well as the TSM and TDM alternatives and improving the existing routes like the Claude Allouez Bridge and/or WIS 172.

Impact Analysis Process. Charlie reviewed the concept of the 500-foot corridors and the 125- to 150-foot representative working alignment in each corridor. The 500-foot corridors are meant to represent that a new road, if built, would be located somewhere within the 500-foot corridor. In this Tier 1 stage the lead agencies are not attempting to modify the working alignment to minimize impacts. But that would occur during Tier 2 when a specific alignment is developed.

Process for Selected a Preferred Alternative. Charlie reviewed the process by which the lead agencies would select a preferred alternative. At the March 19 PIM the lead agencies will ask the public to weigh in on which alternative ought to be selected. Input from local governments is also a consideration, and Charlie noted that the lead agencies are aware that each community has passed a resolution or resolutions supporting Alternative 2.
The lead agencies will send a package to the participating and cooperating agencies in mid-April identifying the preferred alternative and asking for input. This will be Concurrence Point 3 in the FHWA agency coordination process. Concurrence Point 3 material will note that, for the moment, it is Brown County’s preferred alternative, and that WisDOT and FHWA will wait until after receiving input from the participating and cooperating agencies and the public before identifying their preferred alternative in the Draft EIS in June.

**Preview of March 19 PIM exhibits.** Charlie noted that not all the exhibits are done yet but reviewed three exhibits that show the 3-step alternatives screening process. Charlie also noted that exhibits showing how impacts are being calculated will also be at the meeting, but actual impact info will not because it is still being calculated.

**Local officials’ comments, questions issues.**

- City of De Pere representative asked to confirm the input asked for in Concurrence Point 1 and 2. Charlie replied that for Concurrence Point 1, the purpose of and need for the project, the lead agencies are asking for input on whether they have accurately captured the need for the project. Concurrence Point 2 is asking if there are other alternatives that the lead agencies haven’t looked at that ought to be looked at. And do the participating and cooperating agencies agree with the lead agencies decision to retain Alternatives 1 and 2 for detailed analysis, eliminating the rest.

- It was recommended that the study team let the public know at the March 19 PIM that all communities have supported Alternative 2 in individual community resolutions.

- A City of De Pere representative asked how public input is weighed in the process. Charlie replied that there is not set formula for how each is considered; both are important factors.

- A Town of Lawrence representative noted that Alternative 1 has two schools a church next to it, citing these as one factor working against Alternative 1.
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Sign-in Sheet
# BROWN COUNTY
## LOCAL OFFICIALS MEETING
### Project ID: 4556-02-00
Highway and Termini: South Bridge Connector
County Highways EB/F in the Town of Lawrence to County Highway GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview
County: Brown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>TIME:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
<th>PURPOSE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2020</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Brown County Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Second local officials meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ATTENDANCE RECORD

*Please Note: The information in this document (including names, addresses, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and signatures) is not confidential, and may be subject to disclosure upon request, pursuant to the requirements of the Wisconsin open records law, sections 19.31—19.39 of the Wisconsin Statutes.*

<table>
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<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Email (Please fill out if you would like to receive notifications by email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Wells</td>
<td>1610 N 2nd Ave</td>
<td>Milwaukee WI 53202</td>
<td>Johnson, Inc.</td>
<td>414-847-3248</td>
<td><a href="mailto:charlie.wells@jones.com">charlie.wells@jones.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Fretz</td>
<td>6808 Cedar Rd</td>
<td>ME 53040</td>
<td>SEH</td>
<td>608-620-490</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfrtze@sehinc.com">dfrtze@sehinc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Thaleren</td>
<td>925 S 6th St</td>
<td>De Pere WI 54115</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
<td>920-337-8075</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sthaleren@deperewi.gov">sthaleren@deperewi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brynn Lipke</td>
<td>944 Vanderperrenway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wis DOT</td>
<td>920-492-5703</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brynn.lipke@dot.wi.gov">brynn.lipke@dot.wi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Raker</td>
<td>925 S 6th St</td>
<td>De Pere WI 54115</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
<td>920-339-4060</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eraker@deperewi.gov">eraker@deperewi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Laneke</td>
<td>1700 Liberal St</td>
<td>Colby WI 54423</td>
<td>Allouez</td>
<td>720-498-2990</td>
<td><a href="mailto:blaneke@gmail.com">blaneke@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Clever</td>
<td>633 Saint Joseph St</td>
<td>De Pere 54115</td>
<td>PC PERE</td>
<td>920-339-9993</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sclever@gmail.com">sclever@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fontechina</td>
<td>2162 Gladale Ave</td>
<td>Green Bay WI 54304</td>
<td>Brown County</td>
<td>920-662-3170</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.fontechina@browncounty.wi.gov">paul.fontechina@browncounty.wi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Streckenbach</td>
<td>305 E Walnut St</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>920-448-4001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-28
BROWN COUNTY
LOCAL OFFICIALS MEETING
Project ID: 4556-02-00
Highway and Termini: South Bridge Connector
County Highways EB/F in the Town of Lawrence to County Highway GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview
County: Brown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>TIME:</th>
<th>LOCATION:</th>
<th>PURPOSE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 4, 2020</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Brown County Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Second local officials meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTENDANCE RECORD**

*Please Note: The information in this document (including names, addresses, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and signatures) is not confidential, and may be subject to disclosure upon request, pursuant to the requirements of the Wisconsin open records law, sections 19.31—19.39 of the Wisconsin Statutes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY/STATE/ZIP CODE</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Email (Please fill out if you would like to receive notifications by email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lanny J. Tibaldo</td>
<td>1585 Grinner Rd.</td>
<td>De Pere, WI 54115</td>
<td>Town of Lawrence</td>
<td>920-619-6257</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ltibaldo@yahoo.com">ltibaldo@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Cashman</td>
<td>3174 City Rd.</td>
<td>De Pere, WI 54115</td>
<td>Town of Rockland</td>
<td>920-360-9603</td>
<td>DENNIS@LEI GENERAL CONTRACTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Brostean</td>
<td>1707 Lawrence Rd</td>
<td>De Pere, WI 54115</td>
<td>Town of Ledgeview</td>
<td>920-699-1296</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SCOTT@BROSTEANMEADHUN.COM">SCOTT@BROSTEANMEADHUN.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Michaelson</td>
<td>892 N. Washington Ave</td>
<td>Appleton, WI 54910</td>
<td></td>
<td>920-992-5098</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jill@brianwhite.com">jill@brianwhite.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Schulte</td>
<td>215 S. Washington Ave</td>
<td>Appleton, WI 54910</td>
<td></td>
<td>920-992-5098</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron@brianwhite.com">aaron@brianwhite.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Walsh</td>
<td>335 S. Broadway St</td>
<td>De Pere, WI 54115</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
<td>920-399-4040</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwalsh@de-pere.org">mwalsh@de-pere.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Rafter</td>
<td>1910 Berlin St, Appleton, WI</td>
<td>54910</td>
<td>Village of Alouez</td>
<td>920-894-7652</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JRAFTER@VILLAGEALOUEZ.COM">JRAFTER@VILLAGEALOUEZ.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Luthe</td>
<td>305 E. Walnut St. Room 320</td>
<td>Brown County Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>(920) 448-6483</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Cole_ruthe@browncountypo.gov">Cole_ruthe@browncountypo.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Utzroste</td>
<td>2193 Quimby Ave</td>
<td>Green Bay, WI 54312</td>
<td>Brown County</td>
<td>920-662-1522</td>
<td>browncounty.wi.gov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-29
Attachment 2
Meeting Agenda
Local Officials Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions

2. Schedule Update: on schedule
   a. June Draft EIS
   b. July public hearing
   c. October Final EIS/Record of Decision

3. Dec 2019 public information meeting summary

4. Concurrency point 1 and 2
   a. Lead agencies seeking concurrence on the purpose and need for the project and the range of alternatives considered to meet that need.

5. Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study
   a. Alternative 1 (Heritage-Scheuring Road Corridor)
   b. Alternative 2 (Rockland-Red Maple Road Corridor) with interchange at I-41

6. Impact Analysis Process
   a. 500-foot corridor
   b. 125- to 150-foot representative working alignment used to calculate impacts

7. Process for Selecting a Preferred Alternative
   a. Input from March 19 public information meeting
   b. Input from local government
   c. Input from participating and cooperating agencies (concurrency point 3 in April)
   d. Identified in Draft EIS in June

8. Preview March 19 public information meeting exhibits

9. Local officials comments, questions, issues
Federal Agency Correspondence
F.3.1

2006-2012 Federal Agency Correspondence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2006</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22, 2007</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 2007</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 26, 2008</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3, 2008</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14, 2008</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2008</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 2009</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2009</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2009</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2010</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2010</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2010</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2010</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2010</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2011</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your response. The Federal Highway Administration will be involved in the environmental study, and my assumption is that FHWA will be the lead federal agency. I'll keep you informed of the study's progress.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
Department of Planning and Land Services
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Scot.M.Striffler@uscg.mil [mailto:Scot.M.Striffler@uscg.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2006 8:37 AM
To: Runge_CM
Cc: Bloom, Robert; Carlson, Kurt
Subject: Southern Bridge Scoping Meeting

Mr. Runge,

Good morning. I am responding to the invitation letter received by this office for the planned September 19, 2006, meeting to discuss crossings over the Fox River in southern Green Bay.

We will be unable to send a representative to the meeting, but I am providing some information for you at this early stage in your planning. If federal money is expected to be used in this project, we would like to know if Federal Highway Administration will be involved. Specifically, whether they will assume lead federal agency status for NEPA. If not, and a new bridge crosses Fox River, the Coast Guard may assume lead agency status for NEPA. Apart from the environmental aspect of the project, the Coast Guard would be involved in establishing minimum navigation clearances and evaluating the project for all potential impacts to navigation.

We are available to answer questions, if needed. Please call me at (216) 902-6087 with any questions. Thank you.

v/r

8/29/2006
Thank you for your response, and I look forward to working with you on this project.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
Department of Planning and Land Services
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Stacy_Gilmore@fws.gov [mailto:Stacy_Gilmore@fws.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2007 11:10 AM
To: Runge_CM
Cc: Leakhena_Au@fws.gov; johnny.gerbitz@fhwa.dot.gov
Subject: Improvements in the southern Green Bay metropolitan area

Mr. Runge,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Coordination Plan for your proposed improvements to the southern Green Bay metropolitan area. We concur with the proposed coordination plan, and look forward to working with the agencies involved with this project. As the process continues to be outlined, we ask that general timelines be forwarded to our office so we can schedule our time accordingly.

Thank you,

Stacy Gilmore

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
2661 Scott Tower Drive
New Franken, WI 54229
stacy_gilmore@fws.gov
920-866-1755
Cole,

I will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow at 10am. I am not physically able to travel to Green Bay for the meeting, however I remain interested in the project. Is there a way that I can telephone in to the meeting?

Sherry A. Kamke
Environmental Scientist
NEPA Implementation Section
Office of Science, Ecosystems, and Communities
U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Mailcode: B-19J
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Phone: 312-353-5794
Fax: 312-353-5374

Hi Sherry,

Thank you for your response. The Coordination Plan's Project Background and Initial Coordination sections (Pages 2 through 7) are probably the best sources of information for this project. If you want more information, please let me know.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
Department of Planning and Land Services
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

To: Sherry Kamke/R5/USEPA/US@EPA
cc

Subject
RE: Transportation Improvements in Southern Green Bay Metro Area
To: Runge_Cm
Cc: Gerbitz, Johnny
Subject: Transportation Improvements in Southern Green Bay Metro Area

Cole,

I have received your letter dated February 6, 2007 regarding the Southern Portion of Green Bay Metro EIS and your request that EPA be a participating agency. I'm writing to let you know that EPA will accept this role. The accompanying Coordination plan is the first one that we have seen under the new SAFETEA-LU provisions. I took a quick look at it to see if I had any comments. I have none at this time. I expect that my agency will write you formally in the next several days. I was not at the September 16, 2006 kick-off meeting so I know very little about this project. If you have any information that you can send me, it would be helpful in preparing EPA's formal response back to you. I have a call into Johnny Gerbitz at FHWA to try to get more information about the project and how this project will proceed.

In the future, please direct correspondence about this project to Kenneth A. Westlake. Ken's address is as follows:

Kenneth A. Westlake, Chief
NePA Implementation Section
Office of Science, Ecosystems, and Communities
U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Mailcode: B-19J
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590

Sherry A. Kamke
Environmental Scientist
NePA Implementation Section
Office of Science, Ecosystems, and Communities
U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Mailcode: B-19J
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Phone: 312-353-5794
Fax: 312-353-5374
February 26, 2008

Ms. Stephanie Hickman
FHWA – Wisconsin Division
525 Junction Road, Suite 8000
Madison, Wisconsin 53719

re: Cooperating Agency Status
Environmental Impact Statement
Transportation Improvements in the Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area, Brown County, Wisconsin

Dear Ms. Hickman:

This letter is in response to your January 16, 2008, letter inviting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to serve as a cooperating agency with the Federal Highway Administration in the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for proposed transportation improvements in the Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area, Brown County, Wisconsin.

We agree that the Service has jurisdiction and special expertise with respect to potential impacts to wetlands and wildlife habitat that may be affected by the project. However, reductions in funding for the Service’s Ecological Services programs have resulted in a greatly reduced staff at this office and we will be unable to provide the requested review of this project. Therefore, we must decline the invitation to be a cooperating agency.

We appreciate your commitment to conducting a thorough review of the proposed project under the National Environmental Policy Act. If you have further questions you may contact me at 920-866-1725.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Louise Clemency
Field Supervisor
FYI from the coast guard...

Cole Runge  
Principal Planner  
Brown County Planning Commission  
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320  
PO Box 23600  
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600  
Phone: (920) 448-5480  
Fax: (920) 448-4487  
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us  
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Scot.M.Striffler@uscg.mil
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 10:44 AM
To: Runge_CM
Subject: Purpose and Need Concurrence Meeting - 10 Sept. 2008

Mr. Runge,

Good morning. I am writing to advise you we received your letter dated August 20, 2008 regarding the invitation for the subject meeting. We will be unable to attend the meeting. Additionally, the Coast Guard has no comments for the EIS process at this point, or any comments related to Purpose and Need. Please contact me at the number below with any questions.

Sincerely,

Scot

Scot M. Striffler  
Bridge Management Specialist  
Ninth District Bridge Program  
Office: (216) 902-6087  
Fax: (216) 902-6088  
Scot.M.Striffler@uscg.mil
Runge_CM

From: Kamke.Sherry@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2008 4:40 PM
To: Hickman, Stephanie
Cc: Runge_CM; Wagner, Rob - NE Region; Scudder, Dan
Subject: Re: Concurrence on Purpose and Need for the Green Bay EIS (Southern Arterial)

Stephanie,

I appreciated having the opportunity to discuss the Green Bay Purpose & Need document with everyone at the September 10th meeting in Green Bay. I really thought it was valuable to see the project area first-hand. Thanks for setting up the van-tour.

As I said in the meeting, I believe the Purpose & Need documentation for this project has really improved. I think existing traffic data (shown in Figure 2 LOS E) which is indicative of a congested roadway and future traffic data projections (Figure 4 showing LOS E and F) substantiate the need for action. Although I offered a few ideas of things that could be improved, there was nothing in my comments that would prevent our Agency from providing concurrence on Purpose & Need. Please accept this email as concurrence on the project's purpose and need.

Comments for your consideration:
a) After reading the P/N another time, I think it still focuses on future development a bit with statements like this one on page 4 of the Draft Purpose & Need. "The development that is planned for the southern portion of the metropolitan area..." If possible it would be better to lead with the existing traffic capacity/LOS issues before talking about traffic that will develop in the future when development occurs.
b) Figures 3 and Figures 6 look like they convey a lot of good information. However, they are a little hard to understand. For example, there are no street names on the map and it might be easier for me to read if it had street names on it, especially for the Inset maps. Also the thickness of the colored lines isn't uniform and I'm not certain what that means.
c) It might be worth including more information about why Village of Wrightstown is included in the EIS project study area in Figure 1.

Sherry A. Kamke
Environmental Scientist
NSPJA Implementation (Mailcode: E-19J)
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Phone: 312-353-5794
Fax: 312-353-5374

"Hickman,
Stephanie"
<kman@fhwa.dot.gov>
10/09/2008
08:07 AM
To
"Kurtz, Linda M MVP"
<Linda.M.Kurtz@usace.army.mil>,
"Cameron, Tamara E MVP"
<Tamara.E.Cameron@usace.army.mil>
cc
"Runge_CM"
<Runge_CM@co.brown.wi.us>, "Wagner, Rob - NE Region"
<robert.wagner@dot.state.wi.us>,
"Scudder, Dan"
<dan.scudder@dot.state.wi.us>
October 28, 2008

Dear Ms. Hickman:

This letter is in response to your request for concurrence on the Purpose and Need for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Transportation Improvements in the Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area in Brown County, Wisconsin.

We concur with the Project Purpose and Need, dated September 10, 2008. While the alternatives development has not been completed, we understand that you have begun reviewing a no-build alternative for the project. The information to date is adequate to concur that the project can be advanced to the next stage of development.

Our next concurrence point will be the Alternatives to be Carried Forward for Detailed Study. If you have any questions, please contact Linda Kurtz in our Green Bay office at (920) 448-2824. In any correspondence or inquiries, please refer to the Regulatory number shown above.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert J. Whiting
Chief, Regulatory Branch

Copy furnished:

Sherry Kamke, EPA Reg. 5
James Doperalski, WDNR
Rob Wagner, WDOT NE Region
Cole Runge, Brown County Planning Commission
Louise Clemency, USFWS
Mr. Runge,

Thank you for the invitation to attend the Public Information Meeting for possible crossings of the Fox River on April 23, 2009 in De Pere, WI. The Coast Guard cannot attend the meeting, but we should be consulted for permit jurisdiction and navigation clearance requirements at the appropriate stage in the project development. Please feel free to contact me at the number below with questions or concerns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scot M. Striffler  
Bridge Program Manager  
Ninth Coast Guard District Bridge Program  
Office: (216) 902-6087  
Fax: (216) 902-6088  
Scot.M.Striffler@uscg.mil
Dear Mr. Runge:

I am responding to your email letter dated October 30, 2009 regarding the availability of the Draft Southern Brown County Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Alternative Identification and Analysis.

The alternatives presented in the DEIS all generally discuss potential bridge crossings of the Fox River. A new crossing of Fox River will require a Coast Guard Bridge Permit, but specific comments cannot be provided until a specific design is proposed. Additionally, modifications to an existing bridge across Fox River may also require a Coast Guard Bridge Permit. This office will provide specific comments regarding permit requirements, navigation impacts, or bridge clearances for any bridge that may be proposed (or modified) over Fox River at the appropriate time.

Our comments most recently sent by email on April 15, 2009 still apply.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. I may be contacted by calling (216) 902-6087. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

SCOT M. STRIFFLER
Chief, Bridge Branch
By direction of Commander,
Ninth Coast Guard District
Runge_CM

From: Kamke.Sherry@epamail.epa.gov
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2009 10:27 AM
To: Runge_CM
Subject: Comments on Alternatives Analysis Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area

Cole,

Thanks for allowing me extra time to review the Alternatives Analysis document. I had a chance to go over the materials. I have the following comments:

General - It is clear that a lot of work went into developing this list of alternatives and I can see that an effort was made to evaluate the alternatives versus the objectives in the purpose and need for the project. Having said that, I had difficulty discerning among the alternatives and their effectiveness. I offer the following specific comments:

1) I probably have said this before but I'll repeat it here - I think the P/N emphasizes future land use and development a bit much. Not enough emphasis is placed on existing problems today. I think the strongest part of the P/N statement is the section called "Traffic Volumes on the Fox River Bridges in the EIS Study Area" That is the section that talks about existing LOS on the STH 172 and Claude Allouez bridge. If you show the existing traffic is already congested LOS D, E, and F it is easier to sell the problem of future congestion.

2) Many of the alternatives seem very similar to me. I'm wondering if they could be grouped together by type (such as using existing facility, new alignment, or some other measure). Then, you could take the best of each type and evaluate those versus the best of another type.

Will there be a meeting or call to discuss this information? I would like to resolve these issues before we give concurrence with alternatives.

Sherry A. Kamke
Environmental Scientist
NEPA Implementation (Mailcode: E-19J)
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Phone: 312-353-5794
Fax: 312-408-2215
December 15, 2009

Mr. Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54305-3600

Dear Mr. Runge:

This letter is in response to your request for comments or questions regarding the document, Draft Project Alternatives Analysis for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Transportation Improvements in the Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area dated October 2009, in Brown County, Wisconsin.

We understand that Alternative 1, the no-build, would be retained for basis of comparison purposes. While the document indicates that the Alternative 2 (TDM) and/or Alternative 3 (TSM) strategies would continue to be implemented in the EIS area, it is not clear whether these strategies would receive additional study to be incorporated in the EIS, or in project design only. Further clarification and discussion of how and to what level these strategies would be incorporated is recommended.

Based on our review of your initial screening, the array of alignment alternatives (11) for Alternative 4, New Construction, appears to be appropriate. However, the document does not provide sufficient information to allow us to make a determination of whether the range of alternatives would satisfy Clean Water Act Section 404 regulatory requirements. It is critical that clear consideration be given to the avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts to aquatic resources. The information used to analyze impacts on aquatic resources thus far, appears to be limited to general mapping features. The alternatives analysis should to the extent possible at a corridor level, include both quantitative and qualitative assessment of aquatic resources.

In addition, exhibits in the document indicate a secondary study area for a Fox River crossing in Wrightstown. We recommend the document include a discussion of any details on this secondary study area, including reasons for eliminating it from consideration. This crossing should be addressed because a decision for the crossing to potentially become an arterial or a highway could potentially affect a decision of whether to carry Alternative 10 or 11 forward in the EIS. This discussion should include a summary of coordination between preparation of the environmental document for the Wrightstown bridge replacement already underway and preparation of the EIS for Transportation Improvements in the Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area.
Lastly, we recommend that the document more clearly define and summarize the alternatives that would be carried forward and which alternatives would be dismissed from further consideration in the EIS.

If you have any questions, please contact Linda Kurtz in our Green Bay office at (920) 448-2824. In any correspondence or inquiries, please refer to the Regulatory number shown above.

Sincerely,

Tamara E. Cameron
Chief, Regulatory Branch

Copy furnished:
Sherry Kamke, USEPA Region 5
Robert Wagner, WDOT-NE Region
Stephanie Hickman, FHWA
Cole,

I reviewed the EIS alternatives identification, retention and elimination report. It is a bit different looking at a document like this since it resembles more of a planning study. I don't have any specific questions at this time. I think your document presents reasons why you eliminated the alternatives that you did. In my experience new river crossings tend to be a pretty big issue for communities. It helps to have data that shows that your actual river crossing point is at a good location. The width of the river, width of floodplain areas, and wildlife corridor passage for each of the remaining alternatives can be a key consideration, especially for a new crossing. It would be good to include this information as soon as you can. I have no specific comments on the four remaining construction alternatives at this time but the river crossing information might help from this point on.

Sherry A. Kamke
Environmental Scientist
NEPA Implementation (Mailcode: E-19J)
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Phone: 312-353-5794
Fax: 312-408-2215

Hi everyone,

I'm following up to see if you have any questions or comments about the draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report that I sent you on March 12. Specifically, I'm wondering if you have comments about the four construction alternatives that were identified by the Lead Agencies as options that should be studied in greater detail.
Thanks for your assistance.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
105 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Runge_CM
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 1:43 PM
To: 'Doperalski, James P - DNR'; 'Kamke.Sherry@epamail.epa.gov'; 'Kurtz, Linda M MJP'
Cc: 'Wagner, Robert - DOT (Northeast Region)'; 'dave.platz@dot.gov'; Lamine_CF
Subject: Link to draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report

Hi everyone,

Here's a link to the draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report that we discussed at the March 11 MPO Long Range Transportation Plan meeting.

http://www.public.applications.co.brown.wi.us/Plan/PlanningFolder/Transportation/Alternatives%20Identification,%20Retention,%20and%20Elimination%20Report%20(draft%20for%20committee)%20-%20February%202010.pdf

Please let me know if you have questions.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
105 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning
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F-50
Mr. Runge,

Good morning. I am writing this morning in response to the invitation to attend the public information meeting and request for comments regarding the four alternatives for a new Fox River crossing, with the ultimate goal of selecting a preferred alternative.

Unfortunately, we will not be able to attend the public meeting on May 18, 2010 in De Pere, WI. U.S. Coast Guard comments at this stage in the planning and identification of a preferred alternative are limited to the potential requirement for a federal bridge permit from the Coast Guard for any new crossing of the Fox River, including all four remaining alternatives still being evaluated. This office will coordinate with all planners and Federal Highway Administration, the lead federal agency in this study, at the appropriate time to identify required navigation clearances for any new crossing of the Fox River.

Thank you for the invitation to attend the public meeting. I am available to discuss this project and navigation requirements. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scot Striffler
Bridge Program Manager
Ninth Coast Guard District
(216) 902-6087
Fax: (216) 902-6088
Scot.M.Striffler@uscg.mil
Cole,

I received the October 5, 2010 cover letter and attached Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report. After reviewing the document, I have no new comments to make. However, I realize that the comments that I made back on April 1, 2010 regarding the river crossing locations were not addressed in the September 9, 2010 version of the Alternatives Report. I continue to think that the location of the river crossing is critical to further planning for this project. Right now, there really isn't anything discussed in the document about the river crossings. I would recommend that preliminary information about the water crossing locations such as width of the river and other relevant environmental considerations for the river crossings be summarized in the Alternatives document.

Sherry A. Kamke
Environmental Scientist
NEPA Implementation (Mailcode: E-19J)
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance U.S. EPA Region 5
77 W. Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Phone: 312-353-5794
Fax: 312-408-2215

From: Sherry Kamke/R5/USEPA/US
To: "Runge_CM" <Runge_CM@co.brown.wi.us>
Cc: dave.platz@dot.gov, "Doperalski, James P - DNR" <James.Doperalski@Wisconsin.gov>, "Lamine_CF" <Lamine_CF@co.brown.wi.us>, ""Kurtz, Linda M MVP" <Linda.M.Kurtz@usace.army.mil>, "Wagner, Robert - DOT (Northeast Region)"

Date: 04/01/2010 04:27 PM

Subject: Re: Questions or comments on the draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report?

Cole,
Hi Sherry,

One more question - do you agree with the EIS Lead Agencies' recommendation to study Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 in greater detail and to drop Alternative 4 from further consideration? In addition to the reasons for dropping Alternative 4 that are already addressed in the September 9 report, Alternative 4's Fox River crossing distance would be much greater than the distances of the other three alternatives:

Alternative 1: Approx. 840'
Alternative 2: Approx. 1,220'
Alternative 3: Approx. 1,220'
Alternative 4: Approx. 2,300'

Cole,

I agree with studying Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 in detail and dropping Alternative 4 from further consideration. Yes, I think the extra information about the Fox River Crossing added below would further support deleting it.

Sherry A. Kamke  
Environmental Scientist  
NEPA Implementation (Mailcode: E-19J)  
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance U.S. EPA Region 5  
77 W. Jackson Blvd.  
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590  
Phone: 312-353-5794  
Fax: 312-408-2215  

Hi Sherry,

One more question - do you agree with the EIS Lead Agencies' recommendation to study Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 in greater detail and to drop Alternative 4 from further consideration? In addition to the reasons for dropping Alternative 4 that are already addressed in the September 9 report, Alternative 4's Fox River crossing distance would be much greater than the distances of the other three alternatives:

Alternative 1: Approx. 840'
Alternative 2: Approx. 1,220'
Alternative 3: Approx. 1,220'
Alternative 4: Approx. 2,300'
Thanks again.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Runge_CM
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 9:10 AM
To: 'Kamke.Sherry@epamail.epa.gov'
Subject: RE: Questions or comments on the draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report?

Ok. Thanks again for the comments.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Kamke.Sherry@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Kamke.Sherry@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 9:03 AM
To: Runge_CM
Subject: RE: Questions or comments on the draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report?

Hello Cole,

I think even at this stage of the analysis, river crossing information is important. The decision to go with one alternative or another may hinge on the location of the river crossing. I have seen this in other new crossings. The size of the structure, and thus the cost, are dependent on the width of the crossing. So, I recommend
looking at the width of the river where crossings are planned, whether or not wildlife passage can or should be allowed in those locations, as well as any floodplain considerations.

I wasn't planning on coming on November 10th - I have a conflict with another meeting.

Sherry A. Kamke  
Environmental Scientist  
NEPA Implementation (Mailcode: E-19J)  
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance U.S. EPA Region 5  
77 W. Jackson Blvd.  
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590  
Phone: 312-353-5794  
Fax: 312-408-2215

From: "Runge_CM" <Runge_CM@co.brown.wi.us>

To: Sherry Kamke/R5/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 11/01/2010 08:54 AM

Subject: RE: Questions or comments on the draft EIS Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report?

Hi Sherry,

Thanks for the comments. I can certainly add information about the width of the potential river crossings, but can you remind me of the other environmental considerations we should address at this point in the process? We tried to address many considerations through the initial environmental analysis that's shown in Attachment 2 at the end of the September 9 report, but maybe we missed something.

Also, do you plan to attend the optional agencies meeting in Green Bay on November 10?

Thanks again.

Cole

Cole Runge  
Principal Planner  
Brown County Planning Commission  
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320  
PO Box 23600
November 8, 2010

Ms. Tracey McKenney
FHWA – Wisconsin Division
525 Junction Road, Suite 8000
Madison, WI 53717-2157

Mr. Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54305-3600

Dear Ms. McKenney and Mr. Runge:

This letter is in response to your request for concurrence regarding the corridors to be studied in the Southern Brown County Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Our comments are based on the September 9, 2010, Draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report submitted by Brown County Planning Commission October 5, 2010.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is acting as a cooperating agency for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review for the proposed corridor level project study due to the requirement for a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit. We have evaluated the document pursuant to NEPA guidelines and concur with the range of alternatives to be carried forward for study.

Based on our review, the array of alignment alternatives (3) for Option 4, New Construction, appears to be appropriate provided the no-build alternative (Option 1) is carried forward for comparison purposes and that Option 2 and Option 3 are included in study considerations. While additional wetland information has been provided in Attachment 2 for comparison, the document does not provide sufficient information to allow us to make a determination of whether the range of alternatives would satisfy Clean Water Act Section 404 regulatory requirements. It is critical that clear consideration be given to the avoidance and minimization of adverse impacts to aquatic resources. The environmental consequences of the alternatives should, to the extent possible, be completed at a corridor level, include both quantitative and qualitative assessment of aquatic resources.

Though we agree the document is adequate for a corridor level study, we expect that additional agency coordination will be required during your evaluation of environmental
consequences and subsequent selection of a preferred alternative. We recommend that this coordination continue into the design phase.

In particular, the Corps will need to agree that wetland boundaries are established and adequate for the 404 program. These initial boundaries may require further refinement including wetland delineation updates at the design phase. We expect that efforts to avoid and minimize wetland and stream impacts will take place during selection of a preferred alternative.

Further, we recommend that during study to select a preferred alternative, as well as during design phase, you work closely with utility companies and contractors to identify any significant environmental resources within the corridor that may be impacted due to utilities/borrow areas. Additional impacts may need to be evaluated in accordance with NEPA as it pertains to our authority under the Clean Water Act.

We appreciate your request for comments and look forward to continued coordination on this project. Please forward copies of all future NEPA correspondence for this proposal to Linda Kurtz in our Green Bay office, and Rebecca Graser in our Waukesha office. If you have any questions, please contact Linda Kurtz in our Green Bay office at (920) 448-2824. In any correspondence or inquiries, please refer to the Regulatory number shown above.

Sincerely,

Tamara E. Cameron
Chief, Regulatory Branch

CF:
Sherry Kamke, USEPA Region 5
Robert Wagner, WDOT-NE Region
James Doperalski, Jr., WDNR
Jill Utrup, USFWS
Mr. Runge,

Please see comments below in response to your questions sent regarding the development of and EIS for the new Fox River bridge.

Federally-Listed Species, Proposed and Candidate Species, and Critical Habitat

Due to the project location, no federally-listed, proposed, or candidate species would be expected within the project area (all alternatives). No critical habitat is present. This precludes the need for further action on this project as required by the 1973 Endangered Species Act, as amended.

Should additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available or if project plans change or if portions of the proposed project were not evaluated, it is recommended that you contact our office for further review.

Other Comments

We recommend that bridges and abutments be designed and constructed in such a way as to allow terrestrial wildlife to pass under the bridge without entering the river during normal flow conditions. This may require lengthening the bridge, limitations on the use of exposed riprap, modifications to the surface of the riprap (e.g., grouting the surface or filling with soil or other natural materials), or modifications in the substrate and/or slope at the base of the abutments, as some wildlife species cannot or prefer not to traverse areas of riprap.

Wetlands and Streams

We note that the project area includes wetlands. In refining and selecting project alternatives, efforts should be made to select an alternative that does not adversely impact wetlands. If no other alternative is feasible and it is clearly demonstrated that project construction resulting in wetland disturbance or loss cannot be avoided, a wetland mitigation plan should be developed that identifies measures proposed to minimize adverse impacts and replace lost wetland habitat values and other wetland functions and values. Any project that impacts wetlands or waterways, including seasonally ephemeral and intermittent streams, should include design features such as culverts to retain hydrological connection between areas fragmented by the project.

If you have any questions please see the contact information below.

Thank you,

Jill S. Utrup
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Wisconsin Ecological Services Office
2661 Scott Tower Drive
New Franken, Wisconsin 54229-9565
phone: 920-866-1734
e-mail: jill_utrup@fws.gov
F.3.2

2019-2020 Federal Agency Correspondence
Federal Agency Correspondence, 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2019</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2, 2020</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2020</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2020</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6, 2020</td>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2020</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good Afternoon Blair,

Wasn’t sure if we left you hanging on this comment before the Holidays, and if so I apologize. No, in coordination with FHWA it was determined the project will not be implemented through One Federal Decision. That is largely due to lack of fiscal constraint (funding) and thereby the Tier 1 EIS process is being used to environmentally clear a corridor on representative alignment. The actual federal permitting activities etc. are occurring in a later subsequent environmental study (Tier 2 will have refined alignment, preliminary design and detailed impacts). Hope that makes sense.

I see you were just copied on EPA’s response that came this afternoon so we are tracking very well to meet schedule and task goals proposed to our Cooperating Agencies for the project. If you have any further questions as you develop response/comments to our formal cooperating agency request don’t hesitate to contact Ian or myself.

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
Planning Project Manager
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Northeast Region
Phone: (920) 492-5703
Cell Phone: (920) 360-9196
Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov
wisconsindot.gov

If this is related to a records request, please email: dotdtsdnerecords@dot.wi.gov

From: Lipke, Bryan - DOT
Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2020 3:22 PM
To: 'william.b.stanifer@uscg.mil' <william.b.stanifer@uscg.mil>
Cc: VanPrice, Kathie - DOT <Kathie.VanPrice@dot.wi.gov>; Johnston, Jonquil - DOT <Jonquil.Johnston@dot.wi.gov>; Michaelson, Jill - DOT <jill.Michaelson@dot.wi.gov>; Ian Chidister (ian.chidister@dot.gov) <ian.chidister@dot.gov>; 'Michael.O.Walker2@uscg.mil' <Michael.O.Walker2@uscg.mil>; 'Lee.D.Soule@uscg.mil' <Lee.D.Soule@uscg.mil>
Subject: RE: [Non-DoD Source] USCG outreach in follow-up to December 11th Brown County South Bridge Connector Tier 1 EIS Agency Meeting
Good Morning Bryan,

Thank you for forwarding this information. We’ll be looking for more official correspondence in the coming days and will readily accept the role of cooperating agency for the project. From looking over the Draft Cooperation Plan the timeline benchmarks seem to loosely follow the One Federal Decision construct. Will this project be implemented through One Fed? I only ask as there are a few things that need to be done on my end internally and with my program folks in Washington. I’d like to get those things knocked out before the holidays.

Again, thanks for following up and we’ll look for your cooperating agency request. And I would ask that you copy Michael Walker, michael.o.walker2@uscg.mil, on any future correspondence regarding the South Bridge Connector project. Thanks again.

Blair Stanifer
Chief, Bridge Branch
Ninth Coast Guard District
(216) 902-6086
Fax: (216) 902-6088

From: Lipke, Bryan - DOT <Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 10:43 AM
To: Stanifer, William B CIV <William.B.Stanifer@uscg.mil>
Cc: Chidister, Ian (FHWA) <ian.chidister@dot.gov>; VanPrice, Kathie - DOT <Kathie.VanPrice@dot.wi.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] USCG outreach in follow-up to December 11th Brown County South Bridge Connector Tier 1 EIS Agency Meeting

Good Morning Mr. Stanifer

WisDOT and FHWA wanted to follow up with you after the December 11th Agency Meeting as I had indicated when we spoke by phone. While realizing there will be no permit issued as part of the Brown County South Bridge Connector Tier 1 EIS we are requesting that USCG be a cooperating agency. To be more specific to the intent for that, the project has corridor alternatives on new alignment which cross the Fox River a major navigable waterway. WisDNR and USACE are cooperating agencies under the NEPA/Section 404 Permit Merger Agreement with this same understanding of value in having early and active interagency coordination and input on the corridor selected to move forward with the studies Record of Decision (ROD) to future Tier 2 environmental study.

There will be a formal project correspondence headed your way in the coming days with this request and associated actions. If you had time to review the draft Coordination Plan (CP) and draft Impact Analysis Methodology (IAM) Report attached to the meeting invite (forwarded below) they do a good job of explaining project location, background and scope, roles for the cooperating and participating agencies in the Tier 1 EIS process, and a schedule for the agencies to help us follow.

The updated IAM and CP (very minor edits based on our December 11th meeting) will be posted to the Brown County study website in the next day or so and that will be where the two living documents will be housed for the duration of the project.
Again, look for that formal project correspondence from us the coming days and thank you for working with our agencies on this important study. If you have any questions about this Tier 1 EIS or Tier 2 environmental study (future efforts) don’t hesitate to reach out to Ian Chidister (FHWA) or myself.

**Bryan Lipke, P.E.**
Planning Project Manager
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Northeast Region
Phone: (920) 492-5703
Cell Phone: (920) 360-9196
Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov
wiscosindot.gov

If this is related to a records request, please email: dotdtsdnerecords@dot.wi.gov
Bryan Lipke
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
944 Vanderperren Way
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54304

Re: Cooperating Agency Invitation and Project Scoping Comments for the South Bridge Connector Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement, Brown County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Lipke:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region 5 (EPA) has received your letter dated December 18, 2019 (letter), in which the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) invite EPA to become a cooperating agency for the above-referenced project.

FHWA and WisDOT are proposing to conduct a study to identify appropriate corridors, transportation improvement needs, and future transportation demand generated by the planned development in the southern part of the Green Bay metropolitan area. This study is called the South Bridge Connector Project. FHWA and WisDOT intend to produce a two-tiered Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, based on the results of the initial study.

We accept your invitation for EPA to become a cooperating agency for the South Bridge Connector Project. As a cooperating agency, we are available to review preliminary draft documents, such as sections of the EIS, in accordance with our authority under the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulation (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). We do not, however, wish to assist in the preparation of any documents. We understand that this project will follow the NEPA/Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 merger process, which we intend to participate in. We are also available to participate in coordination meetings, teleconferences, and site visits, as our resources allow.

Additionally, we request FHWA and WisDOT provide us with at least two-weeks' advanced notice for the time and dates of all meetings/conference calls, prior to receipt of documents for our review and comment. We request electronic (preferred) copies of all materials submitted for our review and comment. Internet links to project documents are also welcome, if available.
EPA retains its independent review and comment function under Section 309 of CAA. Additionally, EPA also retains its right to review and comment during the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ CWA Section 404 permitting process.

As requested in your letter, EPA does not have any comments relating to the Coordination Plan (CP), Impact Analysis Methodology Report (IAM), or the study schedule, as presented in the CP. We understand specific project details will be presented as part of the Tier 2 EIS However, to the extent that FHWA and WisDOT are able to identify and address environmental issues or mitigation options in the Tier 1 EIS, we encourage FHWA and WisDOT to do so. Some examples include instances where:

- Air and water quality may be maintained or improved;
- Stormwater management features may be incorporated into the proposed project to reduce the potential for damage from future flood events. The U.S. Global Change Research Program’s National Climate Assessment has information on potential impacts to infrastructure in the Midwest caused by increasing severity and frequency of major storm events. Information on climate adaptation is available at EPA’s Climate Adaptation Resource Center (https://www.globalchange.gov/browse/reports and https://epa.gov/arclx);
- Construction of wildlife safety crossings may be beneficial and appropriate;
- Roadway alignment(s) may be analyzed to avoid hazardous waste sites, aquatic resources, underground storage tanks, and cultural resources. Note that the project area includes the Lower Fox River Superfund Site, which extends from the Neenah and Menasha Channels exiting Lake Winnebago downstream through the City of Green Bay to the bay itself. EPA and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources continue to oversee site remediation and ecosystem restoration. EPA’s coordination on the South Bridge Connector Project will include involvement from our Superfund program to ensure that the Superfund site remediation and restoration work does not impact the project and is not impacted by the project;
- Multi-modal transportation connections may be made;
- Noise may be reduced to the maximum extent possible; and
- Potential sites be identified where pollinator-friendly habitat may be constructed, and habitat connectivity is maximized.

EPA is available to discuss the contents of this letter at your convenience. Feel free to contact Mike Sedlacek of my staff at 312-886-1765, or by email at sedlacek.michael@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Kenneth A. Westlake
Deputy Director, Tribal and Multimedia Programs Office
Office of the Regional Administrator

cc: Cole Runge, Brown County Planning Commission
   Colonel Karl Jansen, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – St. Paul District
   Commander Blair Stanifer, U.S. Coast Guard
Mr. Bryan Lipke  
Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
944 Vanderperren Way  
Green Bay, WI 54304

Dear Mr. Lipke,

We are responding to your letter dated December 18, 2019, regarding your invitation for the Coast Guard to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the proposed South Bridge Connector Project, Brown County, Wisconsin.

As joint Lead Federal Agencies, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) are proposing to commence a study to identify the current transportation improvement needs, the future demands of transportation, and the appropriate corridors therein. Known as the South Bridge Connector Project, the Tier 1 EIS will analyze these current needs and future demands in the southern part of the Green Bay metropolitan area. Once a preferred corridor has been identified, a Tier 2 EIS will be produced providing a more detailed impact analysis focusing on specific improvements.

The Coast Guard accepts your invitation to be a cooperating agency in the South Bridge Connector Tier 1 EIS study and will have a roll as a federal permitting agency. Authorities for the Coast Guard’s permitting process can be found in 33 U.S.C. 401, 491, 525-533, the International Bridge Act of 1972 and various acts of Congress. Under these authorities the Coast Guard’s primary role as a permitting agency is ensuring marine safety, security, and stewardship while preserving the public right of navigation through the approval of the location and plans of bridges and causeways and the imposing of any conditions relating to their construction, maintenance, and operation.

Based on the documentation included in your request the proposed South Bridge Connector project would cross a segment of the Fox River south of De Pere, WI. Fox River is a navigable water of the United States and falls under the authority of the Coast Guard Bridge Program.

In accordance with 33 CFR 116.01, “[a]ll bridges are obstructions to navigation and are tolerated only as long as they serve the needs of land transportation while allowing for the reasonable needs of navigation.” The Coast Guard’s primary role in the planned study will be to determine the required navigational clearances for any proposed structure(s) across Fox River. As you are very early in the planning process, the Coast Guard cannot make specific statements at this time regarding required navigation clearances until alternatives are developed. However, we do offer to assist FHWA and WisDOT in the development of navigational clearances as the project scope...
narrow. Please keep in mind that any clearances provided by the Coast Guard prior to the acceptance of a Bridge Permit Application are preliminary, tentative, and subject to the Coast Guard’s vetting process to include public involvement from current waterway users and supporting facilities.

As requested in your letter the Coast Guard has no specific comments regarding the Coordination Plan (CP), the Impact Analysis Methodology Report (IAM), or the proposed study schedule as presented in the CP. We understand specific project details will be generated during the development of the Tier 2 EIS. However, to the extent that navigational concerns can be identified and addressed in the Tier 1 EIS we encourage both FHWA and WisDOT to do so. Examples of these concerns include, but are not limited to:

- Whether the majority of existing waterway users be able to transit any proposed new construction bridge(s) or modification to an existing bridge(s). The Coast Guard does not set a percentage of vessels that need to transit. This is dependent on the individual waterway. Mitigation such as alternative mooring locations for those that will no longer be able to transit must be considered.
- U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and other government and/or public vessels ability to transit the bridge site(s) to conduct mission essential functions.
- Commercial vessels transiting commodity, those that will be accepted at ports supporting post-panamex vessels, and those vessels carrying product unique to the region must be able to transit safely through the navigational draw of any proposed new construction bridge(s) or modification to an existing bridge(s).
- Proposed commercial/recreational vessel traffic resulting from new marine facilities constructed along the waterway or due to the expansion of existing marine facilities.
- Potential navigational impacts related to constructing a proposed new bridge(s) or the modification of an existing bridge(s) to include the construction of cofferdams, causeways, or other falsework. If applicable the potential impacts regarding removal of an existing bridge should also be discussed.

Thank you for the opportunity to accept the role of cooperating agency for the South Bridge Connector Project Tier 1 EIS. Please be aware that the Coast Guard will retain its right to independently review and comment within the extent of our jurisdiction during USACE’s Section 408 review process. Please contact me at (216) 902-6086, or Mr. Michael Walker at (216) 902-6087, to discuss this matter further. Thank you.

Sincerely,

W. B. STANIFER
Bridge Program Manager
By direction of Commander,
Ninth Coast Guard District
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Ian Chidister  
Federal Highway Administration – Wisconsin Division  
525 Junction Road, Suite 8000  
Madison, Wisconsin 53717-2157

Re: Purpose and Need and Alternatives Selection for the South Bridge Connector Project, Brown County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Chidister:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the referenced purpose and need and alternatives selection documents, which were produced by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) in coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). We undertook this review pursuant to our authorities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and as a cooperating agency in the NEPA-Clean Water Act Section 404 Merger Process (NEPA/404).

FHWA and WisDOT conducted a study to identify appropriate corridors, transportation improvement needs, and future transportation demand generated by the planned development in the southern part of the Green Bay metropolitan area. This study is called the South Bridge Connector Project. FHWA and WisDOT intend to produce a two-tiered Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project.

The purpose of this project is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing east-west transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area. The project is needed to:

- Address congestion in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges;
- Accommodate existing and planned land use and future travel demand generated by planned development;
- Reduce travel time by improving east-west connectivity; and:
- Address higher-than-average crash rates and safety issues in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges.
We concur with the purpose and need for this project (Concurrence Point 1). Four alternatives have been provided in the alternatives selection document:

- **No-Build Alternative.** Continued maintenance will occur on existing roadways;
- **Transportation System Management Alternative.** Maximize the efficiency and use of existing roadways to delay or eliminate the need for additional capacity, such as by constructing roundabouts, and reducing the number of access points;
- **Transportation Demand Management Alternative.** Reduce the number of vehicles on the area roadways by use of land use planning strategies, such as increasing transit ridership, promoting ridesharing with park-and-ride lots, and improving bicycle and pedestrian mobility; and:
- **Build Alternative: New Routes.** This alternative includes 11 individual routes that are proposed to either upgrade existing roadway infrastructure, or construct new roadway routes:
  1. Scheuring Road to Heritage Road;
  2. Rockland Road to Red Maple Road;
  3. Rockland Road to Wisconsin Highway 172;
  4. Rockland Road to American Boulevard to Scheuring Road;
  5. Creekview Road to Red Maple Road;
  6. Interstate 41 to Wisconsin Highway 172;
  7. Freedom Road to Wisconsin Highway 172;
  8. Williams Grant Drive to Wisconsin Highway 57;
  9. Freedom Road to County Road ZZ;
  10. Freedom Road to Wisconsin Highway 96; and:
  11. Interstate 41 to Interstate 43.

FHWA and WisDOT are proposing to retain Build Alternatives 1 and 2, and the No-Build Alternative for further detailed study. Due to various constraints and environmental impacts, FHWA and WisDOT are not proposing to retain Build Alternatives 3-11, the Transportation System Management Alternative, and the Transportation Demand Management Alternative for further study. We concur with the alternatives to be retained and not retained (Concurrence Point 2), as listed above. We will provide detailed comments on this proposed project after we review the forthcoming Tier 1 EIS.

As requested, we reviewed the document containing part of Section 3.1 of the Tier 1 EIS. We concur with the description of the environmental review process and the proposed approach to analyze environmental impacts.
We are available to discuss our concurrence of purpose and need, range of alternatives, and the proposed approach for Section 3.1 of the Tier 1 EIS at your convenience. Please feel free to contact Mike Sedlacek of my staff at 312-886-1765, or by email at sedlacek.michael@epa.gov if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kenneth A. Weslake  
Deputy Director, Tribal and Multimedia Programs Office  
Office of the Regional Administrator

cc: Bryan Lipke, Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Good Afternoon, Brian:

Thanks for hosting the call on the 16th and 17th. As I understand, the team has not yet dug deep into the weeds regarding any bridge over the Fox, though I know you’re working close with DOT, FRNSA, and necessary stakeholders. I also understand that you do As I advised, our major concerns will be regarding clearances as well as any attendant environmental concerns for the bridge.

Additionally, as I mentioned on the call, we are working with WisDot on a permit for the Racine Street Bridge in Menasha. Our POC has been Bill Bertrand with WisDOT. I highly recommend you reach out to him as the bridge portion of the project gains shape. Thanks, and I hope everyone is safe and healthy!

Very Respectfully,

Michael Odell Walker
Bridge Management Specialist
9th Coast Guard District (dpb)
1240 East Ninth Street
Cleveland, OH 44199-2001
Office: (216) 902-6087
Fax: (216) 902-6088
michael.o.walker2@uscg.mil
https://www.dco.uscg.mil/Office-of-Bridge-Programs/
https://www.atlanticarea.uscg.mil/Our-Organization/District-9/Ninth-District-Staff/Prevention-Division/Bridge-Administration/

*Broadcast Notice to Mariners (BNM) are issued on VHF-FM Marine Channel 16/22
*Local Notice to Mariners (LNM) are posted at http://www.navcen.uscg.mil
*Report any oil spill, chemical release or maritime security incident to the Coast Guard National Response Center hotline at 1-800-424-8802 or http://www.nrc.uscg.mil

PLEASE NOTE this e-mail is for my duties as a Coast Guard Civilian. For any Coast Guard Reserve matters, including MSU Duluth, please include my Reserve e-mail address, michael.o.walker@uscg.mil in those communications. Thanks.
Dear Mr. Lipke:

This letter is in response to your March 2, 2020 request for review and concurrence from all cooperating agencies concerning the Purpose of and Need for the Project, the Range of Alternatives Considered, and the Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts sections of the South Bridge Connector Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The Corps has reviewed and concurs with the Purpose and Need for the Project and the Range of Alternatives Considered sections. Additionally after reviewing all alternatives, the Corps concurs with alternatives both dismissed and carried forward. Please be aware the Corps will require more specific details regarding impacts to aquatic resources during future evaluation of the referenced document.

The Corps also reviewed the Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts. We request that the Aquatic Resources Section specifically addresses both wetland and waterway resources, individually.

Thank you for the opportunity to review these sections of the EIS. We look forward to continued coordination on this document. If you have any questions, please contact me in our Green Bay office at (651)290-5856 or Jessica.L.Kempke@usace.army.mil. In any correspondence or inquiries, please refer to the Regulatory file number shown above.

Sincerely,

Jessica Kempke
Project Manager

cc:
US Environmental Protection Agency, Kenneth Westlake
Federal Highway Administration, Ian Chidister
F.4

Native American Tribes
Correspondence
F.4.1

2006-2012 Tribes Correspondence
### Native American Tribes Correspondence, 2006-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 21, 2006</td>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 26, 2008</td>
<td>Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 21, 2006

Cole Runge
Planning Commission Brown County
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay WI 54305-3600

Dear Mr. Runge:

Thank you for your letter, which is in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and Section 110.

Project: Southern Bridge and Arterial Street in Brown County, Wisconsin

The Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska NAGPRA department have determined the above project as:

No objections. However, if human skeletal remains and/or any objects falling under NAGPRA are uncovered during construction, please stop immediately and notify NAGPRA representative, Deanne Bahr, at the address above.

There are two other bands of Sac and Fox that also need to be contacted, the Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma and the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa.

Johnathan Buffalo, NAGPRA Representative
Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa
349 Meskwaki Rd.
Tama, IA 52339-9629

Sandra Massey, NAGPRA Representative
Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma
Rt. 2, Box 246
Stroud, OK 74079

If you have any questions, please contact me at the number or address above.

Sincerely,

Deanne Bahr
Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska
NAGPRA Contact Representative
For Your Files on the Brown County EIS project. Jim, please note the change in the Chairman of the Tribe.

S

On behalf of our Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation Tribal Chairman, Steve Ortiz, I am writing to inform you that we have received your National Historic Preservation Act (NHPAS), Section 106 and Section 100, correspondence for the following project(s):

Project(s): 4556-02-00, Brown County, Wi

After reviewing the contents of your correspondence, we are unaware of any historical cultural resources in the proposed development area. However, we do request to be immediately contacted if any inadvertent discoveries are uncovered at anytime throughout the various phases of the project.

Please feel free to call our Tribal Chairman, Steve Ortiz at (785) 966-4007, or additional information can be faxed to him at (785) 966-4009. We look forward working with you.

Thank you

Linda Yazzie
Administrative Assistant
for Tribal Chairman
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation
(785) 966-4008
e-mail: lindayazzie@pbpnation.org
F.4.2
2019-2020 Tribes Correspondence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 19, 2019</td>
<td>St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2020</td>
<td>Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13, 2020</td>
<td>Oneida Nation of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No significance for St. Croix. Contact LdF THPO and Onieda THPO

Wanda McFaggen, Director/THPO
Tribal Historic Preservation
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin
24663 Angeline Avenue
Webster, Wisconsin 54893
715-349-2195 x 5238

"A real Native person feels the obligation and interconnection with their tribe. You contribute to the tribe: the tribe is almost first because you are aware of your responsibilities to help the tribe."

Ada Deer, Menominee Nation

From: Lipke, Bryan - DOT [mailto:Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 9:14 AM
To: Wanda McFaggen
Subject: FW: South Bridge Connector, Tier 1 EIS, Brown County, WI; Tribal Historic Preservation Officer invitation for comment

From: Lipke, Bryan - DOT
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Wanda McFaggen
Subject: RE: South Bridge Connector, Tier 1 EIS, Brown County, WI; Tribal Historic Preservation Officer invitation for comment

No significance for St. Croix. Contact LdF THPO and Onieda THPO

Wanda McFaggen, Director/THPO
Tribal Historic Preservation
St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin
24663 Angeline Avenue
Webster, Wisconsin 54893
715-349-2195 x 5238

"A real Native person feels the obligation and interconnection with their tribe. You contribute to the tribe: the tribe is almost first because you are aware of your responsibilities to help the tribe."

Ada Deer, Menominee Nation
Subject: South Bridge Connector, Tier 1 EIS, Brown County, WI; Tribal Historic Preservation Officer invitation for comment

Dear Sir/Madam:

Federal Highway Administration, Wisconsin DOT and Brown County are re-initiating the South Bridge Connector study in Brown County, WI and we invite comments under 36 CFR 800 for the Tier 1 EIS.

Please find attached a formal notice letter.

A separate notice (copy attached) is being sent to your Tribal leader to invite the tribe to become a Participating Agency for the Tier 1 EIS.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

We look forward to your response.

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
Planning Project Manager
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Northeast Region
Phone: (920) 492-5703
Cell Phone: (920) 360-9196
Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov
wisconsindot.gov
Good morning all,

The Ho-Chunk Nation has no objections to the proposed change suggested below. Thanks for keeping us in the loop.

Best regards,

Bill Quackenbush, THPO
Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin
agency comment on better identifying and considering environmental impacts in how we are screening all of the alternatives considered.

Please reference the Table 2-1 exhibit attached that shows our preliminary changes and use as you consider the Range of Alternative document sent March 2nd. Please note we continue to work with the agency to resolve this specific comment completely and all further edits may be viewed when the draft Tier 1 EIS is shared with all of you this summer but we felt in interest of time sharing this specific draft table information was valuable.

I am also sharing meeting minutes from the March 16th and 17th teleconferences and including the ICE memo that was referenced during discussions

If you have already provided comment on the P&N and Range of Alternatives documents (attached below) then you need take no further action and if you have not, please try to return comment by April 1st. We appreciate your feedback.

**Bryan Lipke, P.E.**
Planning Project Manager
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Northeast Region
Phone: (920) 492-5703
Cell Phone: (920) 360-9196
Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov
Wisconsindot.gov

If this is related to a records request, please email: dotdtsdnerecords@dot.wi.gov
WHEREAS, the Oneida Nation is a federally recognized Indian government and a treaty tribe recognized by the laws of the United States of America; and

WHEREAS, the Oneida General Tribal Council is the governing body of the Oneida Nation; and

WHEREAS, the Oneida Business Committee has been delegated the authority of Article IV, Section 1, of the Oneida Tribal Constitution by the Oneida General Tribal Council; and

WHEREAS, the Oneida Nation understands the need for transportation system improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Oneida Nations supports systems that foster sustainable development and commerce growth that reflect Tsiʔ niyukwalihotʌ (our ways) with innovative approaches that enrich the natural, built and business environments; and

WHEREAS, the Southern Bridge Corridor Project will involve constructing a new Fox River bridge in the City of De Pere and a divided four-lane arterial street corridor between the intersection of County Highways GV and X in the Town of Ledgeview and the intersection of County Highways EB and F in the Town of Lawrence; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the development of a Southern Bridge Corridor could potentially enhance the Nation’s economic development efforts and contribute to Oneida economy as an additional entryway to the reservation; and
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Oneida Nation supports the development of the Southern Bridge Corridor project and strongly urges state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to Wisconsin Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration to enable the environmental impact statement and Interstate Access Justification Report to be approved and a signed Record of Decision (ROD).

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, as Secretary of the Oneida Business Committee, hereby certify that the Oneida Business Committee is composed of 9 members of whom 5 members constitute a quorum; 8 members were present at a meeting duly called, noticed and held on the 13th day of May, 2020; that the forgoing resolution was duly adopted at such meeting by a vote of 7 members for, 0 members against, and 0 members not voting*; and that said resolution has not been rescinded or amended in any way.

Lisa Summers, Secretary
Oneida Business Committee

*According to the By-Laws, Article I, Section 1, the Chair votes "only in the case of a tie."
F.5
State Agency Correspondence
F.5.1

2006-2012 State Agency Correspondence
## State Agency Correspondence, 2006-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2006</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2007</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17, 2007</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 28, 2008</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24, 2008</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2009</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2010</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2010</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2010</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2010</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (letter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2011</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 2011</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 18, 2006

COUNTY

Chuck Lamine
Brown County Planning Director
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

Subject: Southern Bridge and Arterial Streets Corridor
Brown County

Dear Mr. Lamine:

Thank you for the information regarding the proposed Southern Bridge and Arterial Streets project located, Brown County, Wisconsin. Department of Natural Resources staff has reviewed the materials submitted and offers the following preliminary comments:

- The proposed project consists of connecting Packerland Drive (County EB) with Monroe Road (County GV) in Brown County, Wisconsin. This project is anticipated to be a 4 lane urban facility. There is no construction date set at this time.

- There will be wetland impacts associated with this project. The Fox and East River have extensive wetlands along each shoreline. Also, there are many tributaries east of the East River that have wetlands along their shorelines. Compensatory mitigation for wetland losses due to the project may be required by the Army corps of Engineers or under the DOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement, or both. You should contact Linda Kurtz of the US Army Corps of Engineers (920) 448-2824 for federal permit requirements related to any wetlands fills. Please select a corridor which will avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands.

- Any new structures must comply with the floodplain and backwater requirements contained in Administrative Code NR 116, or Section VII of the DOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement if the project is built under that agreement.
• There will be a seasonal restriction on any in-stream work. No in-stream work will be allowed during the time periods of March 1st through June 30th. This seasonal restriction is meant to protect the many warm and cool water species such as Northern Pike, Walleye and the Threatened Redhorse during the critical spawning period. This covers the Fox River, East River and all tributaries of each waterway system.

• Please limit the number of piers in the water on the Fox and East Rivers. Limiting the amount of piers will minimize impacts to fisheries habitat and navigation for recreational boating traffic.

• Any dredging in the Fox and East Rivers associated with pier placement or bridge construction will need to have a soil boring and sediment analysis completed to determine if the dredged sediment is contaminated. The Fox River is currently undergoing a multi-year PCB removal as a result of industrial discharges years ago. A map check indicates that there is the potential to have concentrations necessary to have any spoils hauled to a special landfill capable of handling the contaminated sediment.

• Please indicate in your proposed project plans how you anticipate handling storm water for this proposed project.

• There are endangered or threatened resources that exist within the proposed project scope. Once initial project plans and alternatives are developed, I will review the site for any potential impacts.

• The Fox River Trail, a major recreational and alternative commuter transportation route will be crossed. You will need to contact Gary Hanson at 920-662-5123 for more information on limiting impacts to this highly valued community resource.

• All waste and demolition material from the project must be disposed of properly. **Disposal in wetlands is not permitted.**

• Proper erosion control measures must be used and maintained prior to and throughout construction, followed by removal once the site is stable. All erosion control methods must be properly installed. An erosion control implementation plan (ECIP) for the project must be developed by the contractor, and submitted to this office 14 days prior to the preconstruction date.

• If any borrow or waste sites are necessary for this project we will expect appropriate erosion control measures be applied to the sites prior to, during and following construction. Following completion of the project selected sites need to be properly restored, seeded, mulched, and protected from the effects of erosion. Borrow and waste sites need to have an endangered resources and wetland review completed before they are utilized. Therefore, once DOT/contractor is aware of where a
selected site will be located please let me know so I can ensure no endangered/threatened resources or wetlands will be impacted.

- If any changes relating to the environmental features of this project are altered or modified this office will need to be notified.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to contact me at 920-662-5447 or Chris.Pagels@Wisconsin.gov

Sincerely,

Chris Pagels
Environmental Analysis & Review Specialist, LTE, Northeast Region

cc: Steve Noel, DOT, Northeast Region
    Mike Helmrick, DOT, Northeast Region
    Linda Kurtz, US Army Corps of Engineers
    Jon Brand, DNR, WMS
Hi Al,

Thanks for the feedback, and I appreciate your assistance.

Take it easy.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
Department of Planning and Land Services
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Stranz, Allan M - DNR [mailto:Allan.Stranz@Wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2007 10:19 AM
To: Runge_CM
Cc: Stranz, Allan M - DNR; Pagels, Chris D - DNR; Schaetz, Michelle M - DNR
Subject: Draft EIS for Brown County South Beltline

Cole:

I took a look at the material you sent and it looks like a good start for the EIS.

FWHA and DOT have a lot of experience putting these together and I'm sure can provide the basic format and list of issues that need to be addressed.

Here is a list of things I can think of that are a little more specific and should be addressed at some point. We can help with some of the data gathering when needed, or provide comments.

* Wetland impacts and opportunities for mitigation
* Endangered Species, natural areas, critical habitat
* Wildlife or unique upland habitat
* Fish and other aquatic organism habitat
* Trails, existing or opportunity for new development
* Erosion control during construction
* Stormwater management post-construction
* Waterway crossings, Fox, East, others
* Contaminated sites or sediment, landfills, other

If you need anything from us let me know.

Thanks

Al
May 17, 2007

Angela M. Pierce, Natural Resources Planner II
Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission
441 South Jackson Street
Green Bay, WI 54301

RE: Brown County Transportation Improvements: Fox River Bridge

Dear Ms. Pierce:

Thank you for notifying the Wisconsin Coastal Management Program (WCMP) of the Environmental Impact Statement for transportation improvements in the City of Green Bay. Through its Federal Consistency authority, the WCMP reviews federally-affiliated projects that are likely to have impacts on the coastal zone, defined as the fifteen counties adjacent to Lake Superior, Green Bay and Lake Michigan. This letter is to inform you that the WCMP waives review of the project. The waiver is with the expectation that Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission and the Brown County Planning Commission will cooperate with the Departments of Natural Resources and Transportation in pursuing the project. This letter does not exempt the proposed project from requiring any other necessary state or local permits or authorizations. If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (608) 267-7988.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Angel
Program and Planning Analyst
Wisconsin Coastal Management Program
July 28, 2008

Cole Runge  
Brown County Planning Commission  
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320  
P.O. Box 23600  
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

IN REPLY REFER TO: 10395

SUBJECT: Southern Brown County EIS Draft Impact Assessment Methodologies Document

Dear Mr. Runge:

Preliminary information on the above referenced project has been reviewed by DNR Northeast Region staff under the DOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement. Below are comments on specific elements being that will be assessed:

- **Pedestrian and Bicyclist Impacts** - The Department should be used as an information source. Gary Hanson, DNR Regional Trails Coordinator, can be contacted at 920-662-5123.

- **Noise Impacts** - Impacts to wildlife should also be considered. I have included some information that discusses highway noise and wildlife relationships that may be useful to assess the impact of noise on wildlife.

- **Wetland Impacts** - Depending on the quality and or type of wetland it may be difficult to consider financial feasibility as a viable reason to allow permanent impacts to the wetland. A wetland delineation of the project area may be necessary to properly assess the impact potential.

- **Threatened or Endangered Species Impact** - Wisconsin endangered species regulations and/or actual surveys of the area may be necessary sources of information to assess this element.

- **Construction Impacts** - Additional construction impacts include borrow sites, agricultural impacts, and erosion potential.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this draft segment of the EIS. Additional comment will be provided as this project become further defined. If any of the concerns or information provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 662-5119.

Sincerely,

James P. DoperaLSki Jr.  
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist

c. Mike Helmrick – DOT NER, Green Bay  
Rob Wagner – DOT NER, Green Bay
September 24, 2008

Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

SUBJECT: Purpose and Need Statement Review
Project I.D.#: 4556-02-00
Project Title: Southern Green Bay Metro Area Transportation Improvements
Location: Southern Portion of Green Bay Metro Area
County: Brown

Dear Mr. Runge:

After reviewing the August 13, 2008 draft of the purpose and need statement and participating in the September 10, 2008 purpose and need review meeting I agree there is sufficient information to support the purpose and need for this project. I look forward to working with you on alternative development.

The above comments do not constitute final concurrence. Final concurrence will be granted after further consultation. If any of the comments provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 662-5119.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist

c. Mike Helmrick – DOT NER, Green Bay
Robert Wagner – DOT NER, Green Bay
December 14, 2009

Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

SUBJECT: Draft EIS Draft Alternative Identification and Analysis comments
Project I.D.#: 4556-02-00
Project Title: Southern Green Bay Metro Area Transportation Improvements
Location: Southern Portion of Green Bay Metro Area (Corridor)
County: Brown

Dear Mr. Runge:

I have completed my review of the October 2009 draft Project Alternatives. Of the eleven build alternatives proposed the Department prefers an alternative that incorporates existing roadways as much as practical, reduces any proposed footprint to a minimum and avoids the Niagara Escarpment.

Each of the build alternatives involves a new structure over the Fox River, which contains an important fishery. The potential environmental impacts to the Fox River will vary depending upon location however all instream work must be avoided between March 1 and June 15 to minimize impacts to spawning activities.

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) are known to exist in the sediments of the Fox River. Depending on the location of the proposed new structure further coordination with DNR may be necessary.

Several of the alternatives would have direct and/or indirect impacts to the Niagara Escarpment, which is known to harbor many rare species and important natural communities found in few places elsewhere in the world. Nine snail species which were thought to have disappeared from northeastern Wisconsin at the end of the last Ice Age have been found living on the shaded Niagara Escarpement cliffs and talus slopes, most of them known to live on no more than 50 other sites on earth. One species of snails is so small that it would fit on the head of a pin; the Niagara Escarpment in Wisconsin holds the largest population of this species. Placing a roadway along the Niagara Escarpment could have negative impacts to these very rare species of snails.

Several of the proposed alternatives would cross stream and or wetland corridors. These corridors provide habitat for rare plants, fish (i.e. spawning activities), wildlife (i.e. wildlife corridors), and/or floodplain functions. These areas provide habitat for endangered and threatened species such as the Blanding’s turtle and wood turtle. An endangered resource review will be needed once an alternative is chosen and special conditions such as construction date restrictions or other requirements (i.e. fencing for turtles) may be needed in these areas to address concerns for fish and wildlife and their habitat.
Of the eleven alternatives proposed, Alternatives 1 and 2 appear to have the least amount of environmental impacts based on the mapping alone. Further investigation will be necessary to determine the potential for impacts to endangered, threatened, and special concern species, waterways, wetlands, floodplains, fish and wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. I look forward to working with you on this project as it progresses. If any of the concerns or information provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 662-5119.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist

c. Mike Helmrick – DOT NER, Green Bay
   Joe Henry – Green Bay
   Lisie Kitchel – BER
   Dave Rowe – Green Bay
   Dick Nikolai – Appleton
   File: 10395
April 2, 2010

Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

SUBJECT: Draft EIS Draft Alternative Identification, Retention, & Elimination Report

Dear Mr. Runge:

I have completed my review of the February 10, 2010 Draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report. This report provides reasoning for retaining 4 build alternatives along with the no-build alternative for further study while eliminating the Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Transportation System Management (TSM), and the other build alternatives from further study. As the Department stated in previous correspondence we prefer an alternative that incorporates existing roadways as much as practical, reduces any proposed footprint to a minimum and avoids the Niagara Escarpment. As the analysis of the 5 remaining alternatives (includes the no-build alternative) progresses a more detailed review will be necessary, but for the purposes of this letter only general comments regarding the alternatives will be provided.

Retained Alternatives

1. The new alternative: USH 41-Old Martin Arterial (with new interchange at USH 41) reasoning does not address the potential impacts to the Niagara Escarpment. From the map provided it is unclear as to whether the Niagara Escarpment extends into the proposed new roadway alignment. If there is a potential for impact then this alternative would not meet Objective 8 of the Purpose and Need.

2. Since all alternatives would incorporated a new crossing of the Fox River location of the crossing and the associated environmental impacts should also be considered when choosing the preferred alternative.

Eliminated Alternatives

1. Alternatives 5a and 5b may also cross the Niagara Escarpment according to the map provided and thus could be another reason for elimination.
2. Alternatives 10a and 10b may cross the Niagara Escarpment according to the map provided and thus could be another reason for elimination.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. I look forward to work with you on this project as it progresses. If any of the concerns or information provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 662-5119.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist
October 27, 2010

Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

SUBJECT: Draft EIS Draft Alternative Identification, Retention, & Elimination Report
September 9, 2010
Project I.D.: 4556-02-00
Project Title: Southern Green Bay Metro Area Transportation Improvements
Location: Southern Portion of Green Bay Metro Area (Corridor)
County: Brown

Dear Mr. Runge:

I have completed my review of the September 9, 2010 Draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report. This report provides reasoning for retaining three build alternatives along with the no-build alternative for further study while eliminating the Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Transportation System Management (TSM), and the other build alternatives from further study. As the Department stated in previous correspondence we prefer an alternative that incorporates existing roadways as much as practical, reduces any proposed footprint to a minimum and avoids the Niagara Escarpment. As the analysis of the 4 remaining alternatives (includes the no-build alternative) progresses a more detailed review will be necessary, but for the purposes of this letter only general comments regarding the alternatives will be provided.

Retained Build Alternatives

1. The two Rockland Road – Red Maple Road alternatives involve crossing of Ashwaubenon Creek and Helnuck Creek. There may additional environmental impacts associated with these crossings such as wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat (waterway corridors in urban areas often act as wildlife corridors), and fish spawning activities. These impacts will need to be fully discussed in the EIS and considered when choosing the preferred alternative.

2. Since two of the build alternatives would incorporated a new crossing of the Fox River location of the crossing and the associated environmental impacts will need to be fully discussed in the EIS and be considered when choosing the preferred alternative. Potential environmental impacts may include contaminated sediment, mussel habitat, fish and wildlife habitat, navigation clearance, constructability, storm water, and erosion.
3. Alternative one uses an existing bridge to cross the Fox River and most of the alignment uses existing roads. Using an existing bridge and roadways would minimize environmental impact to the Fox River and adjacent environmental sensitive areas.

4. A Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) review shows recent records for endangered, threatened or special concern species within the project area. Further evaluation will be needed to determine what impacts these alternatives could have on these species.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. I look forward to working with you on this project as it progresses. If any of the concerns or information provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 662-5119.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist

c. Mike Helmrick – DOT NER, Green Bay
   Matt Schaeve – DNR Green Bay
   File: 10395
Cole,

I was mixing two different projects in my head when I wrote this letter. I do realize all three build alternatives would involve a new bridge over the Fox River. I will redraft my letter and send it out ASAP. Since I did not identify DNR's preferred alternative I really shouldn't change my review substantially.

I don't have an issue with dropping alternative 4a.

-----Original Message-----
From: Runge_CM [mailto:Runge_CM@co.brown.wi.us]
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2010 10:14 AM
To: Doperalski, James P - DNR

Hi Jim,

On Page 2 of your October 27, 2010, EIS comment letter, you mentioned that Alternative 1 (Scheuring-Heritage) will utilize an existing Fox River bridge. However, a new Fox River bridge will have to be built at this location to accommodate Alternative 1. Does this affect your views of the alternatives?

Also, do you agree with the Lead Agencies' recommendation to study Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 in greater detail and to drop Alternative 4 from further consideration?

Thanks again.

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, Wi 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Doperalski, James P - DNR [mailto:James.Doperalski@Wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2010 10:41 AM
To: Runge_CM

Yes I plan on attending with my co-worker Matt Schaeve.

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist - Senior Environmental Analysis Bureau of Integrated Science Services Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
(*) phone: (920) 662-5119
(*) fax: (920) 662-5159
(*) e-mail: James.Doperalski@wisconsin.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Runge_CM [mailto:Runge_CM@co.brown.wi.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2010 10:40 AM
To: Doperalski, James P - DNR

Hi Jim,

Thanks for the letter. Do you plan to attend the optional agencies meeting at the DOT office on November 10?

Cole

Cole Runge
Principal Planner
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
Phone: (920) 448-6480
Fax: (920) 448-4487
Email: runge_cm@co.brown.wi.us
Web: www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Doperalski, James P - DNR [mailto:James.Doperalski@Wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 27, 2010 9:56 AM
To: Helmrick, Michael - DOT; Schaeve, Matthew D - DNR
Cc: Runge_CM
Subject: Draft EIS Draft Alternative Identification, Retention and Elimination Report Comments.

* James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist - Senior Environmental Analysis Bureau of Integrated Science Services Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
(*) phone: (920) 662-5119
(*) fax: (920) 662-5159
(*) e-mail: James.Doperalski@wisconsin.gov
November 8, 2010

Cole Runge
Brown County Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut Street, Room 320
P.O. Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

SUBJECT: Draft EIS Draft Alternative Identification, Retention, & Elimination Report September 9, 2010 (REVISED)
Project I.D. #: 4556-02-00
Project Title: Southern Green Bay Metro Area Transportation Improvements
Location: Southern Portion of Green Bay Metro Area (Corridor)
County: Brown

Dear Mr. Runge:

I have completed my review of the September 9, 2010 Draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report. This report provides reasoning for retaining three build alternatives along with the no-build alternative for further study while eliminating the Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Transportation System Management (TSM), and the other build alternatives from further study. As the Department stated in previous correspondence we prefer an alternative that incorporates existing roadways as much as practical, reduces any proposed footprint to a minimum and avoids the Niagara Escarpment. As the analysis of the 4 remaining alternatives (includes the no-build alternative) progresses a more detailed review will be necessary, but for the purposes of this letter only general comments regarding the alternatives will be provided.

1. The two Rockland Road — Red Maple Road alternatives involve crossing of Ashwaubenon Creek and Hemlock Creek. There may additional environmental impacts associated with these crossings such as wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat (waterway corridors in urban areas often act as wildlife corridors), and fish spawning activities. These impacts will need to be fully discussed in the EIS and considered when choosing the preferred alternative.

2. Alternative one uses mostly existing roads. Using existing roadways would reduce environmental impacts.

3. Since all three of the build alternatives would incorporated a new crossing of the Fox River location of the crossing and the associated environmental impacts will need to be fully discussed in the EIS and be considered when choosing the preferred alternative. Potential environmental impacts may include contaminated sediment, mussel habitat, fish and wildlife habitat, navigation clearance, constructability, storm water, and erosion.
4. A Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) review shows recent records for endangered, threatened or special concern species within the project area. Further evaluation will be needed to determine what impacts these alternatives could have on these species.

5. The DNR does not oppose the elimination of Alternative 4 from further consideration.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. I look forward to working with you on this project as it progresses. If any of the concerns or information provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 662-5119.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist

c. Mike Helmrick – DOT NER
   Kathy Van Price – DOT NER
   Matt Schaeve – DNR Green Bay
   File: 10395
Cole,

I forwarded this email to the Wildlife Biologist to get his take on the waterfowl and wildlife questions. I'll let you know if I receive any comments. As far as the other questions these alternatives cross the Fox River, East River, and Ashwaubenon Creek. There are wetlands associated with these waterways. The DNR Water Surface Water Data Viewer shows wetlands in the area and most are associated with the East River and Ashwaubenon Creek.

The East River and Ashwaubenon Creek do act as wildlife corridors, which often do offer preferred habitat for wildlife travel. These corridors help connect smaller areas with wildlife habitat.

For endangered resources there are records in the area for state threatened red horse, wood turtle and snow trillium as well as lake sturgeon, which is a special concern species. There is a northern dry-mesic forest community by the Niagara escarpment. An full endangered resource review will still be needed to determine impact potential.

These comment are only general comments. As I stated in previous comments the alternative that utilizes the existing roads as much as possible will have the least environmental impacts. From the two (three with the interchange) alternatives you attached, alternative 1 looks like it would have the least environmental impacts.

Hi Jim,

The Brown County Planning Commission is still working with the Wisconsin DOT, Federal Highway Administration, and other state and federal agencies to complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system. At this point, we've narrowed the number of project alternatives to the following:
DATE: June 13, 2011

TO: James Doperalski

FROM: Dick Nikolai

SUBJECT: Southern Brown County Road Project (south of DePere)

The proposed road project which was sent to me indicated several alternatives crossing the Fox River is outlined below for wildlife usage. Maps attached are for my use in looking at wildlife values and its possible significance along the Fox River as well as my personal experience. Hope this covers the information you were looking for in making the environmental judgments.

Generalizations of wildlife usage along the Fox River near DePere. Near the dam in DePere we have great usage of waterbirds (gulls, cormorants, white pelicans, mallards, Canada Geese, Great blue herons, black-crown night herons, Common goldeneyes, Common Mergansers, wood ducks, common terns, Forster’s terns, etc.). Bald eagles are common along the river with nesting occurring at several spots from DePere to the Bay of Green Bay. Places of dams or open water are prime spots for winter use for feeding. Tall trees such as white pine, cottonwoods, oaks and ash are used near the river for perching, hunting and roosting. If there are habitats that are somewhat isolated with the tall trees mentioned they can be great areas for roosting not only for a couple of eagles but over the past few years, concentrations of eagles like in the Fox Cities area (Thousands Islands, James Island, Doyle Park, etc) and at Voyager Park in DePere. Even ospreys have been seen within the vicinity of DePere during migration. River corridors are important areas for Neotropical migrants to follow because of the cover whether in rural or urban situations. Any fragmentation of the corridor causes impact, especially if good habitat is disturbed. Wetlands are few along the river and any impacts always put local wetland wildlife populations at risk of being extirpated like amphibians and reptiles. Last but not least are mussels found within the Fox River that have survived PCB’s, urbanization impacts and dams. They exist where gravel and sand areas are found with sufficient flows of water. Few studies have existed on the Fox River identifying mussel beds but as the river is cleaned up, more and more are being found colonizing areas. Typically in the Fox Cities they are found near small islands or with small streams flowing into the Fox River like Mud Creek near Appleton.
F.5.2

2019-2020 State Agency Correspondence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 2020</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We accept your invitation to be a cooperating agency for the above project. Please include WHS # 19-1609 BR on all materials intended for SHPO review. Please also know that we have a single point of contact with WisDOT through the Cultural Resources Team (cc’d here).

We look forward to reviewing your project materials as they become available.

Thank you,

Kimberly Cook
State Historic Preservation Office

Wisconsin Historical Society
816 State Street, Madison, WI 53706
608-264-6493(O)
Kimberly.cook@wisconsinhistory.org

Wisconsin Historical Society
Collecting, Preserving, and Sharing Stories Since 1846
January 9, 2020

Bryan Lipke  
Project Manager  
WisDOT, North East Region  
944 Vanderperren Way  
Green Bay, WI 54304

Re: Project ID: 4556-02-00  
South Bridge Connector  
Brown County

Dear Mr. Lipke:

Thank you for including the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATC) in the review process of the Tier 1 EIS Study for the South Bridge Connector project. On behalf of DATCP, I accept your offer for DATCP to become a Participating Agency in this process.

Regarding the Draft Coordination Plan, in Table 2-1 on page 9, the contact person for DATCP should be me, Alice Halpin, at phone number (608)224-4646 and email alice.halpin@wisconsin.gov. In the section on local government contacts, I recommend that the lead agencies consider inviting the Brown County Drainage Board and the Brown County Land and Water Conservation Department to participate in the Tier 1 IES Study. Contacts for these organizations are: Jim Enderby, Brown County Drainage Board Member, 4200 Luxemburg Road, New Franklen, WI 54229, (920) 468-4302 and Mike Mushinski, Brown County Conservationist, PO Box 23600, Green Bay, WI 54305, (920)391-4621.

I have no comments on the draft Impact Analysis Methodology Report. In addition, I have no comments or concerns about the proposed project schedule. I concur with the Tier 1 EIS Schedule.

One issue I would like to make you aware of is that there are drainage districts within and close to the proposed project area. Attached is a map showing their locations. Drainage District #5 is active and is 724 acres large. Drainage District #4 is active and is 6,105 acres large. Both of those districts are overseen by the Brown County Drainage Board. The Oneida-Hobart Drainage District is active and is 6,301 acres in size, but it is located in Outagamie County and overseen by the Outagamie County Drainage Board.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (608)224-4646 or alice.halpin@wisconsin.gov. I look forward to working with you.
Sincerely,

Alice Halpin  
Agricultural Impact Analyst

Enc.

Cc: Cole Runge, Principal Planner/MPO Director, Brown County Planning Commission  
Ian Chidister, Environmental Program Manager, FHWA
January 15, 2020

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
WI Department of Transportation
944 Vanderperen Way
Green Bay, 54304

Subject: Cooperating Agency Response and Coordination Plan and IAM Comments
Project I.D. 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector, Includes Fox River Crossing
From CTH EB and CTH F Intersection to CTH GV and CTH X Intersection
Towns of Lawrence and Ledgeview and City of De Pere
Brown County

Dear Mr. Lipke:

Thank you for contacting the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regarding your study mentioned above. You have invited the DNR to be actively involved in the environmental review process as a cooperating agency set forth in SAFETEA-LU Section 6002. The DNR accepts your invitation to be a cooperating agency, understanding the following considerations:

Our designation as a cooperating agency, in no way, diminishes or replaces our role and responsibility with DOT administered projects as well as our direct agency-to-agency relationship described in the DNR/DOT Cooperative Agreement. Our interagency agreement with DOT is paramount to being a "cooperating agency" for individual projects.

This environmental review process commonly uses "concurrence points" to move forward in a step-by-step manner. Agencies are expected to provide concurrence at various steps including purpose and need, preliminary alternatives and detailed analysis, among others. However, DNR also provides "final concurrence" to DOT in lieu of issuing most environmental permits for DOT-administered projects. To satisfy SAFETEA-LU requirements, DNR will provide detailed comments at each concurrence point and provide specific concurrence to a particular stage in the process when warranted. These concurrences to the steps in the process should not be confused with "final concurrence" to the project after it has reached final design.

It is our understanding that once the process proceeds past a concurrence point, that particular concurrence point will not be revisited unless there is new and compelling information not already considered. However, if new information does come to light, we understand that concurrence points, such as purpose and need, could be re-examined with good cause. This ability, to re-examine earlier decisions in light of new information, is critical to our successful participation in this process.
Your letter also asks for comments on the two draft sections of the EIS, Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement and Impact Analysis Methodology (IAM). Below are my comments on the two draft sections:

**Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement**

This section breaks down the roles and participation process for the leading, cooperating and participating agencies. Please refer to the considerations listed at the beginning of this letter for comments on the process.

Table 2-1, lists me as the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources designee contact. Please add Jr. to my last name. The Green Bay Service Center no longer uses a P.O. Box.

Section 4, Project Schedule, appears to be very aggressive. For example the Purpose and Need and Range of Corridor Alternatives are proposed to be complete by March 2, 2020 and the Preferred Cooridor be identified by April 2020. There is concern that there may not be enough time to fully review and consider all the alternatives let alone identify the preferred alternative. The Draft IAM discusses windshield survey and possible other field verification options as part of the general or project specific methodologies however in order to conduct some of these surveys or other field verification options weather conditions will limit our ability to conduct these surveys or other field verification options.

**Impact Analysis Methodology (IAM)**

Section 1.2 states “In most cases, the analysis conducted for the Tier 1 EIS will rely on current available and published data rather than project-specific field investigations.” Published data has the potential to be inaccurate particularly if the data is dated. Collecting field data would help verify that the published data is accurate.

Section 4.1, Threatened and Endangered Species Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines. Ch. 29.604, Wis. Stats., Endangered and Threatened Species Protected would also apply.

Section 5.1, Water Resource and Floodplain Laws, regulations, and Guidelines. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation has a Transportation Construction General Permit (WI-S066796-1), which is regulated under ch. 283 Wis Stats., chs. NR 151 and 216, Wis. Adm. Code and s. 30.2022(2), Wis. Stats. This stormwater general permit is usually issued in conjunction with final concurrence of the project.

Section 5.1 should identify the Lower Fox River is a federal Superfund cleanup project site undergoing active remediation of river sediments contaminated with polychlorinated biphenyl compounds (PCBs), with oversight by DNR and US EPA pursuant to the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA, or Superfund). Areas proposed for a bridge installation must consider riverbed areas where engineered caps have been constructed over PCB-contaminated sediments. Such areas must undergo a detailed review by USEPA and DNR Project Managers for the PCB Cleanup Project. Bathymetric surveys will be required before and after any in-river work, along with repair of any damage to engineered caps resulting from bridge construction work. In addition, in-river work could trigger requirements under Wisconsin’s Remediation and Redevelopment site closure process covered under NR 700, Wis. Adm. Code.

Section 6.2 Wetland General Methodology. It should be noted that a wetland delineation or wetland determination will be needed during the design phase of the preferred alternative to better assess wetland impact potential.
Section 11.1, Section 4(f), 6(f) and Other Unique Lands Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines. The last paragraph should be amended to “While other agencies may have an interest or must be consulted in Section 4(f), FHWA is responsible for applicability determinations, evaluations, findings and overall compliance.”

Section 11.3, Section 4(f), 6(f) and Other Unique Lands Project Specific Methodology. DNR is willing to help identify Section 6(f) resources and any other resources that have received special funding however in order to provide accurate information in a timely manner it is important to have accurate information regarding the amount and type of potential impacts to public lands.

Thank you for contacting DNR. We look forward to working with you as this project progresses. If any of the comments or information provided in this letter requires further clarification or if you would like to meet with DNR to discuss the PCB-contaminated sediments remediation efforts, please contact this office at (920) 412-0165, or email at james.doperalski@wisconsin.gov.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis & Review Specialist

c: Kathy Van Price – WI Department of Transportation  
Joey Shoemaker - US Army Corps of Engineers  
Kenneth A. Westlake – Environmental Protection Agency  
James Saric – Environmental Protection Agency (Superfund)  
Ian Chidister – Federal Highway Administration  
Sarah Quamme – US fish and Wildlife Service  
Cole Runge – Brown County Planning Commission  
Paul Fonecchio – Brown County Highway Commissioner  
Beth J. Olson – WI Department of Natural Resources  
File
Subject: FW: 4556-02-00, Southern Bridge Corridor, Community Financial Assistance (CFA) Funding for Public Lands

From: Doperalski, James P - DNR
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2020 12:46 PM
To: Lipke, Bryan - DOT <Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov>
Cc: VanPrice, Kathie - DOT <Kathie.VanPrice@dot.wi.gov>; Winebar, Roberta J - DNR <Roberta.Winebar@wisconsin.gov>; Vanlanduyt, Melissa A - DNR (Missy) <Melissa.Vanlanduyt@wisconsin.gov>; Raleigh Moses, Kelly L - DNR <Kelly.RaleighMoses@wisconsin.gov>

Subject: 4556-02-00, Southern Bridge Corridor, Community Financial Assistance (CFA) Funding for Public Lands

Bryan,

Below is a summary of the known funding through Community Financial Assistance (CFA)

- There is Land and Water Conservation Funding, Stewardship Funding (Acquisition and Development of Local Parks (ADLP), ORAP (precursor to Stewardship) Urban Rivers (UR), and Recreational Trails Program (RTP) funding on both the East River Trail and Fox River State Trail.

- There is one parcel (Hutjens) along Creamery Road in the City of De Pere that is part of the Ashwaubenon Creek area that was acquired with Stewardship (Urban Green Space (UGS)) funding that depending on where the final road plan is, this property may be an issue – it is currently right on the edge of the buffer area.

- No known CFA funding associated with Kiwanis Park or the Lions Trailside Estates Park.

- If for some reason the final route changes for Alt. 2 and it comes closer to French Ct, there is a parcel on the south side of French Ct. that is part of the Southwest Park in the City of De Pere that was acquired with funding from Stewardship (Urban Green Space (UGS)).

- There could be Priority Watershed Grants in the project area that will need to be researched.

This information is based on Alternatives 1 and 2 that were sent me via email on January 31, 2020.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

We are committed to service excellence.
Visit our survey at http://dnr.wi.gov/customersurvey to evaluate how I did.

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist, Advanced – Bureau of Environmental Analysis and Sustainability
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
2984 Shawano Avenue, WI 54313
Phone: (920) 412-0165
Fax: (920) 662-5413
James.Doperalski@wisconsin.gov
Thank you, Lynn and to Kimberly for the prompt review on this.

I have added some comments/clarifications below in red. With this information would you feel comfortable with concurring with the first two concurrence points (Concurrence Point #1: Purpose and Need and Concurrence Point #2: Range of Alternative Corridors to be carried forward for study)?

If there is additional information I can provide, please let me know.

Thank you,

Kathie

---

**From:** Cloud, Lynn - DOT  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 11, 2020 4:42 PM  
**To:** Lipke, Bryan - DOT <Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov>  
**Cc:** VanPrice, Kathie - DOT <Kathie.VanPrice@dot.wi.gov>; Johnston, Jonquil - DOT <Jonquil.Johnston@dot.wi.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: WisDOT 4556-02-00 / WHS 19-1609 BR South Bridge Connector

FYI -

---

**From:** KIMBERLY A COOK <kimberly.cook@wisconsinhistory.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 11, 2020 1:50 PM  
**To:** Cloud, Lynn - DOT <Lynn.Cloud@dot.wi.gov>; Amy Hootman <amy.hootman@meadhunt.com>; Emily Pettis <emily.pettis@meadhunt.com>  
**Subject:** RE: WisDOT 4556-02-00 / WHS 19-1609 BR South Bridge Connector

We have reviewed the Purpose and Need and Range of Alternatives for the above project and offer the following comments:

On page 2-3 it appears to the casual reader that the numbered options are subsets of the “Improve Existing Roads” option, which means the last paragraph of that page dismisses every option but No Build. The graphic on page 2-11 provides clarification, so we recommend either moving up the graphic or providing additional explanation on what the first graphic is trying to convey (eg the numbered options are distinct from the Improve Existing Roads option). I agree that this could be confusing; we will look of opportunities to clarify this in the EIS.

Page 2-29 section 2.3.2 seems to suggest that the Lead Agency has completed the survey and identification phase of the project. There does not appear to have been any research done yet on
historic properties, archaeological and burial sites within the project area all of which could warrant alignment shifts. As described in the Impact Analysis Methodology Report, at the Tier 1 level, impact assessment utilizes available information. In terms of historic properties, archaeological and burial sites, available information consists of previous investigations that were done for this project and information tracked in WHPD. The results of this will be presented in Section 3 of the Tier 1 EIS. Additional archaeological and historical investigations will be completed at the time of Tier 2 document(s). I have attached a graphic used during tribal outreach that helps illustrate this.

The copy provided of Section 3 was incomplete and could not be reviewed at this time. As Section 3.13 is developed, please encourage them contact us if there are any questions about how to talk about cultural resources or the process. Also, if there is a section covering additional permitting requirements, remember to include the burial law (Wis Stat. 157.70). Section 3 will be provided in its entirety in the future. However, Section 3.1 was provided in advance to solicit agency comment on the approach to analysis of environmental impacts. If you have any comments, questions or concerns with the approach outlined in 3.1, we would appreciate hearing them.

Thank you,

Kimberly Cook  
State Historic Preservation Office  

Wisconsin Historical Society  
816 State Street, Madison, WI 53706  
608-264-6493(O)  
Kimberly.cook@wisconsinhistory.org  

Wisconsin Historical Society  
Collecting, Preserving, and Sharing Stories Since 1846
March 20, 2020

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
WI Department of Transportation
944 Vanderperen Way
Green Bay, 54304

Subject: Purpose of and Need for the Project and Alternatives Considered Comments

Project I.D. 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector, Includes Fox River Crossing
From CTH EB and CTH F Intersection to CTH GV and CTH X Intersection
Towns of Lawrence and Ledgeview and City of De Pere
Brown County

Dear Mr. Lipke:

Thank you for contacting the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regarding your study mentioned above. You have invited the DNR, as a cooperating agency to provide comments on the Purpose of and Need for the Project and Alternatives Considered sections of the Tier 1 EIS for the above project as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Below are my comments on the two draft sections and introduction to the third section:

Purpose of and Need for the Project

This section describes the purpose of the project and why the project is needed. The purpose describes what the project is intended to accomplish, and the need explains the transportation concerns and/or deficiencies that the project would address. As stated in NEPA “the purposes of this act are: To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation; and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality.” The Project Purpose only mentions “identifying the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing east-west transportation and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area”. The Project Needs only mentions congestion, planned land use, travel times, and safety issues. There is no mention of incorporating environmental considerations in developing the range of alternatives.

The Federal Highway Administration’s Environmental Review Toolkit states “although significant environmental impacts are expected to be caused by the project, the purpose and need section should justify why impacts are acceptable based on the project importance”. The Environmental Toolkit also states “Without a well-defined, well-established and well-justified purpose and need, it will be difficult to determine which alternatives are reasonable, prudent and practicable, and it may be impossible to
dismiss the no-build alternative.” Neither the purpose nor the need section have any discussion regarding the potential environmental impacts associated with this project.

DNR recommends the Purpose and Need be amended to include a statement(s) regarding how environmental considerations will be incorporated into the alternative development process and how the environmental impacts associated with this project will be addressed in the Alternatives Considered section. This section should recognize that environmental considerations are integral in developing alternatives. DNR will work with the Lead Agencies on this section so that it will better fit the intent of NEPA.

Page 1-10, Section 1.3.4, The last sentence uses the Claude Allouez Bridge as an example of increased crash rates due to the construction on WIS 172 detoured traffic in 2009 and 2010. However page 1-3 says in 2012-2013 the Claude Allouez Bridge roundabout was modified to address traffic delays and crashes. There should be some information that explains how the increase in traffic from the WIS 172 construction contributed to the increased crash rates above the previous roundabout configuration.

Alternatives Considered

This section describes how the alternatives are evaluated to meet the purpose and need of the project.

Page 2-2, section 2.1 discusses the reasoning for completing a Tier 1 EIS and describes when a Tier 2 EIS could be completed. There should be some discussion on the limitations of a Tier 1 EIS in regards to the evaluating environmental impacts. Using 500 foot corridors rather than road alignments and little field work limits our ability to accurately evaluate potential environmental impacts as environmental and sensitive resources can vary quite a bit within each corridor.

Page 2-10, Freeway and Arterial Alternative Routes section states freeway tend to increase the potential for environmental impacts. It should be stated that all build alternatives increase the potential for environmental impacts over the other alternatives. Freeway design will further increase the potential for environmental impacts over an arterial design.

Page 2-11, Section 2.2.2 Step 2: Evaluate Route Alternatives. This section is inadequate and needs to be revised. There is little discussion in the narrative or Table 2-1 regarding environmental impacts. The closest objective is regarding traffic congestion. This section must factor in environmental impacts into alternative evaluation to meet the intent of NEPA. Table 2-1 should have a column added discussing and comparing environmental impacts. This column should include information such as impacts to wetlands, waterways (including the Fox River), and wildlife corridors. Secondary, indirect and cumulative effects should also be assessed at this step. Once this section is revised then the refined alternative routes will be better identified and able to be more accurately assessed for a Tier 1 EIS.

Page 2-22, Section 2.2.3 Step 3: Refined Alternative Routes. This section assess the remaining alternatives using four measures of which one is how the routes minimize effects on environmentally sensitive areas. This measure must be used as an objective in Step 2 of the alternative consideration process.

Section 2.2.3 does go into more detail for each of the alternatives and does contain some language regarding environmental impacts, but there is little comparison between the alternatives. Table 2-1 revisions will help the reader understand the differences in environmental impacts between the alternatives.
Page 2-28, Working alignment. This section should discuss the the limits of avoiding environmental or other sensitive resources due to design standards. Exhibit 2-10 may not be a realistic alignment when taking into account design standards.

Page 2-30, 2.3.2 Methodology for Developing Working Alignments. It may be useful to include the Fox River State Trail crossing location as an area to slightly expand the working alignment. The Fox River State Trails is federally railbanked and subject to future restoration and reconstruction of the right-of-way for rail purposes consistent with Section 208 of the National Trails System Act Amendment of 1983, Publ. L. No. 98-11 (16 U.S.C. 1247(d)). This designation may mean that a grade separated crossing could be needed, which may mean a larger footprint for the alignment.

Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts

This section will describe the potential impact on the natural, human and built environments. Only sections 3.1.1. and 3.12 were submitted for review.

Section 3.1.1, Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts, appears to take a quantitative approach to the potential impacts by using a 0.75 to 1.25 impact calculation factor. This approach will not be able to analyze the qualitative impacts to the environmental resources. The quality of the resources should also included in the analysis.

Section 3.1.2 Evironmental Topics, Table 3.1.1. Upland impacts, wildlife impacts, and both stream and upland connectivity impacts should be included. The alternatives being carried forward include new roadway which will divide wetland, waterway and upland habitat. Depending on the alternative the new roadway could have a an adverse effect and the EIS should discuss these effects.

To be able to adequately review this section once a draft is available we will need information related to indirect and cumulative effects.

Thank you for contacting DNR. At this point DNR is not able to concur with these sections of the EIS. DNR is available for further discussion on how these sections can be improved so that DNR will be able to provide concurrence.

If any of the comments or information provided in this letter requires further clarification or if you would like to meet with DNR to discuss my our comments, please contact this office at (920) 412-0165, or email at james.doperalski@wisconsin.gov.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis & Review Specialist

C: Kathy Van Price – WI DOT
   Joey Shoemaker - USACOE
   Kenneth A. Westlake – EPA
   James Saric – EPA (Superfund)
   Ian Chidister – FHWA
   File

Sarah Quamme – USFWS
Cole Runge – Brown County Planning Commission
Paul Fonecchio – Brown County Highway Commissioner
Beth J. Olson – WI DNR
BobbiJo Fischer – WI DNR
Hello Bryan.

I have reviewed the information you provided regarding Concurrence Points 1 and 2 for the South Bridge Connector project.

The information for Concurrence Point #1: Purpose and Need is thorough and reasonable. DATCP does not have any comments on it. DATCP concurs with the Purpose and Need section of the Tier 1 EIS review process.

Regarding Concurrence Point #2: Range of Alternatives, DATCP generally prefers alternatives that minimize the conversion of existing farmland to non-farm uses. Therefore, the "no build" alternative would be the most preferred alternative. However, DATCP recognizes that the "no build" alternative does not meet any of the project's Purpose and Need guidelines.

When considering build alternatives, DATCP prefers those that incorporate existing roadway alignments, are endorsed by local governments and residents, and are as close as possible to existing urban areas. Of the build alternatives that were described in the Range of Alternatives section, Alternatives 1 and 2 meet DATCP's guidelines the best. Therefore, DATCP concurs with the Range of Alternatives section that will bring forward build Alternatives 1 and 2 as well as the no build alternative for further study.

Please let me know if you have any questions about DATCP's review of and comments on these two concurrence points.

Alice Halpin

Agricultural Impact Statements Program, Division of Agricultural Resource Management

Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection

P.O. Box 8911

Madison, WI 53708-8911

phone: (608)224-4646

fax: (608)224-4615

e-mail: alice.halpin@wisconsin.gov
Hi Bryan.

Thanks for the additional information about this project. I don't have any comments to add on behalf of DATCP beyond what I've already submitted. I concur with the Purpose and Need, and with the Range of Alternatives.

Alice

Alice Halpin
Agricultural Impact Statements Program
Division of Agricultural Resource Management
Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection
P.O. Box 8911
Madison, WI 53708-8911
phone: (608)224-4646
fax: (608)224-4615
e-mail: alice.halpin@wisconsin.gov

Please complete this brief survey to help us improve our customer service. Thank you for your feedback.
April 9, 2020

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
WI Department of Transportation
944 Vanderperen Way
Green Bay, 54304

Subject: Purpose of and Need for the Project and Alternatives Considered

Comments

Project I.D. 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector, Includes Fox River Crossing
From CTH EB and CTH F Intersection to CTH GV and CTH X Intersection
Towns of Lawrence and Ledgeview and City of De Pere
Brown County

Dear Mr. Lipke:

DNR has completed review of the Lead Agencies’ proposed changes to the above sections based on our comments dated March 20, 2020. DNR recognizes that NEPA rules and guidelines grant Lead Agencies “substantial deference” regarding Purpose and Need and is ready to move forward to the next step in the Tier 1 EIS process for this project.

The only additional comment DNR has regarding Lead Agencies response to DNR’s March 20, 2020 comment letter is in regards to quantitative versus qualitative in the Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts section 3.1.1. The response states “We will include information on the quality of resource where that information is available. If DNR has data on quality of any environmental resources that it collects (wetlands, for instance), please advise WisDOT NE Region.” There is data regarding the sediment and water quality and fisheries information for some of the waterways within the project boundary. DNR has already provided information regarding the polychlorinated biphenyl compounds (PCBs) cleanup efforts in the Fox River. However there is not significant data in regards to quality of the wetland, upland and other environmental resource habitat as it has been several years since DNR last surveyed the proposed project area. During the previous efforts to develop an EIS DNR, DOT, and US Army Corps of Engineers conducted a joint wetland determination of the project area however we did not conduct a habitat assessment. Field reviews would help update the original data collected and assess the quality of environmental habitat as there have been landscape changes. This can be scheduled after the Governor’s Emergency Order #12 is lifted.
If any of the comments or information provided in this letter requires further clarification or if you would like to meet with DNR to discuss our comments, please contact this office at (920) 412-0165, or email at james.doperalski@wisconsin.gov.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis & Review Specialist

c: Kathy Van Price – WI DOT
   Jessica Kempke - USACOE
   Kenneth A. Westlake – EPA
   James Saric – EPA (Superfund)
   Ian Chidister – FHWA
   Sarah Quamme – USFWS
   File
   Cole Runge – Brown County Planning Commission
   Paul Fonechchio – Brown County Highway Commissioner
   Beth Olson – WI DNR
   BobbiJo Fischer – WI DNR
April 13, 2020

Bryan Lipke
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
944 Vanderperren Way
Green Bay, WI 54304

Subject: DNR Initial Review
Project I.D. 4556-02-00
Southern Bridge Connector Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
CTH F/CTH EB intersection to CTH X to CTH GV Intersection
Towns of Lawrence and Ledgeview, Brown County
Sec. 25, 36, T23N – R19E, Sec. 28-36, T23N – R20E, Sec. 1-6, T23N – R20E

Dear Mr. Lipke:

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has received the information you provided for the above-referenced project. According to your proposal, the purpose of this project is to prepare a Tier 1 EIS for a South Bridge Connector Study. The proposed project includes identifying transportation improvements for addressing existing demand and demand generated by the planned development of the south bridge connector and other planned development in the southern Green Bay metropolitan area.

Preliminary information has been reviewed by DNR staff for the project under the DNR/DOT Cooperative Agreement. Initial comments on the project as proposed are included below, and we assume that additional information will be provided that addresses all resource concerns identified. When requesting Final Concurrence/Water Quality Certification, please send the most up-to-date plan set (including the erosion control plan sheets), contract special provisions, Wetland Impact Tracking Form, Notice of Intent for the Transportation Construction General Permit (TCGP), and any additional pertinent information to ensure environmental commitments have been met.

Project-Specific Resource Concerns

Public Lands
The project, as proposed, may impact publicly held properties. Some properties may have state or federal encumbrances that require additional coordination. Below you will find more detailed encumbrance information and coordination requirements for the proposed project.

Please consider design alternatives that completely avoid impacts to public lands. However, if avoidance is not practicable, please allow ample time for coordination and resolution.

Below is a summary of the known funding through Community Financial Assistance (CFA)
• There is Land and Water Conservation Funding, Stewardship Funding (Acquisition and Development of Local Parks (ADLP), ORAP (precursor to Stewardship) Urban Rivers (UR), and Recreational Trails Program (RTP) funding on both the East River Trail and Fox River State Trail.

• There is one parcel (Hutjens) along Creamery Road in the City of De Pere that is part of the Ashwaubenon Creek area that was acquired with Stewardship (Urban Green Space (UGS)) funding that depending on where the final road plan is, this property may be an issue – it is currently right on the edge of the buffer area.

• No known CFA funding associated with Kiwanis Park or the Lions Trailside Estates Park.

• If for some reason the final route changes for Alt. 2 and it comes closer to French Ct, there is a parcel on the south side of French Ct. that is part of the Southwest Park in the City of De Pere that was acquired with funding from Stewardship (Urban Green Space (UGS)).

• There could be Priority Watershed Grants in the project area that will need to be researched.

Stewardship Funded Lands
For the properties listed above encumbered with State Knowles-Nelson Stewardship grant dollars the subject properties were acquired or developed with financial assistance via the Stewardship program. We will need to coordinate with our Grants staff and the landowner to seek resolution of this issue if impacts are anticipated.

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Lands – Section 6(f) Coordination
For the properties listed above encumbered with Federal LWCF funds in which we have a legal interest and property which is not owned by DNR we will need to coordinate with our Grants staff and the National Park Service on the Section 6(f) conversion process. Typically, lands converted from a recreational use must be replaced with property of equal market value, acreage, and recreational value.

US DOT Section 4(f) Coordination
The U.S. Dept. of Transportation “Section 4(f)” process applies to federally funded transportation projects that impact specific properties (e.g. public parks, wildlife refuges, and recreation areas) as well as properties where Pittman-Robertson or Dingle-Johnson funds have been expended. There is property within the project limits that is a specific type of property and/or where federal funds have been expended and is owned by DNR [property name]. If it is determined the project will affect certain portions of this property, early coordination with WDNR will be necessary under the Section 4(f) review process to evaluate the significance of potential impacts on the uses and management of this property.

Wetlands
Based on a desktop review and past field review there is potential for wetland impacts to occur as a result of this project. Wetland impacts must be avoided and/or minimized to the greatest extent practicable. Unavoidable wetland losses must be compensated for in accordance with the DNR/DOT Cooperative Agreement and the WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guideline. Additional information will be needed to determine the wetland community type and quantity of unavoidable wetland impacts, and mitigation information for this project using the Wetland Impact Tracking Form.

Fisheries/Stream Work
There are multiple waterways located within the project area. The waterways include Ashwaubenon Creek, Fox River and East River and their tributaries. These waterway are considered warm water streams and either have yearround or seasonal sport fisheries. These waterways are used by spawning fish and unless otherwise agreed upon prior to the start of construction, there shall be no in-stream disturbance between March 1 and June 15, with both dates inclusive of the timeout period. This
construction BMP minimizes impacts to fish and other aquatic organisms during sensitive time periods such as spawning and migration.

These waterways are listed as Areas of Special Natural Resource Interest (ASNRI) waterways and are considered impaired. These waterways are part of the Lower Fox River Basin TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load). Also as noted in previous DNR comments on the Tier 1 EIS the Lower Fox River is a federal Superfund cleanup project site undergoing active remediation of river sediments contaminated with polychlorinated biphenyl compounds (PCBs), with oversight by DNR and US EPA pursuant to the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA, or Superfund). Areas proposed for a bridge installation must consider riverbed areas where engineered caps have been constructed over PCB-contaminated sediments. Such areas must undergo a detailed review by USEPA and DNR Project Managers for the PCB Cleanup Project. Bathymetric surveys will be required before and after any in-river work, along with repair of any damage to engineered caps resulting from bridge construction work. In addition, in-river work could trigger requirements under Wisconsin’s Remediation and Redevelopment site closure process covered under NR 700, Wis. Adm. Code.

Additional data regarding these waterways can be found on DNR’s Surface Water Data Viewer webpage.

- **NOTE:** Requests for minimal modifications to the in-stream timeout dates may be made and will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis with input from resource managers.

If erosion control matting is to be used along stream corridors, DNR recommends biodegradable non-netted matting (e.g. Class I Type A Urban, Class I Type B Urban, or Class II Type C). Long-term netted mats may cause animal entrapment. Avoid the use of fine mesh matting that is tied or bonded at the mesh intersection such that the openings in the mesh are fixed in size.

**Waterway Connectivity and Structure Work**

Because some of the alternatives include constructing new roadways and new waterway crossings, structures should be set and sized in such a manner to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to stream morphology, aquatic organism passage, and water quality. The invert elevation of the new culvert(s) should be set at a distance below the natural streambed elevation, to allow for a natural and continuous streambed condition to occur.

**Habitat Connectivity**

Waterway corridors are often considered valuable wildlife habitat corridors. The proposed project may result in a disruption to wildlife movement and increase vehicular/wildlife conflicts. Structure design and potential roadway design should incorporate wildlife passage considerations. Please coordinate closely with the DNR Transportation Liaison as wildlife passage accommodations are being designed.

**Natural Heritage Conservation (formerly “Endangered Resources”)**

Based upon a review of the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) dated March 20, 2020, there are multiple listed species within the project area or its vicinity. Below is a list of the records found in the project area or its vicinity:

- State Special Concern. Without knowing the proposed route or type of structure over the area waterways it is difficult to provide specific recommendations. As this project moves forward coordination with DNR will be needed.
• State Threatened. Without knowing the proposed route or specific impacts areas it is difficult to provide specific conditions to minimize impacts to this plant. As this project moves forward coordination with DNR will be needed.

• State Threatened. Without knowing the proposed route or type of structure over the area waterways it is difficult to provide specific recommendations. As this project moves forward coordination with DNR will be needed.

There are also some special communities such as a slow hard, warm water streams however there is no specific recommendations for this community due to the lack of information regarding potential impacts.

With this review the following has also been determined:

• There are no known Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB) maternity roost trees within 150 feet of the project or known hibernacula within 0.25 miles of the proposed project area.

• This project is located outside of any High Potential Zones (HPZ) for the Rusty Patched Bumblebee (RPBB), and therefore should have no impact on this federally endangered species.

**NHI Disclaimer:** This review letter may contain NHI data, including specific locations of endangered resources, which are considered sensitive and are not subject to Wisconsin’s Open Records Law (s. 23.27 3(b), Wis. Stats.). As a result, endangered resources-related information contained in this review letter may be shared only with individuals or agencies that require this information in order to carry out specific roles in the permitting, planning and implementation of the proposed project. Endangered resources information must be redacted from this letter prior to inclusion in any publicly disseminated documents

**Migratory Birds**
I have not conducted field reviews of the project area so I am unable to assess the potential of migratory bird habitat. A follow up site inspection is recommended as the project gets closer to design, since migratory bird nests can show up on structures without notice.

**Invasive Species**
All project equipment shall be decontaminated for removal of invasive species prior to and after each use on the project site by utilizing other best management practices (https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/invasives/bmp.html) to avoid the spread of invasive species as outlined in NR 40, Wis. Adm. Code. For further information, please refer to the following: https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/invasives/classification.html

**Floodplains**
A preliminary review of the Surface Water Data Viewer (SWDV) indicates that mapped floodplain exists within the project limits. Any proposed temporary or permanent changes to the road or waters of the state in mapped floodplain areas require that DOT coordinate with the Brown County Zoning Administrator to ensure compliance with the local zoning ordinance and intent of NR116. Examples of floodplain encroachments include but are not limited to: changes to waterway crossings; culvert extensions; changes to road surface elevations and/or side-slopes; temporary causeways; temporary structures; general fill.

**Storm Water Management & Erosion Control**
• For projects disturbing an acre or more of land erosion control and storm water measures must adhere to the Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Transportation Construction General Permit (TCGP) for Storm Water Discharges. Coverage under TCGP is required prior to construction. WisDOT should apply for permit coverage by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI)
prior to, or when requesting Final Concurrence. Permit coverage will be issued by DNR with the Final Concurrence letter after design is complete and documentation shows that the project will meet construction and post-construction performance standards. For more information regarding the TCGP you can go to the following link, and click on the “Transportation” tab:
https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Sectors/Transportation.html

- All projects require an Erosion Control Plan (ECP) that describes best management practices that will be implemented before, during and after construction to minimize pollution from storm water discharges. Additionally, the plan should address how post-construction storm water performance standards will be met for the specific site. The project design and Erosion Control Implementation Plan (ECIP) must comply with the TCGP in order to receive permit-coverage from the DNR.

- Once the project contract has been awarded, the contractor will be required to outline their implementation of erosion control measures as it relates to the construction project, as well as their construction methods in the ECIP. An adequate ECIP for the project must be developed by the contractor and submitted to this office for review at least 14 days prior to the preconstruction conference. For projects regulated under the TCGP, submit the ECIP as an amendment to the ECP.

Structure Removal/Bridge Demolition
Conditions related to structure removal or demolition may be needed depending on the scope of the project. The three most common conditions are:

- Dropping the structure in the waterway - **STSP 203-015**, Removing Old Structure over Waterway, for this project.
- Minimal debris structure removal - **STSP 203-020**, Removing Old Structure Over Waterway with Minimal Debris, will be adequate for this project. Please coordinate with DNR early in the design phase of the project if the bridge must be dropped into the waterway before removal.
- Debris Capture for structure removal - **STSP 203-025**, Removing Old Structure over Waterway with Debris Capture System, should be utilized for this project.

Temporary Structure for Bridge Projects
If temporary structures such as bridges or causeways will be needed early coordination will be required.

Temporary Stream Channel or Culvert
If a temporary channel is needed early coordination will be required.

Asbestos
A Notification of Demolition and/or Renovation and Application for Permit Exemption, DNR form 4500-113 (chapters NR 406, 410, and 447 Wis. Adm. Code) may be required. Please refer to DOT FDM 21-35-45 and the DNR’s notification requirements web page: [http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Demo/Asbestos.html](http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Demo/Asbestos.html) for further guidance on asbestos inspections and notifications. Contact Mark Davis, Air Management Specialist (608) 219-4251, with questions on the form. The notification must be submitted 10 working days in advance of demolition projects, regardless of asbestos quantities. Please refer to WisDOT procedures on asbestos inspection and abatement for supplemental information.

Public Waterway Navigation
The ability for the public to navigate Wisconsin Lakes and rivers in a safe manner is outlined in the Public Trust Doctrine. Based on the state constitution, this doctrine has been further defined by case
law and statute. The proposed project will impact the Fox River, East River and Ashwaubenon Creek which are or may be utilized by recreational craft.

**Navigational Clearance**
- The bridge replacement must maintain the current navigational clearance as measured from the lowest chord of the bridge to the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM). The DNR can help identify the OHWM in the field.
- New structures will need to accommodate waterway traffic. The Fox River crossing will also need coordination with the US Coast Guard and Army Corps of Engineers to determine the proper navigational clearance.

**Bridge Piers & Navigational Channels**
Coordination will be required when designing any bridge pier locations due to navigational concerns and sediment contamination issues.

**Navigational Waterway Markers**
This reach of Fox River, East River, and Ashwaubenon Creek are or may be regularly used by recreational watercraft. It will be necessary to place navigational aids such as waterway markers throughout the construction zone to promote safe passage. Prior to the placement of waterway markers, a Waterway Marker Application and Permit will need to be obtained. For reference, there are two types of waterway markers, informational or controlling/restrictive. During the application process you will be notified if you need informational or controlling/restrictive markers. If controlling/restrictive markers are required, please allot enough time to work with the municipality as a local ordinance will need to be adopted.

The general steps for submission of a Waterway Marker Application and Permit are as follows:


2. Include an aerial map-diagram or engineered-diagram of the work location and the placement of the waterway markers (buoys). If proposed GPS coordinates for each buoy are not provided, then markers placed on the diagram must show distance (in feet) from each marker location and from one permanent fixture as a benchmark.

3. Forward the signed application/permit to myself, as well as the Boating Program Specialist:

   Penny Kanable  
   Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources  
   101 S Webster Street – LE/8  
   Madison, WI 53703

   1. If controlling/restrictive navigational markers are required, also provide the completed application/permit to the local municipality having jurisdictional authority over the area in which the waterway markers will be placed. Consult with the local municipality regarding their ordinance adoption process.

   The Boating Program Specialist will communicate with the local Warden and Recreational Safety Warden in processing and finalizing the permit. If the permit application is incomplete, or
additional information is needed, the Boating Program Specialist will work with DNR’s Regional WisDOT Liaison to resolve.

NOTE: If permanent waterway markers are proposed to be modified, added, or temporarily relocated please include this information in the permit application.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and US Coast Guard Coordination
This project may require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and/or US Coast Guard. Please contact USACE and US Coast Guard for more details.

Other
All local, state, and federal permits and/or approvals must be obtained prior to commencing construction activities.

The above comments represent the DNR’s initial concerns for the proposed project and does not constitute final concurrence. Final concurrence will be granted after further review of refined project plans, Erosion Control Plan, Wetland Impact Tracking Form, Special Provisions, NOI for the TCGP, and additional coordination if necessary. If any of the concerns or information provided in this letter requires further clarification, please contact this office at (920) 412-0165, or email at james.doperalski@wisconsin.gov.

Sincerely,

James P. Doperalski Jr.
Environmental Analysis & Review Specialist

c: Kathie VanPrice
File
F.6

Local Officials Correspondence
2010-2011 Local Resolutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2010</td>
<td>Town of Lawrence #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2010</td>
<td>Town of Lawrence #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 2010</td>
<td>Town of Rockland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17, 2010</td>
<td>Town of Ledgeview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2011</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution to Oppose Proposed Location of Southern Bridge

WHEREAS, the recommendation for a bridge south of De Pere first appeared in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan in 1968. This bridge was envisioned to cross the Fox River in the vicinity of Rockland Road in the Town of Rockland well after the year of 1985; and

WHEREAS, the southern bridge issue was addressed again in 1991 by the Brown County Planning Commission with a study comparing the Rockland Road crossing location to a possible crossing at Heritage and Scheuring Road; and

WHEREAS, in June of 1996 the Brown County Planning Commission adopted the Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan with the recommendation for a crossing within a half-mile corridor surrounding Rockland Road and Red Maple Road to be constructed in 2020; and

WHEREAS, in March, 2000, the Brown County Planning Commission staff creates bypass access guidelines and sends the proposal to Bellevue, Ledgeview, De Pere, Rockland, Ashwaubenon and Lawrence; and

WHEREAS, Wisconsin Act 9 relating to comprehensive planning was passed by the legislature in 1999 and signed into law on May 10, 2000. The Act goes on to state, “Beginning on January 1, 2010 any program or action of a local governmental unit that affects land use shall be consistent with that local governmental unit’s comprehensive plan”.

WHEREAS, in June, 2000, the Town of Lawrence officially maps its portion of the southern bridge bypass completing the official mapping of the bypass right-of-way between CTH X/GV in Ledgeview to Packerland Drive (CTH EB) in Lawrence (See Exhibit “A” map attached to this resolution); and

WHEREAS, in January, 2006, the Town of Lawrence Board of Supervisors adopted a new Comprehensive Plan known as the Town of Lawrence Smart Growth Plan 2025 which included the official mapping of the southern bridge bypass; and

WHEREAS, in February, 2010, the Brown County Planning Commission has proposed additional alternatives for the southern bridge crossing following an Environmental Impact Statement described hereafter:

Alternative 1: Arterial Street Along Scheuring & Heritage Roads
Alternative 2: Arterial Street Along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with a US 41 Interchange)
Alternative 3: Arterial Street Along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (without a US 41 Interchange)
Alternative 4: Arterial Between US 41 and Old Martin Road (with US 41 Interchange).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Town of Lawrence Board of Supervisors strongly oppose Alternative 4 for the following reasons:

1. Not consistent with Town of Lawrence Smart Growth Plan and the Wisconsin Act 9 relating to comprehensive planning.

2. Planning, Design and Construction of infrastructure (i.e. water tower, sewer/water laterals, etc) were made in the Town based on Alternative 2.

3. Considerable financial investments were made by the Town and Town of Lawrence property owners for the construction of infrastructure, including the preservation of right-of-way for future US Hwy 41 access ramps based on the town's official mapping of the southern bridge.

4. Alternative 4 will create a negative impact on areas that were recently developed in accordance to the Town of Lawrence's Official Map and Smart Growth Plan.

5. Many Town of Lawrence residents have made large financial investments on property and homes based on the Town of Lawrence official mapping of the southern bridge bypass. Alternative 4 would have a negative impact on their investments.

6. Many Town of Lawrence residents have also made decisions for property purchases, home purchases, new home construction based on the current low environmental impacts (noise, air quality, etc.). Alternative 4 would increase these environmental impacts negatively and create a nuisance for existing property owners.

7. Alternative 4 does not comply with Brown County Planning Commission's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which states new roadways should minimize negative environmental impacts by following many existing street right-of-way.

8. Alternative 4 crosses the Fox River in an area that is highly used for recreational purposes.

9. Alternative 4 is the furthest south of the proposed alternatives and only a short distance of an existing interchange (Freedom Road/County S). Utilizing a southern bridge crossing route connected to the Freedom Road/County S interchange would provide a more narrow river crossing and fewer economical and environmental impacts than Alternative 4.
Adopted at a regular Town Board Meeting on this 14th day of June, 2010 by the Town of Lawrence Board of Supervisors, Brown County, Wisconsin.

John Klasen, Town Chairman

Judy Benz, Town Clerk
Resolution to Support Proposed Location of Southern Bridge

WHEREAS, the recommendation for a bridge south of De Pere first appeared in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan in 1968. This bridge was envisioned to cross the Fox River in the vicinity of Rockland Road in the Town of Rockland well after the year of 1985; and

WHEREAS, the southern bridge issue was addressed again in 1991 by the Brown County Planning Commission with a study comparing the Rockland Road crossing location to a possible crossing at Heritage and Scheuring Road; and

WHEREAS, in June of 1996 the Brown County Planning Commission adopted the Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan with the recommendation for a crossing within a half-mile corridor surrounding Rockland Road and Red Maple Road to be constructed in 2020; and

WHEREAS, in March, 2000, the Brown County Planning Commission staff creates bypass access guild-lines and sends the proposal to Bellevue, Ledgeview, De Pere, Rockland, Ashwaubenon and Lawrence; and

WHEREAS, Wisconsin Act 9 relating to comprehensive planning was passed by the legislature in 1999 and signed into law on May 10, 2000. The Act goes on to state, "Beginning on January 1, 2010 any program or action of a local governmental unit that affects land use shall be consistent with that local governmental unit's comprehensive plan".

WHEREAS, in June, 2000, the Town of Lawrence officially maps it's portion of the southern bridge bypass completing the official mapping of the bypass right-of-way between CTH X/GV in Ledgeview to Packerland Drive (CTH EB) in Lawrence (See Exhibit "A" map attached to this resolution); and

WHEREAS, in January, 2006, the Town of Lawrence Board of Supervisors adopted a new Comprehensive Plan known as the Town of Lawrence Smart Growth Plan 2025 which included the official mapping of the southern bridge bypass; and

WHEREAS, in February, 2010, the Brown County Planning Commission has proposed additional alternatives for the southern bridge crossing following an Environmental Impact Statement described hereafter:

Alternative 1: Arterial Street Along Scheuring & Heritage Roads
Alternative 2: Arterial Street Along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with a US 41 Interchange)
Alternative 3: Arterial Street Along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (without a US 41 Interchange)
Alternative 4: Arterial Between US 41 and Old Martin Road (with US 41 Interchange).

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Town of Lawrence Board of Supervisors strongly support Alternative 2 for the following reasons:

1. Consistent with the Town of Lawrence Smart Growth 2025 Plan which was originally written based on Alternative 2.

2. In 2000, the town adopted an official map of the southern bridge crossing and has consistently denied proposed development in that area.

3. Infrastructure (i.e. water tower, sewer/water laterals, etc) was planned and constructed to coincide with Alternative 2. Considerable financial investments were made when constructing infrastructure including preservation of right-of-way for Alternative 2.

4. The Town has repeatedly denied proposed development that would affect the officially mapped area for the southern bridge bypass.

5. Construction of Alternative 2 will increase future development in the Town by connecting the City of DePere's industrial parks (east and west of the Fox River) with the Town’s future Industrial Park.

6. The Town of Lawrence Smart Growth Plan does not include additional or alternate locations for the southern bridge by-pass. Existing developments would be negatively impacted by selecting an alternate location.

7. Many Town of Lawrence residents have made financial decisions for property purchases, home purchases, new home construction based on the Town of Lawrence official mapping of the southern bridge bypass.

8. Alternative 2 complies with the Brown County Planning Commission's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which states new roadways should minimize negative environmental impacts by following many existing street right-of-way.

9. Alternative 2 would have fewer environmental impacts (noise, air quality, etc.) on existing Town of Lawrence residents who have made decisions for property purchases, home purchases, and new home construction based on the environment.
10. Alternative 2 would allow for continued existence of recreational use on other parts of the Fox River.

Adopted at a regular Town Board Meeting on this 14th day of June, 2010 by the Town of Lawrence Board of Supervisors, Brown County, Wisconsin.

[Signature]
John Klasen, Town Chairman

ATTEST:  
[Signature]
Judy Benz, Town Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-02

RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE PROPOSED LOCATION OF SOUTHERN BRIDGE

WHEREAS, the recommendation for a bridge South of De Pere first appeared in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan in 1968. This bridge was envisioned to cross the Fox River in the vicinity of Rockland Road in the Town of Rockland well after the year of 1985; and

WHEREAS, the Southern Bridge issue was addressed again in 1991, by the Brown County Planning Commission with a study comparing the Rockland Road crossing location to a possible crossing at Heritage and Scheuring Road; and

WHEREAS, in June of 1996, the Brown County Planning Commission adopted the Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan with the recommendation for a crossing within a half-mile corridor surrounding Rockland Road and Red Maple Road to be constructed in 2020; and

WHEREAS, in March of 2000, the Brown County Planning Commission staff created bypass access guide-lines and sent the proposal to Bellevue, Ledgeview, De Pere, Rockland, Ashwaubenon, and Lawrence; and

WHEREAS, in February of 2010, the Brown County Planning Commission proposed four alternatives for the Southern Bridge crossing, following an Environmental Impact Statement, described as:

   Alternative 1: Arterial Street along Scheuring & Heritage Roads
   Alternative 2: Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with a US 41 Interchange)
   Alternative 3: Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (without a US 41 Interchange)
   Alternative 4: Arterial between US 41 & Old Martin Road (with a US 41 Interchange).

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Town Board of the Town of Rockland, Brown County, strongly opposes Alternative #4 for the following reasons:

1. Many Town of Rockland, Town of Lawrence, Town of Ledgeview, Village of Bellevue, Village of Ashwaubenon, and City of De Pere residents and business owners/developers have made huge financial decisions for property purchases, home purchases, new home construction, and business development with no prior knowledge of an Alternative #4; and
2. Destruction of existing farm land does not create any benefits; and
3. Old Martin Road is too far South of the flow of traffic; and
4. It is simply too late in the planning process to introduce Old Martin Road when development has already occurred based on the fact that this Alternative was not previously presented.

Adopted this 21st day of June, 2010, at a regularly scheduled Town Board meeting.

By the Town Board

Dennis J. Cashman
Chairman

Vicky L. Vandenbark
Supervisor

Jen R. Schwalbach
Supervisor

Attested by Town Clerk:

Toni L. Carter, WCMC
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN BROWN COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2 (Arterial Street Along Rockland and Red Maple Roads with a U.S. 41 Interchange)

WHEREAS, the recommendation for a bridge South of De Pere first appeared in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan in 1968 and this bridge became known as the "Southern Bridge"; and

WHEREAS, the Southern Bridge issue was addressed again in 1991, by the Brown County Planning Commission with a study comparing the Rockland Road crossing location to a possible crossing at Heritage and Scheuring Road; and

WHEREAS, in June of 1996, the Brown County Planning Commission adopted the Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan with the recommendation for a crossing within a half-mile corridor surrounding Rockland Road and Red Maple Road to be constructed in 2020; and

WHEREAS, in March of 2000, the Brown County Planning Commission staff created bypass access guidelines and sent the proposal to Bellevue, Ledgeview, De Pere, Rockland, Ashwaubenon and Lawrence, all communities in Brown County; and

WHEREAS, in February of 2010, the Brown County Planning Commission proposed four alternatives for the Southern Bridge crossing, following an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), described as:

- **Alternative 1:** Arterial Street along Scheuring & Heritage Roads
- **Alternative 2:** Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with a US 41 Interchange)
- **Alternative 3:** Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (without a US 41 Interchange)
- **Alternative 4:** Arterial between US 41 & Old Martin Road (with a US 41 Interchange)

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Town of Ledgeview hereby supports Alternative 2, the Arterial Street Along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with a US 41 Interchange). The Town of Ledgeview, throughout the many years of planning for the Southern Bridge, have made numerous planning decisions that related to land use and business development that are consistent with Alternative 2.

Adopted by the Town Board of the Town Ledgeview, Wisconsin, this 17th day of August, 2010.

**APPROVED:**

Jeffrey D. Van Straten, Chairman

**ATTEST**

Sarah K. Burdette, Administrator
RESOLUTION #11-109

IN SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN BROWN COUNTY
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2
(Arterial Street along Rockland and Red Maple Roads with a US 41 Interchange)

WHEREAS, the recommendation for a bridge South of the City of De Pere first appeared in the Brown County Comprehensive Plan in 1968 and this bridge became known as the “Southern Bridge”; and

WHEREAS, the Southern Bridge issue was addressed again in 1991, by the Brown County Planning Commission with a study comparing the Rockland Road crossing location to a possible crossing at Heritage and Scheuring Road; and

WHEREAS, in June of 1996, the Brown County Planning Commission adopted the Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan with the recommendation for the Southern Bridge crossing to be located within a half-mile corridor surrounding Rockland Road and Red Maple Road to be constructed in 2020; and

WHEREAS, on September 15, 1998, the Common Council adopted Resolution #98-90 in support of the Rockland Road and Red Maple Road corridor; and

WHEREAS, in March of 2000, the Brown County Planning Commission staff created bypass access guidelines and sent the proposal to Bellevue, Ledgeview, De Pere, Rockland, Ashwaubenon and Lawrence, all communities located in Brown County; and
WHEREAS, in February of 2010, the Brown County Planning Commission proposed four alternatives for the Southern Bridge crossing, following an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), described as:

Alternative 1: Arterial Street along Scheuring & Heritage Roads
Alternative 2: Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads
(with a US 41 Interchange)
Alternative 3: Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads
(without a US 41 Interchange)
Alternative 4: Arterial Street between US 41 & Old Martin Road
(with a US 41 Interchange); and

WHEREAS, Alternative 4 (Old Martin Road alternative) has been eliminated from consideration by the Brown County Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, Alternative 2 (Rockland & Red Maple Road with a US 41 interchange) is the preferred alternative due to the following considerations:

- an interchange at US 41 will improve safety in the US 41 corridor by removing traffic with destinations east of the Green Bay metropolitan area onto already constructed or planned public streets;
- the US 41 corridor in the greater Green Bay metropolitan area is an urban corridor carrying commercial, business and personal travel to northeastern Wisconsin from around the Midwest and an additional interchange at the location of the Southern Bridge will facilitate the planned, strategic movement of this traffic to its intended destination;
- the urban area south of De Pere and Green Bay in Brown County has experienced unprecedented growth over the past 15 years, resulting in traffic congestion which will be alleviated with the construction of an interchange in conjunction with construction of the Southern Bridge at the Red Maple and Rockland Road locale;
- this corridor, along with the interchange on US 41, will provide significant economic growth by providing the necessary infrastructure for planned growth as defined in the City Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, Alternative 2 is consistent with adopted plans of Brown County, City of De Pere, Town of Ledgeview and Village of Bellevue.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT:

The City of De Pere hereby supports Alternative 2, the Arterial Street along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with a US 41 Interchange). The City of De Pere, throughout the many years of planning for Southern Bridge, has made numerous planning decisions that related to land use and business development that are consistent with Alternative 2.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

All City officials, officers and employees are authorized and directed to take such steps as are lawful and necessary in furtherance thereof.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of De Pere, Wisconsin, this 15th day of November, 2011.

Ayes: 8
Nays: 0

APPROVED:

Michael J. Walsh
Mayor

ATTEST:

Charlene M. Peterson
Charlene M. Peterson, Clerk-Treasurer
F.6.2

2016 Local Resolutions
**Local Resolutions, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 17, 2016</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2016</td>
<td>Town of Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2016</td>
<td>Town of Ledgeview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26, 2016</td>
<td>Village of Ashwaubenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2016</td>
<td>Village of Bellevue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 2016</td>
<td>Village of Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2016</td>
<td>Town of Rockland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 25, 2016

County Executive Troy Streckenbach
305 E. Walnut Street
Green Bay, WI 54301

RE: Resolution 16-55
May 17, 2016 De Pere Council Meeting

Dear County Executive Streckenbach:

Please find enclosed a certified copy of Resolution 16-55:

Resolution 16-55: Supporting Southern Metropolitan Area Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Detailed Study Alternative 2 (New Fox River Bridge, Connecting Arterial Street System Between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads with a Full-Access Interchange at Interstate 41)

The De Pere Common Council approved this resolution at their May 17, 2016 meeting.

**The enclosed resolution is the correct copy of the resolution approved by the Common Council; please disregard the resolution mailed to you on May 19.

Sincerely,

Shana D. Ledvina
Clerk-Treasurer

Enclosure
RESOLUTION #16-55
SUPPORTING SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2
(NEW FOX RIVER BRIDGE, CONNECTING ARTERIAL STREET SYSTEM
BETWEEN ROCKLAND ROAD AND RED MAPLE/SOUTHBRIDGE ROADS WITH
A FULL-ACCESS INTERCHANGE AT INTERSTATE 41

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan found that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area developed over the 25 year period into 2021; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the four-lane Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide sufficient additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase, the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere (the Southern Bridge) is implemented; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the expansion in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs to the extent that existing transportation facilities will not adequately accommodate the traffic volume, creating congestion, shipping delays and an ineffective transportation network; and

WHEREAS, a Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to
avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge and State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by providing an efficient and effective transportation system to significantly reduce shipping costs and transportation delays and by attracting and retaining businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic currently on a single four-lane connection to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

Alternative 1: A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;

Alternative 2: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

Alternative 3: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT:

The City of De Pere hereby supports Southern Bridge Project Alternative 2 because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, significantly enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative 2 is also favorably compatible with planning and development decisions made by the City over the last 20 years.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT:

The City of De Pere strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion year of 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT:

The City of De Pere also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the City’s preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of De Pere, Wisconsin, this 17th day of May, 2016.

APPROVED:

\[Signature\]

Michael J. Walsh, Mayor

ATTEST:

\[Signature\]

Shana D. Ledvina, Clerk-Treasurer

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0
RESOLUTION 2016-04

SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2

A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between
Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new
full-access interchange at Interstate 41

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that
existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan
Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge
(State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this
project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional
capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction
of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge
was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that
volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new “Southern Bridge” and connecting arterial street system south of downtown
De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high
cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57
south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De
Pere will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to
attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize
congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing
locations instead of one; and
WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

**Alternative 1:** A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;

**Alternative 2:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

**Alternative 3:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Lawrence supports Southern Bridge Project Alternative 2 only because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, significantly enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative 2 is the only choice that is most compatible with the planning and development decisions made by the Town over the last 20 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Lawrence strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion year of 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town of Lawrence also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the (city's/village's/town's) preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Lawrence, Wisconsin, this 11th day of April, 2016.

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Lanny J. Tisbaldi, Chairperson

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Jennifer Messerschmidt, Clerk/Treasurer
RESOLUTION 2016-04
TOWN OF LEDGEVIEW
BROWN COUNTY, WISCONSIN

SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2

(NEW FOX RIVER BRIDGE, CONNECTING ARTERIAL STREET SYSTEM, AND ROCKLAND ROAD AT RED MAPLE ROAD – SOUTHERBRIDGE ROAD)

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new “Southern Bridge” and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

**Alternative 1:** A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;
Alternative 2: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

Alternative 3: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Ledgeview supports Southern Bridge Project Alternative 2 because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, significantly enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative 2 is also the most compatible with the planning and development decisions made by the town over the last 20 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Ledgeview strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion year of 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town of Ledgeview also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the town’s preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Ledgeview, Wisconsin, this 4th day of April, 2016.

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Philip J. Dahlen, Chairman

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Sarah K. Burdette, Clerk/Administrator

Posted: 4-20-16
Published: 4-21-16
VILLAGE OF ASHWABENON
BROWN COUNTY, WISCONSIN

RESOLUTION R4-4-16

SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new “Southern Bridge” and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

**Alternative 1:** A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;

**Alternative 2:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

**Alternative 3:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and
WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Ashwaubenon supports Southern Bridge Project Alternative 2 because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, significantly enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative 2 is also the most compatible with the planning and development decisions made by the village over the last 20 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Village of Ashwaubenon strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion year of 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Village of Ashwaubenon strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the village’s preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Village Board of Trustees of the Village of Ashwaubenon the 26th day of April, 2016.

Michael W. Aubinger, President

ATTEST:

Patrick W. Moynihan, Jr., Clerk-Treasurer
VILLAGE OF BELLEVUE
RESOLUTION # V-11-2016

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE #2
 (NEW FOX RIVER BRIDGE, CONNECTING ARTERIAL STREET SYSTEM, AND FULL ACCESS INTERCHANGE AT INTERSTATE 41)

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new “Southern Bridge” and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

Alternative 1: A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;
Alternative 2: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;
Alternative 3: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project; and
WHEREAS, the Village of Bellevue supports Southern Bridge Project Alternative #2 because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative #2 is also the most compatible with the planning and development decisions made by the Village over the last 20 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Village of Bellevue strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion year of 2016.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Village of Bellevue also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the Village’s preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Village Board of the Village of Bellevue, Wisconsin, this 25th day of May 2016.

Approved:  
Steve Soukup, President

Attest:  
Karen M. Simons, Clerk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres. Soukup</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Gauthier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Kaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Katers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Daul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION 2016-09
SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2
NEW FOX RIVER BRIDGE, CONNECTING ARTERIAL STREET SYSTEM BETWEEN ROCKLAND ROAD AND RED MAPLE/SOUTHBRIDGE ROAD, AND A NEW FULL ACCESS INTERCHANGE AT INTERSTATE 41

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new “Southern Bridge” and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and
WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

**Alternative 1:** A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;

**Alternative 2:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

**Alternative 3:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Hobart supports Southern Bridge Project Alternative _ because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, significantly enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative _ is also the most compatible with the planning and development decisions made by the Village over the last 20 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Village of Hobart strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion year of 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Village of Hobart also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the Village's preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

**Effective Date.** This Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its passage and approval.

Dated in Hobart, Wisconsin this 27th day of June, 2016.
Attest:

Mary R. Smith
Village Clerk-Treasurer

Vote: Aye 5
Nay 0
Abstain 0
Absent 0

Richard R. Heidel
Village President
Resolution #2016-03
Non-Support of Southern Bridge
 Adopted by the
Town Board of the Town of Rockland, Brown County, Wisconsin

WHEREAS, the City of De Pere has been unwilling to negotiate in good faith with the Town of Rockland, Brown County, Wisconsin, regarding a fair and reasonable border agreement; and

WHEREAS, the City of De Pere continues to exercise its unfair three-mile extraterritorial land division review requiring minimum 10-acre land divisions within the Town of Rockland; and

WHEREAS, the City of De Pere uses a parcel located within the Town of Rockland as its border to designate the three-mile review limit; and

WHEREAS, the city of De Pere negotiated a contract with NEW Water which prohibits the Town of Rockland from sewer service unless a landowner annexes into the City of De-Pere for service; and

WHEREAS, the City of De Pere’s unfair control of the Town of Rockland prevents its landowners and residents to exercise their property rights and negatively impacts the Town’s residents and landowners’ financial security;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Rockland, Brown County, Wisconsin, opposes the City of De Pere’s attempt to locate a southern bridge until such time as they rescind their control over the Town of Rockland.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town of Rockland, Brown County, Wisconsin, asks our federal and state legislators to withhold any action on a proposed southern bridge until these issues are resolved.

Adopted this 20th day of June, 2016.

By the Town Board:  
Chairman
Supervisor
Supervisor

Attested by Town Clerk:  
John B. Charette
F.6.3

2019 -2020 Local Resolutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 2019</td>
<td>Village of Ashwaubenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4, 2020</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3, 2020</td>
<td>Town of Ledgeview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING SUPPORT FOR SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY (EIS) ALTERNATIVE 2

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new "Southern Bridge" and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere, and full-access interchange with Interstate 41 will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere, and full access interchange with Interstate 41 will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge, Interstate 41 interchange, and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:

Alternative 1: A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;
**Alternative 2:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

**Alternative 3:** A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new overpass at Interstate 41; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Ashwaubenon approved Resolution R4-4-16 supporting Alternative 2 including a new Southern Bridge between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, connecting arterial street system, and full-access interchange with Interstate 41 on April 26th, 2016.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Village of Ashwaubenon reaffirms its support for Southern Metropolitan Area Environmental Impact Study (EIS) Alternative 2 including a new Southern Bridge between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, connecting arterial street system, and full-access interchange with Interstate 41.

Adopted by the Village Board of Trustees of the Village of Ashwaubenon this 17th day of December 2019.

Mary C. Kardoske, Village President

ATTEST:

Patrick W. Moynihan, Jr., Village Clerk-Treasurer
RESOLUTION #20-11
SUPPORTING SOUTHERN BRIDGE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY (EIS) FOR A NEW BRIDGE OVER THE FOX RIVER AND CONNECTING ARTERIAL STREET SYSTEM BETWEEN ROCKLAND ROAD AND RED MAPLE/SOUTHBRIDGE ROADS WITH A FULL-ACCESS INTERCHANGE AT INTERSTATE 41

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan found that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area developed over the 25 year period into 2021; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2007; and

WHEREAS, the new four-lane Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide sufficient additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase, the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere (the Southern Bridge) is implemented; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the expansion in 2007, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs to the extent that existing transportation facilities will not adequately accommodate the traffic volume, creating congestion, shipping delays and an ineffective transportation network; and
WHEREAS, a Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge and State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by providing an efficient and effective transportation system to significantly reduce shipping costs and transportation delays and by attracting and retaining businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic currently on a single four-lane connection to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT:

The City of De Pere strongly supports the Southern Bridge Project Alternative 2, namely a new bridge over the Fox River with a connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, with a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41 as the best alternative to minimize traffic congestion as the area grows and to provide an efficient alternative route for an effective public safety response to a public disaster or emergency in the area.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Southern Bridge Alternative 2 will minimize traffic congestion, thereby enhancing economic development in the area, and is also favorably compatible with planning and development decisions made by the City over the last 20 years.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT:

The City of De Pere also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the City’s preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of De Pere, Wisconsin, this 4th day of February, 2020.

APPROVED:

Michael J. Walsh
Mayor

ATTEST:

Carey E. Danen, City Clerk

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0
RESOLUTION _2020-04_
TOWN OF LEDGEVIEW
BROWN COUNTY, WISCONSIN

RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING SUPPORT OF SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN AREA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE 2

NEW FOX RIVER BRIDGE, CONNECTING ARTERIAL STREET SYSTEM, AND A NEW, FULL-ACCESS INTERCHANGE AT INTERSTATE 41 BETWEEN ROCKLAND ROAD AND RED MAPLE/SOUTHBRIDGE ROADS

WHEREAS, the 1996 Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan stated that existing and projected demand for east-west travel in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area should be accommodated in two phases as the area develops over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, the first phase involved replacing the deteriorating two-lane Claude Allouez Bridge (State Highway 32) in downtown De Pere with a four-lane bridge at nearly the same location, and this project was completed in 2008; and

WHEREAS, the expanded Claude Allouez Bridge was expected to provide enough additional capacity to handle traffic volumes until the second phase can be implemented, which is the construction of a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, traffic volumes on the Claude Allouez Bridge increased significantly after the bridge was expanded in 2008, and forecasts by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation have indicated that volumes on the bridge and connecting state highways will continue to rise as development occurs; and

WHEREAS, a new “Southern Bridge” and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will help to minimize traffic congestion and allow the state and its local partners to avoid the high cost of expanding the recently reconstructed Claude Allouez Bridge as well as State Highway 32/57 south of downtown De Pere; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system south of downtown De Pere will enhance economic development efforts by significantly reducing shipping costs and helping to attract and retain businesses and the talented people they employ; and

WHEREAS, a new Southern Bridge and connecting arterial street system will minimize congestion-related safety problems by allowing traffic to be distributed between two Fox River crossing locations instead of one; and

WHEREAS, the following three Southern Bridge Project alternatives are currently being studied:
Alternative 1: A new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial street system between Scheuring Road and Heritage Road;

Alternative 2: A new Fox River bridge, connecting arterial street system between Rockland Road and Red Maple/Southbridge Roads, and a new full-access interchange at Interstate 41;

WHEREAS, Brown County is currently working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and communities in the southern part of the metropolitan area to select a preferred project alternative and complete the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for the Southern Bridge Project; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Ledgeview continues to support Southern Bridge Project Alternative 2 because this alternative will minimize traffic congestion as the area grows, significantly enhance economic development efforts, and maximize safety on the transportation system. Alternative 2 is also the most compatible with the planning and development decisions made by the Town over the last 24 years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Ledgeview strongly urges its state and federal legislators to ensure that the Southern Bridge Project remains a priority to WisDOT and FHWA to enable the EIS and IAJR to be approved and a Record of Decision (ROD) to be signed by or before the scheduled completion by October 2020.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town of Ledgeview also strongly urges its state and federal legislators to support the Town’s preferred Southern Bridge Project alternative and to work to obtain state and federal funding to develop the Southern Bridge Project.

Adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Ledgeview, Wisconsin, this 2d day of February, 2020.

APPROVED:

Phillip J. Danen, Chairman

ATTEST:

Charlotte K. Nagel, Clerk

Posted: 02-05-2020

Published: 02-06-2020
F.6.4

2019-2020 Other Local Officials Correspondence
Local Officials Correspondence, 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 6, 2020</td>
<td>Fox River Navigational System Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2020</td>
<td>Town of Ledgeview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2020</td>
<td>Village of Allouez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2020</td>
<td>Village of Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2020</td>
<td>Town of Rockland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2020</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27, 2020</td>
<td>Fox River Navigational Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2020</td>
<td>City of De Pere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 6, 2020

Project ID: 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector
Brown County, WI

Re: Invitation to Become a Participating Agency on the Tier 1 EIS

Bryan Lipke, P.E.

We look forward to becoming a participating agency on the Tier 1 EIS. We understand our agency’s role in the development of the Tier 1 EIS would include the following as they relate to our area of expertise:

- Provide meaningful and early input on defining the purpose and need, determining the range of alternatives to be considered, and the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis.
- Participate in agency coordination meetings.
- Timely review and comment on the EIS

We understand our comments are also needed on the following documents:

- The Coordination Plan (CP) for Agency and Public Involvement
- The Impact Analysis Methodology (IAM) Report
- Study schedule as shown in the Coordination Plan

Please contact Jeremy or myself with any questions.

Sincerely,
Karen

Karen Flesch
Executive Assistant
Fox River Navigational Systems Authority (FRNSA)
1008 Augustine St.
Kaukauna, WI 54130
920-455-9174 (Direct Line)
920-759-9834 (Fax)
kflesch@foxlocks.org
www.foxlocks.org
From: Sarah Burdette <SBurdette@ledgeviewwisconsin.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 07, 2020 2:24 PM
To: Lipke, Bryan - DOT
Subject: RE: South Bridge Connector, Tier 1 EIS, Brown County, WI; Invitation to become a Participating Agency

Hi Bryan,
The Town Board approved the Town of Ledgeview to be a participating agency in this process.

Will this email suffice as to the proper notification you are looking for or do you need me to put that on letterhead?

Sarah

Sarah K. Burdette
Administrator
Town of Ledgeview

3700 Dickinson Road
De Pere, WI 54115
Phone: 920.336.3360, ext. 108
Cell/Text: 920-639-6083
sburdette@ledgeviewwisconsin.com  www.LedgeviewWisconsin.com

This message originates from the Town of Ledgeview. It contains information that may be confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual named above. It is prohibited for anyone to disclose, copy, distribute or use the contents of this message without permission, except as allowed by the Wisconsin Public Records Laws. If this message is sent to a quorum of a governmental body, my intent is the same as though it were sent by regular mail and further distribution is prohibited. All personal messages express views solely of the sender, which are not attributed to the municipality I represent, and may not be copied or distributed without this disclaimer. If you receive this message in error, please notify me immediately.

From: Lipke, Bryan - DOT [mailto:Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 8:10 AM
To: Baker, Diane <diane.baker@bia.gov>; john.malvitz@wi.usda.gov; ldelo@mail.de-pere.org; Cords, Jeremy L - MUN <jcords@foxlocks.org>; glenmoreclerk@yahoo.com; Wetzel, Patrick W - MUN <PatrickW@townofLawrence.org>; Sarah Burdette <SBurdette@ledgeviewwisconsin.com>; jkoenig@TownofRockland.org; brad@villageofallouez.com; aswanson@ashwaubenon.com; dwessel@villageofbellevue.org; aaron@hobart-wi.org; Weiss, Marilyn - DATCP <Marilyn.Weiss@wisconsin.gov>
Cc: Michaelson, Jill - DOT <Jill.Michaelson@dot.wi.gov>; VanPrice, Kathie - DOT <Kathie.VanPrice@dot.wi.gov>; Johnston, Jonquil - DOT <Jonquil.Johnston@dot.wi.gov>; Runge, Cole M. <Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov>; Paul F-179
Subject: South Bridge Connector, Tier 1 EIS, Brown County, WI; Invitation to become a Participating Agency

Dear Sir/Madam:

Federal Highway Administration, Wisconsin DOT and Brown County are re-initiating the South Bridge Connector study in Brown County, WI and we invite you to become a Participating Agency for the Tier 1 EIS.

Please find attached a formal invitation letter and two project documents, discussed in the letter, for your review and comment.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Note that this will also be mailed to your agency and your help meeting requested timeline for return of comments is appreciated.

We look forward to your response.

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
Planning Project Manager
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Northeast Region
Phone: (920) 492-5703
Cell Phone: (920) 360-9196
Bryan.Lipke@dot.wi.gov
wisconsindot.gov

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.
January 9, 2020

Project ID: 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector
Brown County, WI

Re: Invitation to Become a Participating Agency on the Tier 1 EIS

Dear Mr. Lipke,

Please accept this letter as the Village of Allouez acceptance as a participating agency for the Tier I EIS.

Sincerely,

Brad Lange, Administrator
Village of Allouez
January 9th 2020

WisDOT Division of Transportation System Development - Northeast Region
ATTN: Bryan Lipke
944 Vanderperren Way
Green Bay, WI 54304

Dear Bryan:

I am writing this letter today in response to your December 19th 2019 letter regarding the South Bridge Connector Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study (“the Study”). While the Village of Hobart is in agreement that this is a valuable project for Brown County, we are respectfully declining at this time to participate in the Study. Due to our commitment to the Highway 29-County VV Interchange project, which will be commencing in 2021, we do not believe we would be able to contribute the required time and resources to the Study.

While we are not planning to participate in the Study, we do request that we remain on the mailing and notification list for the project, so that we can continue to monitor the progress.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions about this letter or any other matter related to the South Bridge Connector project, please contact me or visit me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Aaron Kramer
Village Administrator, Hobart, WI
aaron@hobart-wi.org – 920-869-3804

CC: Hobart Village Board
Jerry Lancellle, Director of Public Works, Hobart
January 16, 2020

Bryan Lipke, P.E.
Wisconsin DOT Division of Transportation
944 Vanderperren Way
Green Bay, WI 54304

Mr. Lipke,

Thank you for your invitation to include the Town of Rockland in the process to determine the route and details concerning the South Bridge Connector. Rockland is happy to be a participating agency in this process.

We have reviewed both the Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement, and the Impact Analysis Methodology Report and have no immediate concerns regarding either. The schedule is also agreeable.

As for additional feedback, I’d like to register support for the Rockland Road option, as it makes the most sense for my community geographically.

If you have any questions about this situation, please do not hesitate to contact me on my cell at 920-360-9603. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Dennis J. Cashman]
Dennis J Cashman
Chairman, Town of Rockland
Dear Bryan Lipke, P. E. 

Thank you for this information regarding this important potential project. We are responding to let you know that the City of De Pere will be a participating agency, and we look forward to working together to ensure a successful, and environmentally-responsible, outcome that will have positive impacts for our community and neighbors for generations to come.

We thank you for your time. Please keep us informed of any next steps.

Warmest regards,

Mayor Michael J. Walsh
Hi Bryan,

The Fox River Navigational System Authority had not opposition to the plans as proposed.

Thanks

Jeremy Cords
FRNSA – CEO
The purpose for this memo is to provide City Staff comments on the draft South Bridge Connector, Tier 1 EIS, Brown County, on Section 1 (Purpose and Need) and Section 2 (Range of Alternatives).

Section 1 – Purpose and Need for the Project.

1.3.1 – Address Congestion in the Vicinity of Existing Fox River Bridges

Page 1-5. This section discusses the level of service for facilities in the area, focusing on the Claude Allouez Bridge and WIS 172 Bridge. Discussion on the level of service should include the areas adjacent to the Claude Allouez Bridge and the Main Avenue corridor. At the roundabout, there are significant delays on the south side of the roundabout (northbound traffic on STH 32/57). Traffic during peak hour has been observed to back up from the roundabout to the STH 32/57 and Cook Street intersection. The intersection of Main Avenue and Eighth Street should also be included. There are large backups on the north side of the intersection (southbound traffic on STH 32) during pm peak. The delays occur due to the signal timing required to move east west traffic on the Main Avenue corridor that is using the Claude Allouez Bridge to access IH 41.

Page 1-5. It would be nice to include a table that identifies the range in delay (seconds) along with a description for each level of service.

Page 1-6. In the section Downtown De Pere, additional verbiage should be included to emphasize the high volume of pedestrian traffic and additional bicycle traffic. There are a large number of pedestrian in the Main Avenue corridor due to the large number of businesses, parking areas, and St Norbert College. Additionally, this area has bike lanes and is the primary connection route for bicyclists from the west and east sides. The large number of pedestrians and bicyclists and high traffic volumes create many potential points of conflict and impact safety.
Page 1-6. Lines 21 through 23 discuss the substandard railroad bridge height constraint of 14 feet. It should be noted that there have been two documented incidences over the last few years of trailers hauling hay getting stuck under the bridge, which caused significant traffic impacts.

Appendix A – The first table “Brown County South Bridge Arterial Tier 1 EIS No Build Daily Volume Level of Service Table” should include analysis of the southern leg (northbound traffic) at the Claude Allouez Roundabout, Broadway and Merrill Street intersection, and Main Avenue and Eighth Street intersection.

Section 2 – Alternatives Considered

2.2.1 Step 1: Develop and Screen Alternatives

Page 2-5. Under the “No Build Alternative”, language should be added that this does not address the large number of pedestrians and bicyclists and high traffic volumes in Downtown De Pere that create many potential points of conflict and impact safety.

Page 2-8. Under “Build Alternative: Improve Existing Roads”, language should be added that this does not mitigate the potential conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

2.2.2 Step 2: Evaluate Route Alternatives

Page 2-11. Consider adding the objective to “Improve emergency vehicle response times.” as a bullet point on the bottom of the page.

Page 2-13. Table 2-1, Route 1: Scheuring – Heritage Road, under “Project Objectives/Other Considerations” consider adding the following:

- Would increase the volume of traffic at an existing at grade railroad crossing.
- Would increase traffic volumes in a high pedestrian area that includes the Syble Hopp School, which is for children with special needs.
- In addition to traffic volume, traffic speed will be a concern for west bound traffic exiting the bridge near the Syble Hopp School. Traffic speeds are generally higher off of bridges due to the limited lateral conflicts on bridges.

2.3.1. Representative Corridor Concept

Page 2-29. The last paragraph discussed that “The expected posted speed limit is 40 mph.” This statement raises several questions regarding the analysis of the alternatives

- Were the traffic travel times for Alternative 1 based on the existing speed limits of 25 and 35 mph or the expected posted speed of 40 mph? The traffic travel times should be based on the final posted speed of the corridor after construction.
- If the speed limit is anticipated to be increased to 40 mph for Alternative 1, there should be additional safety concerns for pedestrians and vehicular traffic. From a pedestrian standpoint, Syble Hopp School is located in the corridor in a section of roadway that is 25 mph. There are a large number of driveways along this corridor from Matthew Drive to Lost Dauphin. The majority of vehicles exiting the driveways back onto Scheuring
Road, which will create safety issues on a multiple lane facility with a 40 mph posted speed limit.

- If the speed limit on Alternative 1 is going to remain as is today, this should be listed here and also as a detriment later in the study as the preferred speed limit of 40 mph cannot be obtained.

### 2.3.2 Methodology for Developing Working Alignments

Page 2-29. The first paragraph states “To develop the specific location for the 125- to 150-foot-wide working alignments”. The majority of the right of way established in the City in platted areas is 120 feet (excluding 150 feet from IH 41 to Lawrence Drive).

Page 2-29. Corridor 1. The first paragraph states that a 125 foot to 150 foot wide working alignment will be utilized as part of Tier 2. This will be challenging in sections of Scheuring Road as the right of way is only 90 feet.

Page 2-29. Corridor 2. Under the bullet point, it is noted that the Tier 2 analysis may include shifting the alignment to avoid residential areas in the City. Right of way has been established to a width of 120 feet in these areas. Shifting the road to the north may impact existing utilities installed based on the 120 foot right of way.

### 2.3.3 Corridor

Page 2-31. On the paragraph after Exhibit 2-13, change Matthew Drive to Lawrence Drive. WisDOT reconstructed Scheuring Road from IH 41 to Lawrence Drive in 2011.

Page 2-31. In the paragraph above Exhibit 2-14, it states that “A sidewalk or shared use path would likely be provided” for the Alternative 1 on the west side of the Fox River. The City does not support a shared use path in this area due to the large number of driveways. In urban areas with lots of driveways, shared use paths for bicycles create a concern for bicyclist safety.

Page 2-31. The City would prefer to have bike lanes added to Exhibit 2-15. This route will serve as a major connector for bicycle use.

Page 2-32. The Corridor Alternative 2 references Exhibit 2-13 as the typical section. The City requests that a new section be created for Alternative 2. Under this alternative, the City prefers an urban section with curb and gutter, a shared use path on one side of the road, and no sidewalks. The City is OK with eliminating the bike lanes with the shared use facility. The City prefers a shared use path under this alternative due to the limited private driveways throughout the corridor.
F.7

Public Involvement
F.7.1

2006-2012 Public Involvement Meetings
June 19, 2008 Public Involvement Meeting
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Transportation Improvements in the Southern Portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area

Project Purpose and Need

Brown County Planning Commission in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation & Federal Highway Administration
June 19, 2008

Introduction

Brown County Planning Commission is working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to complete the EIS.

EIS study area includes portions of:
- City of De Pere
- Village of Allouez
- Village of Ashwaubenon
- Village of Bellevue
- Village of Wrightstown*
- Village of Hobart
- Village of Glenmore
- Town of Lawrence
- Town of Ledgeview
- Town of Rockland

*The STH 96 bridge in Wrightstown is included as a secondary study area.

Purpose of Project

To identify the most appropriate methods of addressing existing transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the metro area.

Project Objectives

Improve the transportation system’s ability to handle travel demand generated by existing and planned development within the EIS study area.

Maintain the EIS study area’s efficient growth pattern and emphasize methods of addressing travel demand that complement the study area’s existing and planned land uses.

Enhance the EIS study area’s ability to retain and attract businesses and industries.

Maximize mobility, multimodal accessibility, and capacity on the EIS study area’s existing and planned transportation system.
Project Objectives (continued)

Upgrade the EIS study area’s motorized and non-motorized transportation connections to efficiently move the increasing number of residents, employees, visitors, and goods throughout the metro area and region.

Maximize safety on the EIS study area’s transportation system by minimizing traffic congestion and conflicts.

Ensure that the EIS considers the land use, transportation, and other recommendations in the comprehensive plans and studies that have been approved by Brown County and the communities in EIS study area.

Minimize emissions, impacts on the Niagara Escarpment and other environmentally sensitive areas, and other negative effects of traffic congestion within the EIS study area.

Efficiently link transportation systems and communities in the southern portion of the metropolitan area.

Need for EIS

Five short- and long-term issues addressed in EIS:

1. Transportation Demand
2. System Connections (Linkages)
3. Traffic Capacity/Level of Service
4. Transportation Safety
5. Local Planning Efforts

1. Transportation Demand – Existing and Planned Land Uses

More development = more motorized and non-motorized traffic...

1. De Pere West Business Park (1,000+ acres)
2. De Pere East Industrial Park (400+ acres)
3. Ledgeview Neighborhood Commercial Centers
4. Lawrence Business Park (100+ acres)
5. Hobart Southeast Industrial Park (400+ acres)
1. Transportation Demand – Examples of Existing and Planned Community Facilities

1. New De Pere Elementary School
2. Future De Pere Middle or High School
3. New West De Pere Elementary School
4. Austin Straubel Airport
5. Kiwanis Park
6. Possible De Pere Fire Station

2. System Connections (Linkages)

Commercial Impacts
No Fox River crossing between De Pere and Wrightstown downtowns (10 mile gap) = longer truck trips = higher shipping costs = hard to compete with other metro areas.

Impacts on Downtown De Pere
Hundreds of large trucks passing through city’s downtown each day not compatible with “Main Street” atmosphere.

Other Impacts
As growth occurs, more drivers, bicyclists, walkers, product shippers, and others will want to travel to a variety of places. The area’s north-south transportation facilities are or will be in pretty good shape, but the east-west facilities should be upgraded to complement them.

3. Traffic Capacity

Additional development = additional traffic that is projected to congest the existing street and highway system.

Can assess congestion using Level of Service (LOS) measure.

- LOS A = free traffic flow (very few other vehicles)
- LOS B = reasonably free traffic flow (more vehicles present)
- LOS C = stable traffic flow (even more vehicles present, could affect speeds)
- LOS D = traffic flow becoming unstable (cannot travel at consistent speeds)
- LOS E = unstable traffic flow (frequent acceleration & deceleration)
- LOS F = forced traffic flow (frequent starts and stops, gridlock)

3. Traffic Capacity – Recent Traffic Volumes

Total traffic volumes continue to rise on the study area’s bridges…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crossing Location</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STH 172 Bridge</td>
<td>61,100 (LOS C)</td>
<td>69,600 (LOS D)</td>
<td>76,400 (LOS D)</td>
<td>84,800 (LOS E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Allouez Bridge (2-lane bridge)</td>
<td>26,400 (LOS E/F)</td>
<td>25,500 (LOS E/F)</td>
<td>27,100 (LOS F)</td>
<td>24,700 (LOS E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STH 172-CA Bridge Total</td>
<td>87,500 vpd</td>
<td>95,100 vpd</td>
<td>103,500 vpd</td>
<td>109,500 vpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: LOS = Estimated level of service.*
*Traffic Count Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation.*
3. Traffic Capacity – Recent Traffic Volumes
...and on the study area’s streets and highways.

3. Traffic Capacity – Traffic & Transit Projections (2035)
Traffic is projected to continue to increase on the bridges through 2035...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crossing Location</th>
<th>2001 ADT</th>
<th>2003 ADT</th>
<th>2006 ADT</th>
<th>2035 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STH 172 Bridge</td>
<td>69,600 (LOS D)</td>
<td>76,400 (LOS D/E)</td>
<td>84,600 (LOS E)</td>
<td>112,350 (LOS F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Allouez Bridge</td>
<td>25,500 (LOS E/F)</td>
<td>27,100 (LOS E)</td>
<td>24,700 (LOS E)</td>
<td>37,200 (LOS E/F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STH 172-CA Bridge Total</td>
<td>95,100 vpd</td>
<td>103,500 vpd</td>
<td>109,500 vpd</td>
<td>149,550 vpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LOS = Estimated level of service.
Traffic Count Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation.
Projection Source: Wisconsin Department of Transportation (December 2007).

3. Traffic Capacity – Traffic & Transit Projections (2035)
...and on the area’s streets and highways (even with more transit service).
4. Transportation Safety

As traffic volumes rise, the likelihood of crashes rises as well.
- More vehicles on a road = more opportunities for crashes to occur.
- On a freeway or expressway: High speeds + small gaps between vehicles + sudden & unpredictable movements = high potential for severe crashes.
- Congestion also causes driver confusion, stop-and-go traffic conditions that can result in rear end crashes, etc.

Solution? Minimize traffic pressure on the street and highway system.

5. Local Planning Efforts

Since 1996, a new Fox River bridge and connecting arterial streets have been addressed in at least 17 plans and studies. Some of these include:

- Brown County Year 2020 Land Use and Transportation Plan (1996)
- Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Rockland (1997)
- Brown County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (1998)
- City of De Pere Comprehensive Plan (2000)
- Town of Ledgeview Comprehensive Plan (2000)
- East River Trail Extension Plan (2000)
- Town of Lawrence Comprehensive Development Plan Update (2000)
- Southwest De Pere Development Plan (2003)
- City of De Pere Comprehensive Plan (2004)
- Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Rockland (2005)
- Green Bay MPO Long-Range Transportation Plan (2005)
- Town of Lawrence Smart Growth 2025 (2006)

Summary of Purpose and Need

A significant amount of residential, commercial, industrial, and other development is planned in the EIS study area. The development that occurs in the study area will generate more traffic, which will strain the area’s existing highways, streets, and bridges.

Significant transit service enhancements are not expected to reduce traffic to a point where congestion will not exist.

The ability to retain existing commercial developments and attract new ones to the EIS study area could be harmed by the congestion projected for the existing transportation system, lack of convenient river crossings, and absence of other adequate transportation facilities.

Summary of Purpose and Need

Safe and efficient access must be provided to the existing and planned parks, schools, and other facilities inside and outside the EIS study area.

Additional multimodal transportation system connections are needed to efficiently move people and goods throughout the EIS study area and region.

Safety will likely be affected by increasing congestion if something isn’t done to minimize pressure on the existing street and highway system.

At least 17 plans and studies have been completed over the last 11 years that acknowledge the need for additional transportation facilities in this part of the metro area.
Based on these findings, it is recommended that a range of transportation alternatives and facility types be developed and studied to determine the most effective method of safely and efficiently handling existing and future transportation demand in the study area.

Want more information?
Check out our website
www.co.brown.wi.us/planning/transportation.html
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Transportation Improvements in the Southern Portion of Brown County

Project Alternatives Analysis
Part 1: Non-Construction Alternatives
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Introduction
Brown County Planning Commission is working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to complete the EIS.

EIS study area includes portions of:

City of De Pere
Village of Hobart

Village of Allouez
Town of Glenmore

Village of Ashwaubenon
Town of Lawrence

Village of Bellevue
Town of Ledgeview

Village of Wrightstown*
Town of Rockland

*The STH 96 bridge in Wrightstown is included as a secondary study area.

What Have We Already Done?

EIS Coordination Plan
EIS Purpose and Need Document

An analysis of non-construction alternatives

Do nothing (no-build)
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
Transportation System Management (TSM)
Need for a Transportation Project

Five short- and long-term issues addressed in EIS:
1. Transportation Demand
2. System Connections (Linkages)
3. Traffic Capacity/Level of Service
4. Transportation Safety
5. Local Planning Efforts

The need to address these issues has been confirmed by state and federal cooperating agencies (FHWA, DOT, DNR, EPA, USACE).

Alternatives for Improving Transportation System Operations

Build Nothing (No-Build)
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies
Transportation System Management (TSM) Strategies
New Construction

Build Nothing (No-Build)

Adds no new transportation facilities or services to the EIS Study Area.
Maintains the existing transportation system.
Includes reconstruction of existing streets, highways, and other facilities when lifecycles are complete.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

TDM is designed to reduce automobile trips by:
- Diverting people to other transportation modes.
- Providing alternatives to making certain trips.

Examples of TDM strategies include:
- Mixing land uses, building sidewalks and trails, and calming traffic to enable and encourage walking and bicycling trips.
- Designing arterial streets to move traffic efficiently while minimizing barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Encouraging people to use the area’s mass transit system (Green Bay Metro), telecommuting and flexible work schedules.
Transportation System Management (TSM) Strategies

TSM strategies improve the efficiency & use of the existing transportation system.

Examples of TSM strategies include:
- Placing roundabouts at intersections instead of signals to maximize efficiency & safety.
- Restriping arterial streets to create left turn pockets or two-way left turn lanes.
- Reducing access points along major streets and highways.
- Using Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technologies to improve system operations.

New Construction

Should be considered only when the other strategies will not improve efficiency & safety on their own.

Possible construction alternatives will be identified by:
- Consulting past and present transportation plans & studies.
- Reviewing the county and each study area community’s comprehensive plans.
- Receiving input from the public and local officials.
- Considering socioeconomic factors and environmental constraints.

Alternatives Screening

Alternatives Screening will determine how well each of the four alternatives satisfies the project’s purpose and objectives.

Project Purpose
To identify the most appropriate methods of addressing existing transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of Brown County.

Project Objectives
- Improve the transportation system’s ability to handle travel demand generated by existing and planned development within the EIS study area.
- Maintain the EIS study area’s efficient growth pattern and emphasize methods of addressing travel demand that complement the study area’s existing and planned land uses.
- Enhance the EIS study area’s ability to retain and attract businesses and industries.
Project Objectives (continued)
Maximize mobility, multimodal accessibility, and capacity on the EIS study area’s existing and planned transportation system.
Upgrade the EIS study area’s motorized and non-motorized transportation connections to efficiently move the increasing number of residents, employees, visitors, and goods throughout the metro area and region.
Maximize safety on the EIS study area’s transportation system by minimizing traffic congestion and conflicts.
Ensure that the EIS considers the land use, transportation, and other recommendations in the comprehensive plans and studies that have been approved by Brown County and the communities in EIS study area.
Minimize emissions, impacts on the Niagara Escarpment and other environmentally sensitive areas, and other negative effects of traffic congestion within the EIS study area.
Efficiently link transportation systems and communities in the southern portion of Brown County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>TDM</th>
<th>TAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the transportation system’s ability to handle travel demand generated by existing and planned development to a peak hour level of service (LOS) D or greater within the EIS study area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the EIS study area’s motorized and non-motorized transportation connections to efficiently move the increasing number of residents, employees, visitors, and goods throughout the metropolitan area and region.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the EIS study area’s ability to retain and attract businesses and other employers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize the EIS study area’s ability to attract and retain businesses and other employers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiently link transportation systems and communities in the southern portion of Brown County.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize emissions, impacts on the Niagara Escarpment and other environmentally sensitive areas, and other negative environmental effects of traffic congestion within the EIS study area.</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion:
Because TDM and TSM strategies will not likely achieve many of the project objectives on their own, a range of construction alternatives should be identified and studied to determine the most effective method of safely and efficiently handling existing and future transportation demand in the study area.

Next Step: Identify Construction Alternatives to Study
After that, Develop Set of Reasonable Alternatives

What are Reasonable Alternatives?
Alternatives that are practical and feasible for addressing a project's purpose and need.
Alternatives for which overall social, environmental, and economic impacts can be avoided, minimized, or mitigated to a practicable extent.
Alternatives that are consistent with regional planning goals and objectives.

Source: Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Want more information?
Check out our website
www.co.brown.wi.us/planning/transportation.html

Questions or Comments?
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Introduction

Brown County Planning Commission is working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to complete the EIS.

EIS study area includes portions of:
- City of De Pere
- Village of Hobart
- Village of Allouez
- Village of Ashwaubenon
- Village of Bellevue
- Village of Wrightstown*
- Town of Glenmore
- Town of Lawrence
- Town of Ledgeview
- Town of Rockland

*The STH 96 bridge in Wrightstown is included as a secondary study area.

What Have We Already Done?

EIS Coordination Plan
EIS Purpose and Need Document
An analysis of non-construction alternatives
  - Do nothing (no-build)
  - Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
  - Transportation System Management (TSM)

Need for a Transportation Project

Five short- and long-term issues addressed in EIS:
1. Transportation Demand
2. System Connections (Linkages)
3. Traffic Capacity/Level of Service
4. Transportation Safety
5. Local Planning Efforts

The need to address these issues has been confirmed by state and federal cooperating agencies (FHWA, DOT, DNR, EPA, USACE).
Alternatives for Improving Transportation System Operations

Build Nothing (No-Build)

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

Transportation System Management (TSM) Strategies

New Construction

Build Nothing (No-Build)

Add no new transportation facilities or services to the EIS Study Area.

Maintains the existing transportation system.

Includes reconstruction of existing streets, highways, and other facilities when lifecycles are complete.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies

TDM is designed to reduce automobile trips by:

- Diverting people to other transportation modes.
- Providing alternatives to making certain trips.

Examples of TDM strategies include:

- Mixing land uses, building sidewalks and trails, and calming traffic to enable and encourage walking and bicycling trips.
- Designing arterial streets to move traffic efficiently while minimizing barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Encouraging people to use the area’s mass transit system (Green Bay Metro).
- Telecommuting and flexible work schedules.

Transportation System Management (TSM) Strategies

TSM strategies improve the efficiency & use of the existing transportation system.

Examples of TSM strategies include:

- Placing roundabouts at intersections instead of signals to maximize efficiency & safety.
- Restriping arterial streets to create left turn pockets or two-way left turn lanes.
- Reducing access points along major streets and highways.
- Using Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technologies to improve system operations.
New Construction

Should be considered only when the other strategies will not improve efficiency & safety on their own.

Possible construction alternatives will be identified by:
- Consulting past and present transportation plans & studies.
- Reviewing the county and each study area community's comprehensive plans.
- Receiving input from the public and local officials.
- Considering socioeconomic factors and environmental constraints.

Alternatives Screening

Alternatives Screening will determine how well each of the four alternatives satisfies the project's purpose and objectives.

Project Purpose
To identify the most appropriate methods of addressing existing transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of Brown County.

Project Objectives
- Improve the transportation system's ability to handle travel demand generated by existing and planned development within the EIS study area.
- Maintain the EIS study area's efficient growth pattern and emphasize methods of addressing travel demand that complement the study area's existing and planned land uses.
- Enhance the EIS study area's ability to retain and attract businesses and industries.
- Maximize mobility, multimodal accessibility, and capacity on the EIS study area's existing and planned transportation system.
- Upgrade the EIS study area's motorized and non-motorized transportation connections to efficiently move the increasing number of residents, employees, visitors, and goods throughout the metro area and region.
- Maximize safety on the EIS study area's transportation system by minimizing traffic congestion and conflicts.
- Ensure that the EIS considers the land use, transportation, and other recommendations in the comprehensive plans and studies that have been approved by Brown County and the communities in EIS study area.
- Minimize emissions, impacts on the Niagara Escarpment and other environmentally sensitive areas, and other negative effects of traffic congestion within the EIS study area.
- Efficiently link transportation systems and communities in the southern portion of Brown County.
**Project Objective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>TDM</th>
<th>TSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the transportation system's ability to handle travel demand generated by existing and planned development in a manner to prevent or reduce a peak hour level of service (LOS) D or greater within the EIS study area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the EIS study area's contiguous growth pattern and emphasize methods of addressing travel demand that complement the land uses planned for the study area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the EIS study area's ability to retain and attract businesses and industries.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade the EIS study area's motorized and non-motorized transportation linkages to efficiently move the increasing number of residents, employees, visitors, and goods throughout the metropolitan area and region.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize mobility, multimodal accessibility, and capacity on the EIS study area's existing transportation system.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain safety on the EIS study area's transportation system by minimizing traffic congestion and conflicts.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the project candidates the least cost transportation solutions, and alternative strategies and solutions consider the entire transportation system and not just the linkages.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize vehicle emissions, impacts on the fragile ecosystems, and other environmentally sensitive assets, and other negative environmental effects of traffic congestion within the EIS study area.</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiently link transportation systems and corridors in the southern portion of Brown County.</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:**

Because TDM and TSM strategies will not likely achieve many of the project objectives on their own, a range of construction alternatives should be identified and studied to determine the most effective method of safely and efficiently handling existing and future transportation demand in the study area.

**Next Step: Identify Construction Alternatives to Study**

**After that, Develop Set of Reasonable Alternatives**

What are Reasonable Alternatives?

- Alternatives that are practical and feasible for addressing a project's purpose and need.
- Alternatives for which overall social, environmental, and economic impacts can be avoided, minimized, or mitigated to a practicable extent.
- Alternatives that are consistent with regional planning goals and objectives.

Source: Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).
Public Comments from the April 23, 2009, PIM

The following table summarizes the action comments that were received during the April 23, 2009, PIM. It should be noted that individual comments often expressed more than one sentiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rockland-Red Maple corridor is still the best option because of previous investments and other reasons.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A corridor between CTH S and CTH ZZ along Hickory Road makes sense because the river channel is narrow and it is not near many residences.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A corridor between CTH S and CTH ZZ along Little Rapids Road makes sense because the river channel is narrow and it is not near many residences.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not put a new river crossing within the Rockland-Red Maple corridor because development has been allowed along it.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Road should not be chosen because it is too far south and is home to wildlife.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter where the bridge goes, it needs to have bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must decide if this should be a high speed bypass or a low speed access route.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new crossing should not be south of Rockland Road.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regardless of where the new corridor is built, please decide as soon as possible.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rockland-Red Maple and Scheuring-Heritage corridors are acceptable.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build one bridge along the Rockland-Red Maple or Scheuring-Heritage corridor and another bridge at Little Rapids Road.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be a high speed bypass.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we need a new bridge corridor?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Final Set of Detailed Alternatives Identified by the EIS Lead Agencies
Southern Brown County Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Detailed Study Alternative 1: Arterial Street Along Scheuring & Heritage Roads - February 10, 2010

Legend

- Highways
- County Highway
- Street Centerline
- Railroad
- EIS Corridor Alignment
- Municipal Districts
- Lakes, Ponds & Rivers & Streams
- EIS Boundary
- Historic Sites & Districts

Southern Brown County Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
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Southern Brown County Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
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Southern Brown County Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Detailed Study Alternative 2: Arterial Street Along Rockland & Red Maple Roads (with interchange) & Planned Land Uses - February 10, 2010
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Next Steps

Present alternative retention and elimination recommendations to EIS Stakeholder Committee, Cooperating Agencies, and public.

Finalize the recommendations based on committee, agency, and public input.

Receive concurrence from the Cooperating Agencies on the narrowed range of alternatives.

Begin detailed study of the remaining alternatives.

Summary of IAJR Criteria

- Will new interchange improve traffic flow and capacity at existing interchanges?
- Will TSM and/or TDM strategies solve problems instead?
- Will new interchange improve safety?
- Will new interchange connect to public streets/highways?
- Is new interchange consistent with local and regional plans?
- How does new interchange “fit” with other existing/planned interchanges along interstate corridor?
- If development is driving the request for new interchange, are development and transportation system improvements coordinated?
- Does the interchange request include the status of the environmental process?

Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR)

**Federal requirement.** IAJR must be completed to determine if interchange can be added to an existing or designated interstate.

Current federal transportation law states that US 41 is designated as an interstate, so IAJR must be completed to see if new interchange can be built.

IAJR requires that eight criteria be satisfied before interchange can be approved.

**All eight criteria must be satisfied.**

Want more EIS information?

Check out our website

www.co.brown.wi.us/planning

(Click on the Transportation Option)
Public Comments from the May 18, 2010, PIM

The following table enumerates the written comments that were received during and after the May 18, 2010, PIM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made investments in homes along the Scheuring-Heritage corridor because plans showed the Rockland-Red Maple corridor as the location of the new bridge and connecting streets. A new bridge and widened streets along Scheuring and Heritage Roads will cause financial harm and reduce livability.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rockland-Red Maple corridor still makes the most sense because of the investments that have been made.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the Old Martin Road Alternative because of its impact on existing homes and because it was never discussed as an option in the past.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates the work that has been done for the EIS and the way this meeting was handled.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new bridge should be built along the Scheuring-Heritage corridor because it would provide the most relief to the Claude Allouez Bridge and would be the most cost-effective.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new bridge should connect to Little Rapids Road because a bridge at this location will have the least impact on aesthetics and existing residents.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new bridge should not be built along the Scheuring-Heritage corridor because there would be too many impacts on homes, schools, and daycare centers.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People should be able to vote on where the new bridge will go.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old Martin Road alternative makes the most sense.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned that development was allowed next to the Rockland-Red Maple corridor during the period when this was assumed to be the bridge corridor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we really need another Fox River crossing?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new bridge needs to be designed to accommodate rowing events.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed to the Rockland-Red Maple option because people weren’t informed that this could be the bridge corridor when they bought their homes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We own more than 50 acres of land along US 41 and Southbridge Road, and we are counting on this being the bridge corridor because we want to develop along it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the Rockland-Red Maple option, but this bridge should have been built before the Claude Allouez Bridge was rebuilt.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheuring-Heritage is the best choice, Rockland-Red Maple is the next best choice, and Old Martin Road is a bad choice.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be a high-speed facility south of De Pere, not an arterial street.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F.7.2

2019-2020 Public Involvement Meetings
December 11, 2019 Public Involvement Meeting
The first Public Involvement Meeting for the South Bridge Connector Project was held on Wednesday, December 11, 2019 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in the cafeteria at Altmayer Elementary School in De Pere. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a status update on the South Bridge Connector Study and give attendees the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback.

Approximately 3,500 postcards were mailed in advance to property owners, businesses, and stakeholders informing them of the meeting. Brown County also issued a Press Release, and the meeting was advertised in the Green Bay Press Gazette on Thursday, November 28, 2019 and the Green Bay Press Times on Friday, November 29, 2019.

A total of 269 people signed in at the meeting. The meeting was an open house format. Exhibits were on display around the room for people to browse at their leisure and ask questions. The exhibits displayed an overview of the alternatives considered and retained for detailed analysis; parks, schools, floodplains, and community resources in the project area; and the history and timelines for the proposed project. Representatives from Brown County, WisDOT, and the consultant team were available to answer questions about the study and receive input from the attendees.

At 6:45 p.m. a representative from Brown County gave a presentation on the history of the project and the process going forward.

Comment forms were available at the meeting for participants to submit. Following the meeting, the public was able to submit comment forms to Brown County until January 10, 2020. At the end of the comment period, Brown County collected 39 comment letters (total of those handed in at the meeting and submitted after the meeting).

The exhibits, presentation, and handouts were made available on the South Bridge Connector project website after the meeting. The project website is available at: https://www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/

Overall comment themes include:

- 10 commenters indicated preference for Rockland/Red Maple Roads Alternative
- 2 commenters indicated preference for Heritage Road Alternative
• 4 commenters disliked all alternatives and/or do not think project will help
• 10 commenters recommended crossing the river at Little Rapids and using the County S/Freedom Road interchange and Midway Road as part of the alternative
• 3 commenters urged completion of the project as soon as possible
• 4 commenters expressed concerns about Old Plank Road and neighborhood
• 3 commenters requested sidewalks and bike lanes as part of the eventual selected alternative
• 9 commenters expressed property value concerns

Specific concerns and questions raised included:

**Residential**
- How will property values be impacted?
- This is detrimental to property values
- Who will reimburse property owners for their loss in property value?
- How will the purchase price of the property to be acquired be determined?
- Request for a sound barrier wall for the Trailside Estates Subdivision
- What will be done for noise and vibration abatement, appearance, and light containment?
- Will land owners be notified of impacts of project and if right-of-way will be required?
- Concern over the amount of residential properties impacted and cost incurred by placing the project in high residential areas.

*Response:* It is difficult to say how a new road and bridge will affect property values because there are so many factors at play. Brown County will work to minimize impacts to residences. All land owners whose property will be impacted will be contacted in advance of construction. Residents (both owners and renters) are protected by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Mitigation measures, including those for noise, vibration, and light, will be determined during the Tier 2 phase.

**Old Plank Road and Neighborhood**
- Rockland Road dead ends on a historic Rustic Road (one of 120 in the State of Wisconsin); doesn’t this designation by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation protect the building over such historic roads?
- Opposed to the desecration of Old Plank Historic Road designation
- Please provide sidewalks and bike lanes in this area
- Speeding through Old Plank neighborhood area is a concern
- Various concerns for the intersection of Rockland Road with WIS 57, including:
  - Speed limit should be reduced along WIS 57
  - Bus drivers dislike turning left from Rockland Road onto WIS 57 because cars are going very fast
  - In winter, road conditions can get icy, which makes it risky to turn out into fast moving traffic
  - Project should include a bike and pedestrian crossway at the intersection to get to the Fox River Trail

*Response:* Brown County will work to minimize impacts the Old Plank Road and surrounding neighborhood. It is too early in the process to determine know the exact design of the roadway and
intersection at this location. Further intersection analysis will be conducted during Phase 2; however, Brown County will work to make the intersection as safe as possible while minimizing impacts to the surrounding environment. Brown County intends to include sidewalks and bike lanes along the roadway, and maintain access to Fox River Trail.

**Businesses**
- Downtown businesses would object to a bypass, as it would divert traffic from driving by their business
- What do the downtown businesses think of diverting traffic from the city area?
- If traffic is diverted away from downtown De Pere businesses, what will be the economic impact on the City of De Pere?
- If Heritage Road route is chosen, how would the Belmark Production and Office Facilities be affected?

Response: Study area communities recognize a new Fox River crossing as an important transportation system link to support future growth and travel demand. According to the City of De Pere, business owners on Main Avenue have noted the difficulty that customers experience with on-street parking on congested Main Avenue. Reducing congestion in downtown De Pere may increase pedestrian safety as less cars will be traveling through the area. Impacts to specific businesses will be determined during the Phase 2 process.

**Environmental**
- There are several bald eagle nesting sites along the Fox River, including across from Red Maple Road, that would be impacted
- What is the environmental impact of building another bridge on the Fox River bottom? Concern about river impacts, especially after just having completed a major cleanup
- This will have a negative impact on boating and recreational practices along the river
- If Rockland Road corridor is selected, it will be important to ensure that bicyclists and pedestrians can cross Rockland Road while on the Fox River Trail
- Concern that since detailed impact analyses are not being completed, impacts to resources are being ignored including agriculture, threatened and endangered species, wetlands, air quality, noise, construction, visual, historic, relocations, and indirect impacts.
- Will results of impact analyses be made public?
- What criteria is being used in weighting all the factors to determine the preferred alternative corridor?

Response: Brown County will work to minimize environmental impacts from the project to the extent possible. The County will continue to coordinate with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding protected species within the corridors. The bridge is not expected to impact recreational activities on the river. Further detailed analysis included specific impacts and mitigation measures will be conducted during Phase 2 environmental documents. Brown County intends to provide bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along the roadway and maintain connection to the Fox River Trail. All impacts will be documented in the environmental documents and made available to the public. Brown County will work to balance direct impacts, indirect impacts, and ability to mitigate for these impacts for all resources.
**Cost/Budget:**

- How much will the project cost?
- What is the cost to build the additional bridge? And who pays for it?
- Who is paying for different parts of the project? (i.e., bridges, interchange, intersections, etc.)
- How much will this cost tax payers? What will this do to my taxes?
- The proposed cost to build this is unrealistic (too low)
- Wouldn’t it make sense to get the State to commit their money to the bridge and not a new, unnecessary, interchange?

*Response:* Initial cost estimates have been completed and will continue to be refined. The project will be jointly funded the Federal Highway Administration, WisDOT, Brown County, and local communities (Lawrence, De Pere, and Ledgeview). It is too early to know the impact this will have on tax dollars.

**Design**

- What type of bridge is planned to span the Fox River?
- How will the bridge affect Lost Dauphin Road? Will the bridge be accessed from Lost Dauphin or go over the road?
- Will there be any grade change along the roadway that will result in acceleration or deceleration (engine braking) by large trucks?
- What is the plan for the Rockland Road/County PP intersection? It is near a school as well as residences that need to be taken into consideration.
- What interchange is proposed at Rockland Road/WIS 57/32? Roundabout?
- How many lanes will the road be along Rockland Road? Will it be similar to County GV (which is a 4-lane boulevard)?
- What happens if an interchange is not built at I-41 as part of project?
- Sidewalks and bike lanes are important
- Eliminate the well at Lost Dauphin/Red Maple roads. The well was built in 1998 and has never been placed into service. Property owners will be very concerned if the road infrastructure works around the well at their expense
- A year or so ago, what looked like sewer and water pipes were put in going east from the Rockland/County PP intersection. Was this for the future expansion of the corridor?
- New water pipes were just put in north of Rockland Road from County PP to WIS 57/32 alongside of the road, will they have to be moved if the Rockland Road corridor is chosen? If yes, seems like a waste of money and materials.
- What functional purpose does this South Bridge Connector serve?

*Response:* The purpose of the South Bridge Connector is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing transportation demand and the demand generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area. At this point, only a general corridor and working alignment is known. Specific project designs, such as type of bridge, grade of the roadway, and intersection designs will be further refined during the Phase 2 environmental documents. The roadway is anticipated to be a 4-lane divided roadway similar to County GV. Brown County intends to include pedestrian and bicycle accommodations as part of the project. The sewer installed at the Rockland County PP intersection extended an interceptor sewer to this area to serve development that is not related to the South Bridge Connector. If the Rockland-Red Maple alternative is chosen, the water main should not need to be moved.
**Safety**
- What would the speed limit be on this new or upgraded facility?
- How do you reduce the speed as you drive through residential areas and a nearby school? Who patrols for safety in these areas?
- What are the plans for traffic control, including cars and buses, before and after school? (Altmayer School)
- The bridge project will be extremely dangerous if a vehicle were to go off the bridge in a snow or ice storm

*Response: Brown County will work to make the roadway and intersections as safe as possible while minimizing impacts to the surrounding environment. The expected posted speed limit would be 40 mph. Patrols and school traffic control along the corridor will be maintained by the local communities.*

**Traffic**
- Neither option will sufficiently address the congestion at the existing bridge (although Alternative 1: Scheuring Road-Heritage Road is better)
- The minor traffic jams and congestion is not worth the negative impacts of building a bridge.
- What route do traffic studies recommend? (i.e., where does the current De Pere bridge traffic come from?)
- What percentage of the 30,000 cars over De Pere bridge will use this bypass?
- Has a survey been taken to find out if any of these drivers want or will use this new bridge?
- A new traffic study of Claude Allouez Bridge should be conducted now that the Wrightstown Bridge is complete.
- The roundabout at Claude Allouez Bridge was not sized appropriately to handle current and future traffic. An appropriately sized roundabout could benefit the area more than another bridge.
- The area just south of WIS 172 flooded twice in 2019 and County GV was closed to traffic. Where does the traffic go when this happens?
- How do you plan on moving traffic when the speed limit on County GV is 40 mph in Ledgeview and 35 mph in Bellevue?
- Traffic would be diverted through three separate residential areas.
- Concerns over truck traffic in residential areas.

*Response: Brown County conducted a traffic study as part of the environmental process. Congestion occurs on the Claude Allouez and WIS 172 bridges and is expected to worsen in the future. East-west travel times are longer due to congested traffic conditions at the existing bridges, and will increase with population and employment growth. In addition, the crash rates on the WIS 172 bridge and on roadways in the vicinity of the Claude Allouez Bridge are higher than the statewide average.*

**Construction**
- Are opportunities to expedite the construction possible (as it is needed and overdue)?
- Can County GV be built to WIS 57 before the bridge?
- Concerned about heavy equipment travel on Old Plank Road during construction. The road is historic and fragile. Heavy equipment might damage this.
• Concerned with rushing this process to obtain free state money.
• This process has taken long enough; build it now.

Response: At this point, it is too early to know construction impacts. Construction impacts will be determined during the Phase 2 environmental documents; however, Brown County will work to minimize impacts to the extent possible. This type of project requires a considerable amount of planning and engineering design. This project has been planned for a long time but Brown County is taking the necessary steps to complete the project in a timely manner.

Availability for Public Input
• Representatives have ignored the viewpoint of residents
• There was no opportunity for public verbal questioning or comments
• The public meeting was badly timed during the holiday season

Response: Brown County has included in the public throughout the environmental process. A public involvement meeting was first held in 2010. Public comments and opinions are important throughout the process and Brown County has taken these into consideration when developing and evaluating alternatives. A public hearing will be held in the summer of 2020, following the publication of the Draft Tier 1 EIS. This will allow the public opportunity to provide verbal testimony.

Suggested Crossing Location at Little Rapids (County S/Freedom Road Interchange)
• Costs less money because it would not require building a new interchange (could tie in at County S Interchange)
• A cost analysis should be performed comparing this option to Southbridge/Rockland Roads
• Bridge crossing would be at narrowest width of the river (less expensive)
• Moves traffic away from downtown
• In a less developed area so fewer impacts on residences
• Money saved from this alternative could be used to improve other roads
• State owns most of the land already
• If County GV were extended south, it would be through mostly farmland
• The residences in this area have a lower property value than other areas so would cost less to acquire
• Going over the railroad at Little Rapids is much easier than at Red Maple Road
• Bridge is less disruptive visually since it is narrower
• Future development will continue south into this area
• This is the halfway point between the De Pere bridge and the Wrightstown bridge

Response: An alternative at this location was evaluated as part of the alternative analysis. It is true that a shorter Fox River bridge connecting to an existing I-41 interchange would be less expensive than building a new interchange. However, the County S interchange would likely need to be reconstructed and expanded if the South Bridge Connector connected to I-41 there, which would reduce the cost savings. These cost savings would also be at least partially offset by the need to build a longer road east of the Fox River. An alternative in that general area that would connect to I-43/WIS 172 would require 7 additional miles of roadway to be built east of the Fox River, compared to Alternatives 1 and 2. Even if an
alternative in this corridor did not extend east to I-43/WIS 172 but rather connected to County GV, it would still require an additional 4 miles of roadway to be built compared to Alternative 1 and an additional 3 miles of new roadway compared to Alternative 2. The effect on residences is within the same range as for Alternatives 1 and 2. Ultimately, alternative corridors using the County S interchange to connect with I-41 were not considered viable because they did not meet the project Purpose and Need: (1) It would provide a new east-west road across Fox River but would be 4.5 miles south of the Claude Allouez Bridge and therefore, would not relieve congestion to the extent of Alternatives 1 or 2; (2) provides less safety benefit than Alternatives 1 or 2 because this corridor would not divert as much traffic from existing routes.

Reasons for disliking Heritage and/or Rockland Road Alternatives

- Wide part of river; this increases bridge cost
- Homes very expensive to acquire in both these areas
- School and factories on east side are expensive to move/relocate
- Too close to downtown bridge so will not lessen traffic flow
- Far more people will be affected by noise in these corridors
- This area continued to grow and develop new residences that will be affected despite years of planning

Response: Brown County is assessing the impacts of both alternatives and will work to minimize and mitigate impacts to the extent possible.

Attachments:

- Handouts
- Exhibits
- Presentation
- Sign-In Sheets
- Photos
- Postcard/Display Ad
- Written Comment Forms
Handouts
Purpose of the meeting

This public meeting is being held to provide a status update on the South Bridge Connector Study and get input from the public. The current study effort, which was re-initiated in November 2019, builds on previous efforts to evaluate alternatives for a Fox River crossing and the connecting roadway between the County F/County EB intersection in the Town of Lawrence, west of I-41, and the County X/County GV intersection in the Town of Ledgeview. The City of De Pere is located between these two study limits.

The proposed project is intended to address the following draft set of needs; these are currently being considered again to see if updates should be made:

- Improve traffic capacity in the area
- Improve transportation linkages in the area
- Accommodate future travel demand generated by development identified in local/county/regional land use plans
- Improve transportation safety in the area

This public meeting is being held in an open house format from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Attendees are invited to review displays, ask questions and provide comments via the comment form included in this handout. Comments received by January 10, 2020 will be included in the public involvement meeting summary prepared by Brown County.

There will be a presentation at 6:45 p.m. providing a project update.

Project information

The study is being re-initiated by Brown County in coordination with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The study will result in a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD). The draft Tier 1 EIS will identify a preferred corridor and the ROD will select the preferred corridor for addressing existing and projected travel demand in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area.

As part of the County’s earlier study efforts, more than 22 alternatives were evaluated, including:

- No-build alternative
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies
  - Diverting people to other transportation modes
  - Providing alternatives to making certain trips
- Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies (improve existing roadways)
- New roadway construction alternatives

Two stakeholder committee meetings and three public involvement meetings were held as part of the earlier study effort (2008-2012). Three alternatives along two corridors were identified as the most effective methods of achieving the project’s purpose and need and retained for detailed study.

The study was put on hold in 2012.
When the study was re-started, it was determined that the EIS would be prepared as a Tier 1 document because the tentative construction timeframe is so far out into the future. The Tier 1 EIS will identify a preferred corridor for transportation improvements rather than a detailed alignment. As funding becomes available for portions of the corridor construction, subsequent Tier 2 environmental documents will be prepared with a greater degree of engineering detail and a more detailed impact analysis for specific improvements in the corridor.

Figure 1: Project History

The study team would like your input on purpose and need, which alternatives should be considered in detail in the Tier 1 EIS, and which alternatives should be eliminated from further consideration, or if you have an idea for a new alternative that has not yet been considered.

After considering your input, and feedback from agencies and Indian tribes, Brown County, WisDOT, and FHWA will determine which alternatives will remain under consideration and be evaluated in detail in the Tier 1 EIS. The study will ultimately identify one preferred corridor for the South Bridge Connector. A public involvement meeting is planned for March 2020 to discuss which corridor should be identified as the preferred corridor.

Figure 2: South Bridge Connector Alternatives Previously Retained for Detailed Analysis
Real estate

Additional land will be acquired as highway right-of-way in order to build this project. It is too early in the study to identify the exact properties and amount of land needed for the project. Brown County would likely begin real estate acquisition two years in advance of construction. Construction will be phased over several years.

Project update/next steps

The study includes another public involvement meeting in the spring of 2020 and a public hearing in the summer of 2020. The Tier 1 EIS is anticipated to end with a signed Record of Decision (ROD) in late 2020. A ROD is the federal government’s approval of the corridor location for the South Bridge Connector. The lead federal agency for this study is the Federal Highway Administration. A Tier 2 document will be completed prior to construction for each section of the project as funding is secured.

Figure 3: Study Timeline

Public input/comments

We encourage you to provide comments on the project, talk to the study team and ask questions. Attached to this handout is a sheet for your written comments and input regarding the proposed project. Please mail any written comments about the project by January 10, 2020 or leave them in the comment box tonight. You can also e-mail your comments to the study team contact listed below.

Your comments assist the study team in developing a project that will serve the needs of the traveling public as well as the needs of the local community. Your input is welcome and appreciated throughout the study process.

For more information, please contact:

Cole Runge
Brown County
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
(920) 448-6480 Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov

Project Website:
www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/
Public Involvement Meeting Comment Form

Project ID 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector
County EB/F in the Town of Lawrence to
County GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview
Brown County

December 11, 2019

Please place this form in the comment box or mail by January 10, 2020 to the address on the back of this sheet. Comments can also be e-mailed to Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov. Your comments assist us in developing a project that will serve the needs of the traveling public as well as the needs of the local community. Your input is welcome and appreciated throughout the design process.

Name: _____________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________

Daytime Phone Number (optional): ________________________________

Email Address (optional): _______________________________________

Please Print Comments (attach additional sheets if necessary):
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

The information in this document including names, addresses, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and signatures is not confidential, and may be subject to disclosure upon request, pursuant to the requirements of the Wisconsin open records law, sections 19.31 - 19.39 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
Exhibits
These alternatives were developed during previous project development and will be reviewed by the study team, the public, and agencies to determine whether and how they will be incorporated in the Tier 1 EIS. The Tier 1 EIS will evaluate corridor alternatives rather than specific alignments.

The Tier 1 EIS will evaluate corridor alternatives rather than specific alignments.
The schedule depends on availability of funds.

This is an example schedule. Time frames associated with each item will vary based on selected alternative.

Assumes that the interchange portion of CTH EB/F - GV/X - Lawrence Drive section is eligible for the Major Highway Development Program as part of the I-41 Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTH EB/F - Lawrence Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAJR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH EB/F - Lawrence Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Dr. - CTH D(Railroad Crossing Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bridge Connector - CTH D(Railroad Crossing Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTH PP - CTH GV/X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement process begun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;N and range of alternatives to be studied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement process complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bridge Connector - Lawrence Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR Const.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Meeting #7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>Public Hearing</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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A Purpose and Need statement is developed as part of the environmental review process to help evaluate alternatives. In 2012, the following was included in the Environmental Impact Statement. The study team would like your input on whether the previously developed Purpose and Need should be updated.

**Draft Purpose and Need Statement**

The purpose of the project is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the metropolitan area.

**Needs:**
- Improve traffic capacity in the area
- Improve transportation linkages in the area
- Accommodate future travel demand generated by development identified in local/county/regional land use plans
- Improve transportation safety in the area

Please use a Post-it note to make suggestions below:
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Southern Bridge Corridor Project History

• Southern Bridge concept included in 1968 Brown County Plan.

• 1996 Brown County Plan recommended a general Southern Bridge corridor location.

• Planning work continued from 1996 to 2006.

• EIS development process began in 2006.

• EIS process needed to include development of an Interstate Access Justification Report (IAJR) for US 41 because it was planned to become an Interstate Highway.

Original EIS Study Area

Brown County began working with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in 2006.

EIS study area originally included portions of:

- City of De Pere
- Village of Allouez
- Village of Ashwaubenon
- Village of Bellevue
- Village of Wrightstown*
- Village of Hobart
- Town of Glenmore
- Town of Lawrence
- Town of Ledgeview
- Town of Rockland

*The State Highway 96 bridge in Wrightstown was included as a secondary study area.
**Original EIS Purpose**

- Identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing and projected travel demand in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area.

**Original EIS “Need”**

- Improve traffic capacity in the area (reduce congestion on/near Downtown De Pere Bridge, etc.).
- Improve transportation linkages in the area (provide more east-west routes for all transportation modes).
- Accommodate future travel demand generated by development identified in local/county/regional land use plans.
- Improve transportation safety in the area.

*Received Purpose & Need Concurrence in 2008*

**Original Range of Alternatives**

Four options were considered for addressing the EIS Purpose and Need:

- **Build Nothing (No-Build Alternative).**
- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies.**
  - Diverting people to other transportation modes (e.g. public transit).
  - Providing alternatives to making certain trips (e.g. telecommuting for work trips).
- **Transportation System Management (TSM) Strategies.**
  - Improving the efficiency of existing streets/highways to avoid having to expand them or build new ones (e.g. removing parking, restriping streets to add left turn lanes).
- **New Construction.**

The No-Build, TDM, and TSM options would not adequately address the EIS Purpose and Need.

At the time, new construction was believed to be the only way to adequately address the Purpose and Need.

Construction alternatives were identified by:

- EIS Lead and Cooperating Agencies.
- Stakeholder Committee (Communities, School Districts, etc.).
- The Public (April 2009 Public Information Meeting).
- Community Comprehensive Plans.
- Community and Regional Transportation Plans/Studies.

**22 Build Alternatives**
Original Range of Alternatives

Screened all construction options based on EIS Purpose & Need as well as nine project objectives identified at the beginning of the EIS process.

Presented the results to the public at a Public Information Meeting (PIM) in May of 2010, incorporated public comments into screening process.

Recommended eliminating many alternatives from further study based on results of screening process.

*Received Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study Concurrency in 2011*

Draft EIS Document Development

Conducted detailed study of the remaining alternatives.

20+ environmental impacts were studied in detail. Examples:
- Economic (business retention and attraction)
- Social (neighborhoods, schools, etc.)
- Air and water quality
- Archaeological and historical resources
- Threatened/endangered species

Presented findings to EIS Stakeholder Committee and Cooperating Agencies.

*Completed Original Draft EIS in 2012*

Post-2012 Activities

- EIS process suspended to conduct an operations and engineering analysis to screen remaining corridor alternatives.
- Brown County worked with a consulting firm on this analysis between 2012 and 2019.
- During this time, sections of corridor alternatives were eliminated.
  - County Highway GV because it needed to be reconstructed before EIS would be finished (a separate environmental document was prepared for GV).
  - County Highways G and MM because these were not expected to be expanded and would no longer be connected to EIS corridors after GV was eliminated.
- Also, EIS would now be prepared as a Tier I document because there was no reasonable expectation money would be available for the project when EIS is finished (federal fiscal constraint requirement).
Next Steps

**State has offered to design & build a new interchange for Southern Bridge Corridor as part of I-41 Expansion Project if ROD signed by October of 2020.**

Brown County and communities directly impacted by corridors (Lawrence, De Pere, Ledgeview) jointly funding consulting team to help meet this deadline.

From WisDOT Secretary-Designee Craig Thompson to Brown County Executive Troy Streckenbach:

Upon Brown County’s completion of the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement and receipt of the Record of Decision (ROD) that identifies the preferred Southern Bridge Arterial corridor and I-41 interchange location, WisDOT will design and construct the I-41 and Southern Bridge Arterial Interchange as part of the I-41 Expansion Project. This commitment is contingent upon Brown County completing a ROD by October 2020.
The Southern Bridge Project is Now:


Questions or Comments?
Postcard/Display Ad
For questions about the meeting, contact:
Cole Runge, Brown County Planning Commission
(920) 448-6480
Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov
Project information is available online at:
www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT OPEN HOUSE
Brown County, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), is re-initiating the National Environmental Policy Act process to study corridor alternatives for a southern bridge across the Fox River. This will address the existing and future transportation issues in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area.

You are invited to a public involvement meeting to ask questions and provide feedback about this proposed project.

December 11, 2019
6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Presentation at 6:45 p.m.
Altmayer Elementary School
3001 Ryan Road, De Pere, WI 54115

The objective of this meeting is to provide a status update and discuss upcoming activities. You are welcome to attend anytime between 6:30 p.m. and 8:30 p.m. Brown County will be giving a presentation at 6:45 p.m. Representatives will be available to discuss the transportation study, take comments, and answer questions.

If you are deaf or hard of hearing and require an interpreter, you may request one at least three working days prior to the meeting via the Wisconsin Telecommunications Relay System (Dial 711).

For questions about the meeting, contact:
Cole Runge, Brown County Planning Commission
(920) 448-6480
Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov
Project information is available online at:
www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/
March 19, 2020 Public Involvement Event
South Bridge Connector
Public Involvement Event

Location: Project Website

Event Date: March 19, 2020

The Lead Agencies scheduled a Public Involvement Meeting on Thursday, March 19, 2020, 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. at Altmayer Elementary School. However, due to recommendations and orders from the state and federal government to limit the spread of the coronavirus (COVID-19), the in-person meeting was indefinitely postponed. Instead of holding an in-person meeting, the project team made the meeting materials available for public review on the project website and invited comments on these materials.

Prior to the change in meeting format, approximately 3,500 postcards were mailed in advance to property owners, businesses, and stakeholders informing them of the meeting. Brown County also issued a Press Release, and the meeting was advertised in the Green Bay Press Gazette on Sunday, March 8, 2020 and the Green Bay Press Times on Friday, March 6, 2020.

Following the decision to indefinitely postpone the in-person meeting, Brown County mailed another approximately 3,500 postcards to property owners, businesses, and stakeholders informing them of the meeting. Brown County also sent out a statement to the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Public Participation Process list, which includes over 250 organizations and individuals, informing them project materials were available on the website and available for review.

The handout, recorded presentation, and a narration of the exhibits were posted to the project website on March 19, 2020 before the originally scheduled meeting time. The presentation summarized the December public involvement meeting, the progress made on the study since then, and the next steps. The exhibits displayed an overview of the environmental process, traffic and crash data, the alternatives screening process, resource impact analysis, and preferred alternative identification criteria.

On March 19th, there were 366 unique visits/individual views to the project website. The project website was viewed a total of 1,461 times between March 19, 2020 to April 20, 2020. Of the 1,461 total views, 593 were new (or non-repeat) users who had never previous been to the site. Brown County encouraged participants to submit comments via email, phone, or mail. Comments on the materials were accepted until April 20, 2020. At the end of the comment period, 25 comments were collected.
Overall support for different alternatives, and the reasoning for their support, include:

- 8 commenters prefer Corridor Alternative 2
  - This corridor is better located relative to where growth is occurring, would better alleviate congestion to the existing roadway system, and may have less impact to residential neighborhoods than Corridor Alternative 1.

- 2 commenters prefer Corridor Alternative 1
  - This corridor uses existing roads and is a more direct route so would presumably cost less; much of the corridor is commercial so would presumably be less impactful to residences than Corridor Alternative 2.

- 5 commenters suggest using a corridor further south than Corridor Alternative 2, such as crossing the Fox River at Little Rapids and/or using County S or Midway Road
  - This corridor would create a true bypass of the city, would accommodate future regional growth to the south, and would travel through less developed areas so would be expected to have less impact on residences.

Specific questions and concerns raised in submitted comments included:

**Comments about Corridor Alternative 1**

- Heritage Road is already too congested
- Traffic and safety concerns around schools located along Heritage Road
- Widening Heritage Road would have a negative impact on businesses
- There are too many intersections on Heritage Road
- This corridor is too developed

*Response: Brown County will work to minimize impacts to residences and businesses. Heritage Road (County X) currently operates at an acceptable level of service (A/B) and would continue to operate at an acceptable level of service in the future if widened to accommodate the South Bridge Connector.*

**Comments about Corridor Alternative 2**

- Traffic noise will increase
- Too close to residential neighborhoods
- This corridor would cost more

*Response: Brown County will work to minimize impacts to residences and businesses. Some sensitive receptors already experience traffic noise. Traffic noise modeling will occur during Tier 2 to determine existing traffic noise conditions and future traffic noise conditions. No detailed cost estimates have been developed for any of the corridor alternatives.*

**Comments about other alternatives**

- Why wasn’t Old Martin Road considered?

*Response: Old Martin Road was considered during the alternatives screening process (Alternative Route 5/6 Hybrid: Old Martin Road Route with I-41 Interchange). This alternative was eliminated from further consideration because it would require acquisition of more land, including farmland; and lacked public...*
support, and was opposed by the towns of Lawrence and Rockland. In addition, this alternative would not meet the Step 2 objective regarding accommodating existing and planned development because it would provide little to no access to existing area industrial parks and business centers.

- The route should bypass the city and create a direct route from Highway 43 (I-43) to the new southern Bridge. Truck traffic is already a concern on County GV.

Response: Alternatives which connected directly to I-43 were analyzed during the alternatives screening process. These alternatives included Alternative Routes 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11. All these alternative routes were eliminated for various reasons. Because portions of each of them would be on new alignment, these routes connecting directly to I-43 would require acquisition of more land, including farmland. Also, these routes could impact sensitive environmental resources along the Niagara Escarpment. Routes 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 are not consistent with local planning in that they would not serve the existing and planned business/industrial development that is north of Midway Road. Also, these routes which are further south will not alleviate traffic, reduce travel time, or provide the same safety benefit as the corridor alternatives retained for detailed study (Corridor Alternatives 1 and 2).

- An alternative that crosses the Fox River at Little Rapids is the best option. What data is there that shows a southern route crossing the Fox River around Little Rapids won’t alleviate traffic or improve safety to the same extent as the corridor alternatives retained for detailed study?

Response: The Lead Agencies (Brown County, WisDOT, and FHWA) studied a corridor that would cross the Fox River around the Little Rapids area and connect to I-41 at County S (Alternatives 9 and 10 on the Initial Range of Corridor Alternatives Considered on the project’s website) as well as a corridor that would use Midway Road and also connect to I-41 at County S (Corridor Alternative 7).

As part of the 2016 traffic study, a further south corridor that would cross the Fox River and connect to I-41 at County S was evaluated to determine how much traffic would utilize a southern route, how much traffic would be diverted from other bridge crossings, and how it would affect safety. The route evaluated was just south of Little Rapids (where Alternative Routes 9 and 10 cross the river).

The traffic modeling found that a new route at Little Rapids (Alternatives 9 and 10) would only carry 11,500 vehicles per day in the year 2045. In comparison, Corridor Alternative 1, if selected, would carry 31,000 vehicles per day over the Fox River in 2045 and Corridor Alternative 2, if selected, would carry 25,000 vehicles per day in 2045. In addition, WisDOT’s 2016 forecast showed that a new Fox River bridge at Little Rapids would only divert 3,900 vehicles per day (7 percent) from the Claude Allouez Bridge in 2045. This would provide only slight congestion relief in Downtown De Pere. With the bridge farther away from existing and future development, it is less likely to be utilized and, therefore, would not relieve nearly as much congestion in Downtown De Pere as Corridor Alternatives 1 and 2.

The forecasts used for this traffic study were developed using industry-accepted standards that are consistent with WisDOT policy.

Corridor Alternative 7 that would use Midway Road (which is two miles south of Corridor Alternative 2 and one mile north of Corridor Alternatives 9/10) was dropped from consideration because it would also not address congestion in Downtown De Pere as well as Corridor Alternatives 1 and 2. The Lead Agencies assessed the applicability of the 2016 forecast for the Little Rapids crossing to Corridor Alternative 7 and
determined it will not divert as much traffic from the Claude Allouez Bridge as routes farther north (because Corridor Alternative 7 is only one mile from Corridor Alternative 9/10 and is south of the area that is projected to heavily develop over the next 20+ years). In addition, a new Fox River crossing along the Midway Road corridor is not consistent with local plans and has not been identified as the preferred location by any community in the study area.

Regarding safety, since a Little Rapids alternative is farther away from existing and planned development, it would require longer driving distances to and from existing and planned development than Corridor Alternatives 1 or 2. Longer driving distances create a higher exposure to crashes. Since these alternatives would not decrease congestion on the existing Fox River bridges (as described above), it would also not reduce congestion-related crashes to the same extent as the alternatives retained for detailed study.

- Why would the County S interchange need to be rebuilt or expanded as part of a southern alternative?

Response: The two-lane County S bridge over I-41 would need to be reconstructed or widened because it would carry more traffic than it does today (County S currently has 4,000 vehicles per day just west of I-41). The 2016 traffic forecast for a new bridge at the Little Rapids corridor estimated it would carry 11,500 vehicles per day) in 2045. Also, traffic signals or roundabouts would probably have to be installed instead of stop signs at the intersections where the offramps connect to County S.

Comments about Effectiveness of Alternative Corridors

- If the goal is to redirect truck traffic, then Corridor Alternative 1 should be considered since the traffic will flow from one industrial park to the other.
- If a bypass corridor is the plan, then look beyond Corridor Alternative 2 to consider future development and expansion of Brown county

Response: The purpose of the project is to address existing east-west transportation demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area. While the project is needed to address congestion in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges, the purpose is not solely to redirect truck traffic, or to specifically create a bypass. The Lead Agencies will consider many factors when identifying a preferred corridor.

Comments about Design

- When can we see renderings of the project?
- What will the design of the bridge look like, including the approaches?
- Will there be roundabouts on either end of the bridge?
- Where will the bridge cross the river and what will be the access points on either side?
- What is the layout for intersections?
- What will be the speed limit?

Response: At this point, only general corridors and working alignments are being evaluated. If the Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision selects a corridor alternative, specific project details, such as type of bridge and intersection designs will be further refined during the Tier 2 environmental documents. The
roadway is anticipated to be a 4-lane divided roadway similar to County GV; however, the number of travel lanes will be revisited during Tier 2 studies. Brown County intends to include pedestrian and bicycle accommodations as part of the project. The expected posted speed limit for Corridor Alternative 1 is 25 to 40 mph. The expected posted speed limit on Corridor Alternative 2 is 40 mph.

Comments about Project Construction Cost

- Please provide a cost estimate for the alternatives
- What is the cost savings by using an existing interchange and shorter bridge?
- Due to the economic impacts from COVID-19, the funds required for this bridge would be better spent elsewhere
- The proposal to spend millions of dollars to potentially alleviate the minor issue of congestion is not justifiable.

Response: No detailed cost estimates have been developed for any of the corridor alternatives. If a corridor alternative is selected at the end of Tier 1 studies, and is further developed in Tier 2 analysis and design, the project would be jointly funded by Brown County and local communities (Lawrence, De Pere, and Ledgeview). The proposed improvements will provide benefits beyond alleviating congestion. Although in the future, construction would directly create new demands for construction materials and jobs.

Comments about Traffic

- The long-term impacts of COVID-19 will likely reduce traffic and reduce the need for expanded infrastructure.

Response: While COVID-19 has reduced traffic in the short term, it is premature to conclude that travel patterns will never return to their current or expected future level. As noted at the December 2019 public information meeting, many parts of the project are not expected to be built for 5-10 years, which is ample time to re-assess expected future traffic volumes.

Comments about Property Concerns

- What are the impacts to my property?
- Which properties will be affected and/or purchased?
- How many homes will be removed?

Response: Brown County will work to minimize impacts to residences; however, at this point in the process it is too early to know which specific properties will be impacted. Corridor Alternative 1 would likely require 4-8 residential relocations and 45-75 property acquisitions (that is, would require a portion, but not all, of a property), while Corridor Alternative 2 would likely require 10-16 relocations and 16-25 property acquisitions.

If your property, or a portion of it, needs to be acquired, the property owner will be notified as soon as possible of the agency’s interest in acquiring your property, their obligation to secure any necessary appraisals, and any other useful information. Residents (both owners and renters) are protected by the
Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. No acquisitions will occur until the Tier 2 studies.

- There will be a reduction in property values

Response: It is difficult to say how a new road and bridge will affect property values because there are so many factors that determine property value.

- Will there be access to properties during construction?

Response: Brown County anticipates that access will remain for all local traffic throughout the project.

- Concerns over traffic noise in residential areas

Response: There are approximately 300 noise sensitive receptors adjacent to Corridor Alternative 1 and 250 noise sensitive receptors adjacent to Corridor Alternative 2. The proposed improvements would impact noise levels for sensitive receptors to varying degrees depending on where they are located along the Corridor Alternatives. Some sensitive receptors already experience traffic noise. Traffic noise modeling will occur during Tier 2 to determine existing traffic noise conditions and future traffic noise conditions. Where traffic noise impacts are predicted to occur, traffic noise abatement strategies will be considered. Traffic noise abatement strategies that are typically considered include traffic control measures, buffer zones, noise barriers, and soundproofing.

Comments about impacts at Lost Dauphin Road

- What will be the access to Lost Dauphin Road via the bridge?
- Do not make the access ramps empty onto Lost Dauphin Road as there is already too much traffic.
- What considerations will be used to prevent traffic from using Lost Dauphin as a cut through?

Response: It is too early in the process to know the bridge access points. Specific designs will be determined during the Tier 2 process. However, the South Bridge Connector will not be a freeway with on- and off-ramps. It will have intersections with crossroads, much like the recently reconstructed County GV north of County X.

Comments about the Fox River State Trail

- What will be the impacts to the Fox River State Trail?
- Will there be an overpass?
- Noise reduction will be needed on an overpass to the Fox River State Trail

Response: Brown County will minimize impacts to the Fox River State Trail. It is too early in the process to know whether an overpass will be used, but this option is being considered as part of the design process. Traffic noise modeling will occur during Tier 2 to determine existing traffic noise conditions and future traffic noise conditions at the Fox River State Trail. If a traffic noise impact is expected to occur at this location, noise abatement strategies will be considered.
Other Comments

- What will be done regarding the engine braking along Highway 57 by Rockland Road?

Response: The design of Highway 57 near Rockland Road will be determined during Tier 2. The design of the intersection may impact engine braking and accelerating but it is too early to know at this point. The proposed improvements will consider both capacity and safety.

- Concern for the destruction of Old Plank Road

Response: Brown County will work to minimize impacts to the Old Plank Road and surrounding neighborhood. It is too early in the process to know the exact design of the roadway and intersections at this location.

- The project should consider traffic that will be generated from the new De Pere Cultural Center

Response: The project develops a travel demand model to plan for and design roadways. These models take into account development in the area including population and employment growth.

- The decision on where to build the bridge has already been made
- Build the project as soon as possible

Response: The Lead Agencies are still evaluating multiple alternative corridors under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA establishes a national environmental policy and provides a framework for environmental planning and decision making by Federal agencies. It requires a comprehensive evaluation of alternatives. Brown County, WisDOT, and FHWA are not treating the alternatives analysis process as a “fait accompli” and intend to continue following the federally-required NEPA process to evaluate reasonable alternatives to addressing the project purpose and needs. The Tier 1 process is anticipated to be completed in 2020. The Tier 2 process will begin following Tier 1 completion and be constructed in separate stages.
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Handouts
Public Involvement Handout

South Bridge Connector
County EB/F in the Town of Lawrence to
County GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview
Brown County

Project ID: 4556-02-00

March 19, 2020
Purpose of the handout

This handout was originally prepared to provide background information for a public involvement meeting that was scheduled to be held on Thursday, March 19, 2020, 6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m. at Altmayer Elementary School. Due to recommendations and orders from the state and federal government to limit the spread of the coronavirus (COVID-19), the in-person meeting was indefinitely postponed. Instead of holding an in-person meeting, the project team is making the meeting materials available for public review on the project website and inviting comments on these materials until April 20, 2020 (see contact information and comment form on the last three pages of this handout).

The project team is sharing this information to update the public on the South Bridge Connector Study and to obtain public input. The current study, which was re-initiated in December 2019, builds on previous efforts to evaluate alternatives to address transportation needs in the southern part of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area. The following communities are located within the study area: Town of Lawrence, City of De Pere, Town of Ledgeview.

The purpose of the project is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing east-west transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area. This project is needed to:

- Address congestion in the vicinity of existing Fox River bridges.
- Accommodate existing and planned land use and future travel demand generated by planned development.
- Reduce travel time by improving east-west connectivity.
- Address higher-than-average crash rates and safety issues in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges.

The public involvement materials discuss the corridor alternatives retained for detailed analysis and the process for identifying a preferred corridor alternative.

Members of the public are invited to listen to the recorded presentation on the project website, review displays, ask questions and provide comments via the comment form included in this handout or via email to the contact listed at the end of this packet. Comments received by April 20, 2020 will be included in the public involvement summary prepared by Brown County.

Project information

The lead agencies for this study are Brown County, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The study will result in a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD). The Tier 1 Draft EIS will identify a preferred corridor alternative and the ROD will identify a selected corridor alternative for addressing existing and projected travel demand in the southern portion of the Green Bay Metropolitan Area. To identify a preferred corridor alternative, the lead agencies are evaluating how the alternatives retained for detailed study meet the screening criteria, and gathering input from the public, tribes, and agencies.

Environmental resource impact analysis is currently in progress. The existing environmental conditions and a discussion of the environmental consequences of each alternative will be presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS.
Figure 1: Initial Range of Alternative Corridors Considered

Figure 2: Alternative Corridors Screening Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Range of Alternatives Considered</th>
<th>Alternatives Remaining after Screening Step 1</th>
<th>Corridor Alternatives Remaining after Screening Step 2</th>
<th>Corridor Alternatives Remaining after Screening Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Build</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td>➕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td>(with and without I-41 interchange)</td>
<td>(with I-41 interchange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Existing Roads</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheuring-Heritage Rd</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redland-Red Maple Rd</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland-Red Maple-WIS 172</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td>(with and without I-41 interchange)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland-Red Maple-American-Scheuring</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekview Road-Rockland-Red Maple</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6 Hybrid</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td>➕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-41-Midway-WIS 172</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom-Midway-WIS 172</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Grant-WIS 57</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom-County ZZ-County MM</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom-County ZZ-WIS 96</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-41 to I-43</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation System Management (As stand alone alternative)</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (As stand alone alternative)</td>
<td>➕</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retained for Detailed Study

☑ Carried Forward  ☒ Eliminated
Summary of the December Public Involvement Meeting

The most recent Public Involvement Meeting for the South Bridge Connector Project was on Wednesday, December 11, 2019 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in the cafeteria at Altmayer Elementary School. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a status update on the South Bridge Connector Study and give attendees the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback. Approximately 269 people attended the meeting. Representatives from Brown County, WisDOT, and the consultant team were available to answer questions about the study and receive input from the attendees.

Exhibits were available for attendees to review, with project staff present to answer questions during the open house portion of the meeting. Cole Runge from Brown County gave a presentation on the history of the project and the process going forward. Comment forms were available at the meeting for participants to submit. At the end of the comment period, Brown County collected 40 comment letters (total of those handed in at the meeting and submitted after the meeting).

A summary of overall comment themes included:

- Preference for a specific alternative (Rockland/Red Maple Roads Alternative; Heritage Road Alternatives; or alternative which included a Fox River crossing at Little Rapids)
- Lack of support for the project or comments that the project is not needed
- Request to complete the project as soon as possible
- Request to provide sidewalks and bike lanes as part of the eventual preferred alternative corridor
- Concerns over property value
- Concerns over Old Plank Road and surrounding neighborhood, including speeding and intersection concerns along WIS 57
- Impacts to businesses if traffic is diverted away from downtown De Pere
- Environmental impact concerns including impacts to the Fox River, Bald Eagles, and recreation
- Cost and source of funding for the project
- Specific design related questions such as bridge design, speed limit, and traffic control
- Request for traffic counts along proposed alternative corridor
- Concerns over construction impacts and timing

Responses to comments will be provided in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Many of the comments requested information that requires a greater level of design than will be provided in the Tier 1 Draft EIS. These comments will be addressed during the Tier 2 process. The Tier 2 environmental documents will provide greater detail regarding design, traffic impacts, environmental impacts and costs, and construction impacts.

Real estate

Additional land will be acquired as highway right-of-way if this project is built. It is too early in the study to identify the exact properties affected and the amount of land needed for the project. Brown County would likely begin real estate acquisition two years in advance of construction. Construction would be phased over several years.
Project update/next steps

Involving the public, tribes, local officials, and regulatory agencies is important to project planning and development. A Local Officials Meeting was held on March 4, 2020 to discuss the corridor alternatives retained for detailed study. The project team continues to coordinate with local officials, state and federal agencies, and American Indian Tribes to discuss the corridor alternatives and status of the project.

The study will include a public hearing in the summer of 2020. The Tier 1 EIS is anticipated to end with a signed Record of Decision (ROD) in late 2020. The ROD will document the final decision of the Tier 1 EIS, including the possible approval of the corridor location for the South Bridge Connector. The lead federal agency for this study is the Federal Highway Administration. Tier 2 environmental documents will be completed prior to construction for each section of the project as funding is secured. The Tier 2 environmental documents will be prepared with a greater degree of engineering detail and a more detailed impact analysis for specific improvements in the corridor.

Public input/comments

We encourage you to talk to the project representatives and ask them questions. Attached to this handout is a sheet for your written comments and input regarding the proposed project. Please mail any written comments about the project by April 20, 2020 or leave them in the comment box tonight. You can also e-mail your comments to the study team contact listed below.

Your comments assist us in developing a project that will serve the needs of the traveling public as well as the needs of the local community. Your input is welcome and appreciated throughout the design process.

For more information, please contact:

Cole Runge
Brown County
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
(920) 448-6480
Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov

Project Website:
www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/
Public Involvement Meeting Comment Form

Project ID 4556-02-00
South Bridge Connector
County EB/F in the Town of Lawrence to
County GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview
Brown County

March 19, 2020

Please place this form in the comment box or mail by April 20, 2020 to the address on the back of this sheet. Comments can also be e-mailed to Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov. Your comments assist us in developing a project that will serve the needs of the traveling public as well as the needs of the local community. Your input is welcome and appreciated throughout the design process.

Name: _____________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________

Daytime Phone Number (optional): _________________________________

Email Address (optional): _________________________________________

Please Print Comments (attach additional sheets if necessary)
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

The information in this document including names, addresses, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and signatures is not confidential, and may be subject to disclosure upon request, pursuant to the requirements of the Wisconsin open records law, sections 19.31 - 19.39 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
Exhibits
Section 1: Purpose and Need
- Describe the purpose of the project (what the project is intended to accomplish)
- Describe why the project is needed (explain the transportation concern and/or deficiencies that the project would address)

Section 2: Alternatives Considered
- Describe the range of alternative corridors identified
- Describe how alternative corridors were evaluated and retained or eliminated from detailed study

Section 3: Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences
- Describe the project's existing social, economic, and environmental setting
- Describe the project's beneficial and adverse social, economic, and environmental consequences

Section 4: Public Involvement and Agency Coordination
- Describe the results of public and interest group meetings
- Describe coordination efforts with local, state, and federal agencies

The Lead Agencies considered the input of the public, tribes, agencies, and local governments in the development and screening of alternatives.
During the December 2019 Public Involvement Meeting, several commenters suggested an alternative that uses the existing County S interchange to connect with I-41 and crosses the Fox River at the relatively narrow location near Little Rapids. Supporters indicated that the advantage of connecting to I-41 at County S and crossing the Fox River at Little Rapids is that it would save money by using an existing interchange and cross the Fox River at a narrower point than other alternatives and runs through fewer developed areas.

Reasons for Elimination from Detailed Analysis

- Would provide a new east-west road across Fox River but would be 4.5 miles south of the Claude Allouez Bridge. Therefore, would not relieve congestion to the extent of Alternatives 1 or 2.
- Less safety benefit than Alternatives 1 or 2 because this corridor would not divert as much traffic from existing routes.
- Not consistent with local and county planning, which calls for business/industrial development to occur north of Midway Road.
- Cost savings would be offset because:
  - The County S interchange would likely need to be rebuilt and expanded.
  - Would require 7 additional miles of roadway east of the river to connect to I-43/WIS 172 or an additional 3 to 4 miles of roadway to connect to County GV, compared to Alternatives 1 and 2.
For a tiered EIS, a range of alternative corridors, rather than specific road alignments, is identified and evaluated at Tier 1 stage. The corridors cover a wider area in which the roadway (alignment) could lie and provide flexibility in positioning a roadway and evaluating potential impacts prior to conducting detailed engineering during Tier 2 studies.

Tier 1 Corridor and Working Alignment

- **Corridor Width**: Area of potential Tier 2 alignments are expected to stay within. (500-foot-wide)
- **Working Alignment**: Area that could accommodate needed roadway sections. (125-150 feet wide, clear zone, etc.)

The working alignment is a conceptual roadway alignment inside each Corridor Alternative, used to estimate representative environmental impacts. The working alignment is used to determine if the corridor is consistent with community, etc., and to define commonalities among the alternatives. The working alignment is a hypothetical roadway cross-section (generally shown in each direction with turn lanes). The width allows enough area for engineering design flexibility during subsequent Tier 2 studies.

Preferred Corridor Identification Criteria

Corridor Alternatives 1 and 2 both met the Steps 1, 2, and 3 screening criteria. The Lead Agencies will evaluate both alternatives to assess which best met the Steps 1, 2, and 3 criteria. Criteria used to differentiate the two alternatives include:

- **Travel Time**: Reduce travel time by improving east-west connectivity.
- **Safety**: Maximize safety on the study area’s transportation system by minimizing traffic congestion and conflicts (Step 2 objective)
- **Land Use Compatibility**: Is the route consistent with local and county plan updates, and does the community support it? (Step 3 criteria)
- **Right of Way Acquisition**: What is the extent of land acquisition needed for the route? (Step 3 criteria)
- **Environmental Effects**: Does the route minimize effects on environmentally sensitive areas? (Step 3 criteria)

A preferred corridor alternative will be identified following impact analysis and public and agency input.

The No Build Alternative was retained as a baseline for comparison to the Corridor Build Alternatives. It is not identified as the preferred corridor alternative because it would not address the project’s purpose and need with respect to traffic operations, compatibility with local plans, or safety concerns. Because the No Build Alternative does not address purpose and need, it is not a reasonable course of action.

Calculating Impacts

1. **Working alignments were developed within 500-foot corridors for each alternative.**
2. **Resource impacts were then calculated using these working alignments.**
3. **To account for the uncertainty the calculated impact number was broadened and presented as an impact range.**
4. **The low end of the impact range 0.75 of the calculated impact number, and the high end of the range is 1.25 times.**
5. **The high end is intended to represent a worst-case scenario, which could account for a potential increase in impacts as a result of more detailed engineering and impact analysis.**
6. **Impact calculation and analysis is in progress and will be presented in the Tier 1 EIS.**

Resource Impact Analysis

The Tier 1 EIS is a broad-scale document intended to provide an indication of potential impacts that may be associated with the proposed corridor alternatives.

As specific alignments are developed during Tier 2, actual impacts will be determined and assessed at a more detailed level.

**Resources or Topics Discussed in the EIS**

- Land Use Planning
- Residential Development
- Business Development
- Community Resources
- Socioeconomic Characteristics
- Environmental Justice
- Transportation Services
- Agriculture
- Water Resources
- Protected Species
- Traffic Noise
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetics
- Hazardous Materials
- Indirect and Cumulative Impacts
Project History and Proposed Tier 1 EIS Timeline

1968 South Bridge concept first included in Brown County Plan

1996 Brown County Plan recommends general Southern Bridge corridor location

2008 Public Involvement Meeting #1 (Presentation of the Purpose & Need)

2008 Environmental Impact Statement development begins

2009 Public Involvement Meeting #2 (Identification of potential build alternatives identified by the public)

2010 Public Involvement Meeting #3 (Generation of alternatives identified by the public)

2019 Environmental Impaired Statement as a Tier 1 document

1960s 1990s 2000s 2010s

Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Timeline

Dec 2019 Publication of Notice of Intent

Feb 2020 Resume Environmental Impact Statement as a Tier 1 document

June 2020 Completion of the Tier 1 Draft EIS

Oct 2020 Completion of Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision

Mar 2021 Public Involvement Meeting #1 (Presentation of alternatives selected for detailed study)

Mar 2021 Public Involvement Meeting #2 (Provide input on corridor alternatives to be studied in the EIS)

Mar 2021 Public Involvement Meeting #3 (Provide input on corridor alternatives selected for detailed study)

July 2020 Public Hearing (Provide general input on impacts and preferred alternative)

Jan 2021 Wisconsin DOT I-41 Environmental Assessment and potential Finding of No Significant Impact complete

Late 2021 Wisconsin DOT I-41 Environmental Assessment and potential Finding of No Significant Impact complete

- Analysis of potential I-41 interchange was undertaken,
- This may serve as the Tier 2 document for the new South Bridge Connector interchange with I-41 if a new interchange is part of the preferred alternative.

2019 2020 2021
Presentation
Recap of December Public Involvement Meeting

Held on December 11, 2019

- Re-introduce the project
- Give opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback
- 269 people signed in at the meeting
- 40 written comments

All information from the meeting is on the project website

Progress since the December Meeting

Updated the Purpose and Need
- Request input from the public and agencies

Reviewed alternatives and made tentative decisions to eliminate some and retain Alternatives 1 and 2 for detailed study
- Request input from public and agencies

Conduct impact analyses

Purpose of this Meeting

Public input on the Lead Agencies decision to retain Alternatives 1 and 2 for detailed evaluation, eliminating the other alternatives from consideration.

Public input on which alternative, 1 or 2, should be identified as the preferred alternative
Purpose and Need of the Project

The purpose of the project is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing east-west transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area.

The project is needed to:

- Address congestion in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges.
- Accommodate existing and planned land use and future travel demand generated by planned development.
- Reduce travel time by improving east-west connectivity.
- Address higher-than-average crash rates and safety issues in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges.

Alternatives Analysis

Three step process:
Step 1—Develop and Screen Alternatives
Step 2—Evaluate Alternative Routes
Step 3—Refine Alternative Routes

Impact Analyses

Each resource impact analysis includes:
- Describe existing environmental conditions
- Environmental impacts of each alternative
- Strategies for avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating potential adverse impacts

Resource impacts were calculated using the working alignments and presented as a range to account for uncertainty

As specific alignments are developed during Tier 2, actual impacts will be determined and assessed at a more detailed level

Agency Coordination

Local official, tribal, and regulatory agency coordination occurs throughout the study.

Participating and Cooperating Agencies are part of the planning process and provide concurrence on three formal points in the Tier 1 EIS process:

- Concurrency Point #1: Purpose and Need statement for the project
- Concurrency Point #2: Range of Alternative Considered and alternatives to be carried forward for study
- Concurrency Point #3: Identification of the Preferred Corridor Alternative
Next Steps

- Continue impact analysis
- Seek input on the preferred corridor alternative from public, tribes, local governments, resource agencies. Please send comments by April 20
- Tier 1 Draft EIS published in June 2020
  - 45-day comment period
  - Public Hearing in July
- Tier 1 Final EIS/Record of Decision planned in October 2020
- Tier 2 environmental documents will be completed for each section of the project prior to construction

Please take time to access the exhibit boards, review the handout (available on the project website), and send comments to Cole Runge at the e-mail below.

Thank you

Contact:
Cole Runge
Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov
Postcard/Display Ad
In the interest of protecting the health and safety of the community to prevent the spread of coronavirus (COVID-19), Brown County is indefinitely postponing the South Bridge Connector Tier 1 EIS public involvement in-person meeting scheduled for March 19, 2020. Instead meeting materials will be posted online.

Exhibits, handouts, and the presentation will be available on the project website starting on March 19, 2020. The presentation and exhibit narration has been recorded in media format to provide updates and additional information on the project. Comments on the material will be collected through April 20, 2020.

Thank you for your understanding and we look forward to your input on the project.

We encourage you to submit feedback on the project to Cole Runge at:
(920) 448-6480
Cole.Runge@browncounty.wi.gov.

or
Brown County
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600

If you need special accommodations to access the material please contact Cole.

Go to the project website to see the exhibits, listen to the narration, and obtain comment forms to submit.
www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/
Brown County, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is studying corridor alternatives for a southern bridge across the Fox River. The purpose of the project is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing east-west transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area.

You are invited to a public involvement meeting to ask questions and provide feedback about this proposed project.

For questions about the meeting, contact:
Cole Runge, Brown County Planning Commission
(920) 448-6480
Cole.Runge@browncountywi.gov
Project information is available online at:
www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/

The objective of this meeting is to discuss the corridor alternatives retained for detailed analysis, their potential impacts, and the process for identifying the preferred corridor alternative. The study team will be available to answer questions and take comments.

If you are deaf or hard of hearing and require an interpreter, you may request one at least three working days prior to the meeting via the Wisconsin Telecommunications Relay System (Dial 711).

March 19, 2020
6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Presentation at 6:45 p.m.
Altmayer Elementary School
3001 Ryan Road, De Pere, WI 54115
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