



ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION OF FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)
 DT2094 1/2016

BASIC SHEET 1 – PROJECT SUMMARY

| Project ID 3763-00-04 | Project Termini County KR from County H to Old Green Bay Road | Funding Sources (<i>check all that apply</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Federal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------|-------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Construction ID 3763-00-74 | | Estimated Project Cost and Funding Source (<i>state</i> funding). Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars include delivery cost. \$54 million in 2021 dollars | | | | | | | | |
| Route Designation (<i>if applicable</i>) CTH KR | Nearest Community Village of Mount Pleasant and Village of Somers | Real Estate Acquisition Portion of Estimated Cost (YOE) \$5 million in 2019 dollars | | | | | | | | |
| National Highway System (NHS) Route <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Title County KR-Phase 2 | Section / Township / Range Sections 2,3,4,5/2N/R22E and Sections 32,33,34,35/3N/R22E | Utility Relocation Portion of Estimated Cost (YOE) \$400,000 in 2021 dollars | | | | | | | | |
| County Racine and Kenosha counties | | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Right of Way Acquisition</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fee</td> <td>53.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TLE</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PLE</td> <td>12.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Right of Way Acquisition | Acres | Fee | 53.8 | TLE | 3.0 | PLE | 12.1 |
| Right of Way Acquisition | Acres | | | | | | | | | |
| Fee | 53.8 | | | | | | | | | |
| TLE | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| PLE | 12.1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridge Number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>) Pike River Bridges: B-30-143/144 UPRR Bridges: B-30-145/146 CPRR Bridges: B-30-147/148 | For an ER, indicate the date funding was authorized to begin preliminary engineering. For an EA, indicate the date the Process Initiation Letter was accepted by FHWA. 06/04/18 | | | | | | | | | |

| Functional Classification of Existing Route (FDM 3-5-2) | WisDOT Project Classification (FDM 3-5-2) | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Urban | Rural |
| Freeway/Expressway | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Principal Arterial | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Minor Arterial | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major Collector | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Minor Collector | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Collector | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Local | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No Functional Class | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| WisDOT Project Classification (FDM 3-5-2) | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Resurfacing | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Pavement Replacement | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reconditioning | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Expansion | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Bridge Rehabilitation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Bridge Replacement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| "Majors" Project (there are both state and federal majors) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SHRM | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Reconstruction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Preventive Maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other – Describe: Railroad grade separation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

FHWA Draft Type 2c Categorical Exclusion (CE)/WisDOT Draft Environmental Report (ER). No significant impacts indicated by initial assessment.
 FHWA/WisDOT Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). No significant impacts indicated by initial assessment.

Caron Kloser, Principal Planner, HNTB Corp, 1-22-19 (Print – Preparer Name, Title, Company/Organization) Date – m/d/yy

Steve Hoff, WisDOT Project Mgr. 1/22/19 (Signature, Title) Date – m/d/yy

Region Aeronautics Rails & Harbors

Steve Hoff (Signature) Date – m/d/yy

N/A (Signature, Title) Date – m/d/yy

FHWA FAA FTA FRA

FHWA Final Type 2 Categorical Exclusion (CE)/WisDOT Final Environmental Report (ER). It has been determined **no significant impacts will occur** and a Public Hearing is not required.

After reviewing and addressing substantive public comments, updating the Draft CE/ER or Draft EA and coordinating with other agencies, it is determined this action:

- Will NOT significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. This document is a Final CE/Final ER.
- Will NOT significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. This document is a Final EA/Finding of No Significant Impact.
- Has potential to significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) required.

(Print – Preparer Name, Title, Company/Organization) (Date – m/d/yy)

(Signature – Director, Bureau of Technical Services) (Date – m/d/yy)

(Signature, Title) (Date – m/d/yy)

Region Aeronautics Rails & Harbors

(Signature, Title) (Date – m/d/yy)

FHWA FAA FTA FRA

BASIC SHEET 2 – TABLE OF CONTENTS, ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS, DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

1. Table of Contents

Purpose and Need: Page 5

Summary of Alternatives: Page 7

Description of Proposed Action: Page 10

Public/Government/Tribal Involvement: Page 14

Traffic Summary Matrix: Page 18

Agency and Tribal Coordination: Page 21

Alternatives Comparison Matrix: Page 23

Environmental Commitments: Page 25

Environmental Factors Matrix: Page 28

A1 General Economics – Page 32

A3 Agriculture – Page 34

B1 Community or Residential – Page 37

B8 Section 4(f) and 6(f) or Other Unique Areas – Page 47

B9 Aesthetics – Page 51

C1 Wetlands – Page 53

C2 Rivers, Streams and Floodplains – Page 60

C7 Threatened and Endangered Species – Page 63

D1 Air Quality – Page 67

D2 Construction Stage Sound Quality – Page 69

D3 Traffic Noise – Page 71

D4 Hazardous Substances or Contamination – Page 76

D5 Stormwater – Page 78

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Location

Appendix B-1: Design Plans

Appendix B-2: Typical Sections

Appendix B3: Pike River Bridge Sections

Appendix B-4: Grade Separation Access Options

Appendix B-5: 72nd Avenue/90th Street Realignment Option 2

Appendix B-6: Median Access Options between UPRR and 56th Avenue

Appendix B-7: Median access options between 43rd Avenue and east project terminus

Appendix B-8: Bypass Alternative

Appendix B-9: Construction Detour Options

Appendix C: Rendering of Retaining Wall

Appendix D: Indirect and Cumulative Effects Technical Report

Appendix E: Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan

Appendix F: Pike River Improvement Project

Appendix G: Noise Reference Materials and Exhibits

Appendix H: Correspondence

2. Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|--|---|
| A-1 – Agricultural Preservation District | NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act |
| A-2 – General Agricultural District | NPS – National Park Service |
| AADT – Annual Average Daily Traffic | NRCS – National Resource Conservation Service |
| ACHP – Advisory Council on Historic Preservation | OCR – Office of the Commissioner of Railroads |
| AWDT – Average Annual Weekday Traffic | Pb - Lead |
| BOA – WisDOT Bureau of Aeronautics | PIM – Public Involvement Meeting |
| B-P – Business Park | PUL – Public or Utility Plans |
| Cd - Cadmium | R-2 – Suburban Single-Family Residential District |
| CPRR – Canadian Pacific Railroad | R-3 – Urban Single-Family |
| CSRP – Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan | RHS – WisDOT Railroads and Harbors Section |
| Cu - copper | RPBB – Rusty Patched Bumble Bee |
| DATCP – Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection | SEWRPC – Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission |
| DHV – Design Hourly Volume | SHPO – State Historic Preservation Office |
| DNR – Department of Natural Resources | STIP – State Transportation Improvement Program |
| EA – Environmental Assessment | TCGP – Transportation Construction General Permit |
| EIS – Environmental Impact Statement | THPO – Tribal Historic Preservation Officer |
| EPA – Environmental Protection Agency | TID – Tax Increment District |
| FAA – Federal Aviation Administration | TNM – Traffic Noise Model |
| FDM – WisDOT Facilities Development Manual | TSS – Total suspended solids |
| FHWA – Federal Highway Administration | UPRR – Union Pacific Railroad |
| FIS – Flood Insurance Study | USACE – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers |
| Foxconn – Foxconn Technology Group | USCG – U.S. Coast Guard |
| HCS – Highway Capacity Software | EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| HPZ – High Potential Zone | USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| ILF – In-lieu fee payment | WEPA – Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act |
| IPaC – Information for Planning and Consultation | WisDOT – Wisconsin Department of Transportation |
| LCD – Liquid Crystal Display | YOE – Year of Expenditure |
| LET – date for posting construction bids | Zn - Zinc |
| LOS – Level of Service | |

3. Environmental Document Statement

This environmental document is an essential component of the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act (WEPA) project development process, which supports and complements public involvement and interagency coordination.

The environmental document is a full-disclosure document which provides a description of the purpose and need for the proposed project, the existing environment, analysis of the anticipated beneficial or adverse environmental effects resulting from the proposed action and potential mitigation measures to address identified effects. This document also allows others the opportunity to provide input and comment on the proposed action, alternatives and environmental impacts. Finally, it provides the decision maker with appropriate information to make a reasoned choice when identifying a preferred alternative.

This environmental document must be read entirely so the reader understands the reasons that one alternative is selected as the preferred alternative over other alternatives considered.

BASIC SHEET 3 – PURPOSE AND NEED

1. Purpose and Need

Project Status

Through an agreement with Kenosha County and Racine County, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is preparing engineering plans and conducting environmental analyses for proposed County KR improvements between County H and Old Green Bay Road in Racine and Kenosha counties. The project begins 400 feet east of the County KR/County H intersection and extends east for 2.8 miles to end 1,600 feet east of the County KR/Old Green Bay Road intersection. (See **Appendix A** - Project Location).

WisDOT, Racine County and Kenosha County entered into a state trunk highway jurisdictional transfer agreement in April 2018 for County KR improvements between I-94 and Old Green Bay Road.¹ The agreement allows WisDOT to complete design and construction activities for this section of County KR. The counties are responsible for right of way acquisition and relocations. After construction, WisDOT will return jurisdiction of the roadway to the counties for ongoing control, access rights and maintenance. The design and construction of the section of County KR between I-94 and County H is being completed as part of a separate project. The section between County H and Old Green Bay Road is being evaluated in this Environmental Assessment (EA) and is referred to as the County KR-Phase 2 project.

The western terminus for the County KR-Phase 2 project ties into the first phase County KR project at the County KR/County H intersection. The eastern terminus for the County KR-Phase 2 project is Old Green Bay Road. This terminus was agreed to by WisDOT, Racine County and Kenosha County per the April 2018 jurisdictional transfer agreement. The eastern terminus is logical based on year 2042 traffic projections from the Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), that show traffic volumes drop 25 percent to 33 percent to the east of WIS 31 and Old Green Bay Road, respectively, to 12,000 vehicles per day.² The existing two-lanes along County KR to the east of Old Green Bay Road has available capacity for the projected traffic volumes. Kenosha County and Racine County are responsible for future improvements to County KR between the project's east limits and WIS 32 as stated in the April 2018 jurisdictional transfer agreement. Per WisDOT discussions with Racine County and Kenosha County, the counties do not anticipate the need for improvements to the section of County KR between Old Green Bay Road and WIS 32 in the near future after completion of any improvement to KR that results from this project due to unknown development potential.

If a build alternative is selected, final design for County KR-Phase 2 will be complete in 2020 and right of way acquisition (by Kenosha and Racine counties) will be complete in 2020. Construction is scheduled for 2021 through 2022.

Project Purpose

The purpose of the project is to upgrade the County KR infrastructure to safely and efficiently handle projected traffic volumes anticipated from local economic development activities occurring in the project area, and to provide a safe and well-connected transportation corridor that serves the communities in Racine County and Kenosha County.

Project Need

The needs for the project are related to increasing travel demand, system linkage and route importance, roadway deficiencies and safety.

Travel Demand

The existing two-lane undivided rural roadway configuration along County KR is not adequate to handle increased travel demand anticipated from local economic development projects and land use plans.

This area has a significant amount of new development planned related to the forthcoming Foxconn manufacturing campus located just east of I-94, between County KR and WIS 11 in the village of Mount Pleasant. It is anticipated that the Foxconn development will potentially create up to 13,000 jobs, attract new residents to the area, and spur business development for suppliers and commercial support services.

To prepare for Foxconn and other anticipated development, the villages of Mount Pleasant and Somers recently updated their land use plans to facilitate the transition of the existing agricultural area to urban uses. The village of Mount Pleasant

¹ In addition to County KR, WisDOT is working with the village of Mount Pleasant and Racine County on the reconstruction of several state, village and county roadways around the Foxconn development (known as the Wisconsin Valley Development Roads project) in Racine County in accordance with a November 2017 temporary jurisdiction agreement. Roadways include WIS 11, Braun Road, County H, Wisconsin Valley Way and International Drive.

² Per WisDOT FDM 11-15, Attachment 1.1, the top of the traffic volume range for design class A2 for Non-Corridors 2020 routes is 15,000 AADT.

94 and 90th Street. The village of Somers approved an amendment to their Land Use Plan in July 2018 that includes a business/industrial park designation along County KR between I-94 and 90th Street and a medium density residential designation to the east of 90th Street. Mount Pleasant and Somers have also updated sewer service areas and implemented tax incremental districts to facilitate development in the project area.

This planned growth and development is expected to increase travel demand on County KR. The existing two-lane roadway currently handles about 9,000 to 9,500 vehicles per day. Future traffic volume on County KR is expected to more than double to 18,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day by the year 2042. The traffic analysis prepared for the project indicates that, under the current two-lane undivided configuration, County KR is expected to operate at level of service (LOS) E in the year 2042.³ This means traffic along County KR would experience delays and have unstable flow, speeds that change quickly and low maneuverability. Also, several turning movements at the County KR intersections with County EA (72nd Avenue) and WIS 31 would operate at LOS F conditions during morning and/or afternoon peak periods.

County KR has two at-grade railroad crossings, the Canadian Pacific Railroad (CPRR) and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) that use gates and mounted flashing lights to stop and warn vehicles at the crossings. According to the Federal Railroad Administration's Highway-Rail Crossing Inventory, the estimated number of daily train movements is 52 (16 passenger and 36 freight) for the CPRR crossing and 12 (freight only) for the UPRR crossing. With traffic along County KR expected to more than double by 2042, more vehicles will be delayed at the crossings. Also, County KR is used by emergency services and school bus operators and may accommodate future commuter bus service. Delays at the crossings can affect the reliability of these services.

System Linkage and Route Importance

County KR is an important east-west local arterial road for Racine and Kenosha counties. County KR connects I-94 with WIS 31 and WIS 32 and serves the existing population and employment base in the cities of Kenosha and Racine, as well as the expanding employment base in Mount Pleasant and Somers.

The Eastern Racine County Transportation Task Force, comprised of representatives from Racine County, Mount Pleasant, Caledonia and Sturtevant, was formed in March 2018 with the goal of developing recommendations to improve east-west travel times and to help move workers to jobs. According to the 2018 Task Force report, Racine is the largest city in Wisconsin that does not have direct freeway access, and current travel times between I-94 and downtown Racine can take between 19 and 22 minutes. According to the Task Force report, these travel times are problematic for workers and for economic development purposes. According to the Task Force report, County KR has the greatest opportunity for travel time improvement, and capacity expansion of County KR between I-94 and WIS 32 is one of the task force's top priorities.

The projected 2042 traffic volumes would cause traffic delays (LOS E) along County KR under its current two-lane configuration. This would reduce speeds and maneuverability along County KR, which is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the Eastern Racine County Transportation Task Force to improve and maintain mobility along the primary east-west roadways in the county. Also, vehicular delays at the two at-grade railroad crossings along County KR are an impediment to east-west traffic flow, which is not consistent with the task force's plan to minimize impediments to travel time along primary east-west corridors.

The 2035 Comprehensive Plans for Racine County and Kenosha County include functional improvement recommendations for arterial streets and highways. Both plans recommend the preservation of right of way to accommodate four lanes of traffic along County KR between I-94 and WIS 32 in the future.

SEWRPC amended its Vision 2050: A Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan to incorporate land use changes and population and employment growth related to the Foxconn manufacturing campus in Mount Pleasant in Racine County. The plan amendment incorporates transportation improvements to serve the Foxconn development area and recommends the widening of County KR from two to six travel lanes between I-94 and County H and from two to four travel lanes between County H and WIS 32.

Roadway Deficiencies

County KR has the following roadway design deficiencies:

- County KR does not meet standards for distances required for vehicles to come to a complete stop. Stopping site distances range from 235 feet to greater than 425 feet. Current design standards specify a minimum of 425 feet for stopping site distances.

³ Level of Service (LOS) is a quantitative measure that refers to the overall quality of traffic flow ranging from very good, represented by LOS A, to very poor, represented by LOS F. LOS D was used to define desirable peak hour operating conditions for County KR and County KR intersections.

- No bike or pedestrian facilities are present along most of the roadway. An existing shared-use path is located on the south side of KR between 56th Avenue and WIS 31. The village of Mount Pleasant started constructing a new segment of the Pike River Pathway north of County KR, between Oakes Road and County KR. Shared-use paths will be constructed along County KR west of County H as part of the County KR Phase 1 project and other local development roads in the Foxconn development area.⁴ There are no continuous bike and pedestrian connections between these trails and planned development along County KR in the project area.
- Narrow shoulders are inadequate for vehicle refuge. Existing shoulders are 1 to 3 feet wide. Design standards require at least 3 feet of shoulder width for a county trunk highway.
- Inadequate cross slopes cause poor drainage. Existing cross slopes range from 1 to 2 percent. Design standards recommend 2 percent.

Based on engineering judgement, these deficiencies, combined with future travel demand on County KR, would impact safety for vehicular, bike and pedestrian travel.

Safety

Within the project limits, County KR experienced 50 crashes between 2013 and 2017 and had a crash rate of 140.2 crashes per 100 million vehicle miles. This crash rate exceeds the statewide crash rate threshold of 115.9 crashes/100 million vehicle miles for similar roadways. Most of the crashes in the project area, 37 crashes, occurred at the intersection of County KR and WIS 31. According to the traffic report prepared for the project, intersection modifications could help to mitigate some of the crash patterns at this intersection. Also, the traffic report concluded that additional modifications such as intersection and capacity improvements would be needed to accommodate the projected 2042 traffic volumes along County KR to maintain safety.

2. Summary of Alternatives

The following alternatives were considered for the County KR-Phase 2 project:

No Build Alternative

The EA for the County KR-Phase 2 project evaluated a No Build Alternative to serve as a baseline for comparison to the Build Alternative. Under the No Build Alternative, the roadway would remain in its current configuration as a two-lane undivided rural roadway with two 12-foot travel lanes, 1-3-foot shoulders and drainage ditches within a 66-foot right of way. The No Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need for the project. The No Build alternative would not adequately handle increased travel demand anticipated from local economic development projects, it would not result in safety improvements and it would not maintain mobility along an important east-west local arterial road for Racine and Kenosha counties.

Build Alternative – Reconstruction (Preferred Alternative)

The Build Alternative - Reconstruction would reconstruct and widen County KR as a four-lane divided urban roadway with two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction that are divided by a median. The median between County H and 90th Street would be 36-feet and the median for the remainder of the corridor would typically be 30-feet. Between the UPRR and 56th Avenue, County KR would have a 22-foot median and 8-foot shoulders to allow vehicles to decelerate to and accelerate from driveways. East of Old Green Bay Road, County KR would have a 30-foot median that tapers to match the existing road width. The median in this section would be painted to facilitate full access for cross streets and driveways along County KR in this section. (See **Appendix B-1: Design Plans and B-2: Typical Sections.**)

The Build Alternative - Reconstruction would include intersection improvements (signals and turn lanes) to maintain traffic operations at the County KR intersections with WIS 31 and Old Green Bay Road and it would realign 90th Street on the north with County EA (72nd Avenue) on the south. The 90th Street realignment moves the intersection of these two north-south streets approximately 200 feet to the west on County KR.

The existing at-grade railroad crossings at CPRR and UPRR would be grade separated with County KR built over the railroad corridors. When a project is planned that includes a railroad crossing, WisDOT evaluates the adequacy of the proposed crossing. WisDOT used multiple criteria to recommend a grade separation for these crossing locations. The criteria include: roadway classification, exposure factor, the presence of high-speed freight and passenger trains, existing terrain, presence of commercial and school buses, highway design speed, potential for unusually long delays for motorists, and future expansion of highway facilities. County KR will serve as an important east-west connection between I-94 and the cities of Racine and Kenosha. The projected traffic volumes are anticipated to double by 2042. The new

⁴ The shared-use paths will be constructed as a separate project following construction of the roadways.
Project ID # 3763-00-04

roadway will be a four-lane urban roadway with a median and the proposed bridges at CPRR and UPRR will contain a four-lane divided roadway with bike lanes and 18-foot shoulders (See **Appendix B-2**). The exposure factor is based on design year vehicular traffic and railroad operations characteristics. At both crossings, the general threshold for the exposure factor will be exceeded by the 2042 design year.⁵ County KR will have emergency services and can accommodate future commuter and school bus routes. Grade separation was chosen at the CPRR and UPRR to minimize delays to the traveling public.

The box culvert conveying the Pike River would be replaced with new bridge structures (See **Appendix B-3: Bridge Section**). Existing drainage ditches would be replaced with curb and gutter, and stormwater would be conveyed to detention ponds. A 10-foot shared-use path would be built on both sides of the road between County H and 90th Street and on the north side of County KR between 90th Street and Vicksburg Drive to the east of Old Green Bay Road. The existing shared-use path on the south side of County KR between 56th Avenue and WIS 31 would be replaced in generally the same configuration except bicyclists and pedestrians would be rerouted onto a bike/pedestrian lane on the new County KR bridge over the Pike River.

The preferred Build Alternative - Reconstruction would meet the purpose and need for the project because the capacity expansion, intersection improvements and grade separations would accommodate the travel demand that is anticipated from local economic development projects and land use plans. The Build Alternative - Reconstruction would also maintain mobility along an important east-west local arterial road for Racine and Kenosha counties, improve safety and address roadway deficiencies.

Options Considered for Build Alternative - Reconstruction

WisDOT evaluated the following design options for the Build Alternative – Reconstruction:

- **UPRR Grade Separation Access Options:** Two grade separation access options are being evaluated (see **Appendix B-4**). Option 1 would construct a retaining wall and access road off County KR to avoid residential property acquisitions and maintain access to residences on the south side of County KR. (See **Appendix C** for retaining wall renderings.) Option 2 would construct a retaining wall along County KR for the grade separation and provide access to five residential properties on the south side of County KR from a new access road that would extend east from 1st Place off 56th Avenue.

Option 1 is preferred because it avoids the neighborhood impacts associated with Option 2.

- **County EA (72nd Avenue)/90th Street Realignment Options:** Two realignment options were evaluated for this intersection. Option 1 shifts 90th Street to the west to align with the existing 72nd Avenue intersection south of County KR (**See Appendix B-1**). Option 2 shifts 72nd Avenue to the east to align with the existing 90th Street intersection north of County KR (**See Appendix B-5**).

Option 1 is preferred because it uses land that is either purchased or will be purchased by the village of Mount Pleasant for the Foxconn manufacturing campus and it minimizes impacts to residential properties and wetlands on the south side of County KR. Kenosha and Racine counties concurred with the realignment of 90th Street to match into the existing 72nd Avenue intersection.

- **Median Access Options between UPRR and 56th Avenue:** WisDOT evaluated four median access options for this section of County KR (see **Appendix B-6**). Option 1 (Full Median with No Access) includes a raised median that separates opposing directions of traffic with no median openings along this section of County KR. This option limits access from intersecting driveways to right-in and right-out turns with U-turns available at 56th Avenue to the east and 90th Street to the west for this section of County KR. Option 2 (Median Opening with Left Turn Lanes) includes a raised median that separates opposing directions of traffic and provides two median openings that have dedicated left-turn lanes for cross access along this section of County KR. This option limits driveway access to right-in and right-out turns but provides more frequent opportunities for U-turns along this section of County KR. Option 3 (Two-Way-Left-Turn Lane) includes a two-way-left-turn in the median that allows cross access directly from driveways along this section of County KR.

Option 1 is preferred because the raised median is needed as a result of the anticipated traffic volumes along this section of County KR to provide safe traffic operations and to minimize conflicts between through traffic and turning vehicles entering and exiting County KR. WisDOT refined Option 1 to reduce the median width to 22 feet

⁵ The exposure factor is estimated to be 520,000 and 108,000 for CPRR and UPRR, respectively. Per WisDOT Facilities Development Manual, Chapter 17, Section 40 (dated 3/27/2008), the exposure factor threshold is 100,000.

(from UPRR to 56th Avenue) and increase the shoulder to 8 feet to provide space for vehicles to decelerate to and accelerate from driveways.

- Median Access Options between 43rd Avenue and East Project Terminus: WisDOT evaluated four median access options for this section of County KR (see **Appendix B-7**). Option 1 (Right-In/Right-Out) includes a raised median that separates opposing directions of traffic with no median openings along this section of County KR. This option limits access from intersecting roadways (43rd Avenue and Vicksburg Drive) and driveways to right-in and right-out turns with U-turns available at the end of the median nose (about 400 feet east of Vicksburg Drive) to the east and Old Green Bay Road to the west. Option 2 (Painted Median) includes a painted median that allows full cross access for intersecting roadways (43rd Avenue and Vicksburg Drive) and driveways for this section of County KR. Option 3 (Corrugated Concrete Median) includes a corrugated concrete median and median openings at County KR intersections with 43rd Avenue and Vicksburg Drive to provide full cross access for driveways and intersections along this section of County KR. Option 4 (Left Turn Lane) includes a raised median that separates opposing directions of traffic with a single median opening at Vicksburg Drive and a dedicated left-turn lane for eastbound traffic along County KR at the median opening. This option would provide full access to the Vicksburg Drive intersection to the north of County KR and limited right-in/right-out access for the 43rd Avenue intersection and driveways to the south of County KR.

Option 2 is the preferred option because it provides full access to residential areas and driveways compared to Options 1, 3 and 4. Traffic volumes decrease east of Old Green Bay Road, which minimizes the potential for conflicts between through traffic and turning traffic.

- Shared-Use Path Options between 90th Street and Old Green Bay Road: WisDOT evaluated two options for the location of the shared-use path between 90th Street and Old Green Bay Road. Option 1 placed the shared-use path on the south side of County KR and Option 2 placed the path on the north side of County KR. Option 2 is the preferred option because the north side of County KR has fewer driveway access points, which is safer for pedestrians and bicyclists using the path. Also, option 2 avoids potential impacts to residential properties on the south side of County KR.

Build Alternative – Bypass

In response to public input obtained at the October 17, 2018 public meeting for the County KR-Phase 2 project, WisDOT reviewed a bypass alternative that was presented by local citizens concerned about the impact to residences that front County KR to the east of 90th Street. The bypass alternative would create a new roadway alignment to the north of the existing County KR from 90th Street to WIS 11 and downtown Racine (See **Appendix B-8**). Phase 1 of the proposed bypass would start at the intersection of County KR with 90th Street and extend east along a corridor approximately 2,000 feet north of County KR that crosses the UP railroad, Pike River and WIS 31 corridors. Phase 2 of the proposed bypass would extend the bypass east from WIS 31 along a new roadway corridor that crosses Old Green Bay Road, Wood Road, Meachem Road, Lathrop Avenue and the Racine County Bike Trail. Then, the bypass would head north to Chicory Road where it would meet up with the existing S. Memorial Drive that connects with WIS 11 (Durand Avenue). Phase 3 of the bypass would link to WIS 32 (Sheridan Road) and downtown Racine.

With input from Racine and Kenosha Counties, WisDOT determined to not pursue the Bypass Alternative. This decision is based on evaluation of the following factors:

- Purpose and Need of County KR-Phase 2 Project: One of the primary purposes of the County KR-Phase 2 project is to safely and efficiently improve mobility from I-94 to the communities in both Kenosha and Racine counties. The Bypass Alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the project because it only addresses mobility to Racine and would not address mobility to the city of Kenosha and other Kenosha County communities.
- Environmental Impacts: The new roadway alignment for the Bypass Alternative has a much larger footprint compared to using existing County KR, which already has a base roadway footprint. The additional area to widen the existing roadway is much less than the area required for a new roadway. The Bypass Alternative would impact the following resources:
 - Pike River improvement project west of the WIS 31 intersection: The village of Mount Pleasant, working in conjunction with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), recently completed restoration improvements along the Pike River to control flooding, restore natural features, enhance aquatic life and improve water quality. The Bypass Alternative introduces a new physical impact that would bisect this area and impact the restoration area, which is not consistent with the long-term restoration goals in the river corridor.

- New stream crossings: The Bypass Alternative could require up to four new stream crossings, which could disrupt aquatic habitats.
 - Floodplain impacts: The area north of County KR and west of WIS 31 is low and wet. The Bypass Alternative would require substantial filling of this floodplain.
 - Land-use plans: The Bypass Alternative would interrupt the cohesive residential area planned by the village of Mount Pleasant between County KR and Braun Road. The Bypass Alternative would also impact existing neighborhoods east of WIS 31, due to the relative close proximity of a proposed new 4-lane divided roadway to them.
 - Park impacts: The Bypass Alternative potentially impacts the future Biex Ramcke Park and Sanders Park, which is also a SEWRPC-designated isolated natural resource.
 - Farm land impacts: The bypass would sever farm land for new roadway right of way.
- Right of Way Costs and Impacts: The right of way and additional cost needed to widen the existing County KR road is substantially less than what would be required for a roadway on a new alignment. A substantial portion of right of way from the existing County KR is already in place.
 - New Railroad Crossing: A new bypass requires a new crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad. Railroads typically require a very detailed evaluation of a new crossing before they'll consider it. Getting clearance from Union Pacific for this new crossing could be difficult and would potentially take a long time.
 - Project Cost Comparison of Bypass: WisDOT estimates the Bypass Alternative would be about a half mile longer than the existing alignment between 90th Street and WIS 31. Adding those additional roadway costs to other "new" costs of the bypass (such as structures for additional stream crossings mentioned above), the bypass route could cost \$5M to \$9M more than the current proposal to widen County KR on its current alignment.
 - Additional Roadway Maintenance Costs: The new bypass roadway would increase local roadway maintenance costs since Racine County would have to maintain over 4 miles of new roadway.

3. Description of Proposed Action

The preferred Build Alternative - Reconstruction would replace the existing two-lane rural undivided roadway with a four-lane divided urban roadway. (See **Appendix B** for the design plans, typical sections, bridge cross sections and design options). The Build Alternative - Reconstruction would reconstruct and expand County KR with two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction that are divided by a median. The raised median between County H and 90th Street would be 36-feet and the median for the remainder of the corridor would typically be 30-feet. Between the UPRR and 56th Avenue, County KR would have a 22-foot raised median and 8-foot shoulders to allow vehicles to decelerate to and accelerate from driveways. East of Old Green Bay Road, the 30-foot raised median would end just west of 43rd Avenue. Then, the median, which tapers to match the existing road width, would be painted to facilitate full access across County KR. Proposed right of way for the Build Alternative - Reconstruction would vary from 224 feet to 380 feet, depending on location.

The project would include improvements to maintain traffic operations at the County KR intersections with WIS 31 and Old Green Bay Road and it would realign 90th Street on the north with County EA (72nd Avenue) on the south. Each of these intersections would be signalized and have exclusive left turn and right turn lanes. The intersection approaches on both WIS 31 and Old Green Bay Road would be reconstructed to accommodate proposed County KR construction. WIS 31 would be reconstructed with its current lane configuration approximately 600 feet to the north, and 650 feet south of the current County KR intersection. Old Green Bay Road would be similarly reconstructed: 400 feet to the south and 400 feet to the north of the current County KR intersection.

New bridges (grade separations) for County KR would replace the existing at-grade railroad crossings at CPRR and UPRR. The new bridges would have a 23-foot, 3-inch clearance over the railroad tracks to meet design standards for railroad grade separations. The grade separation at UPRR would include a retaining wall on the south side of County KR that ranges in height from 2 feet to 28 feet and an access road off County KR to provide access to residential properties to the south of County KR. A rendering of the retaining wall is in **Appendix C**.

Two new 233-foot concrete slab span⁶ bridges over the Pike River would replace the existing 3-cell (12-foot x 13.5-foot/cell) box culvert that conveys the Pike River under County KR.

⁶ Slab span bridges are thick reinforced concrete slabs (no beams/girders) that span crossing (i.e. roads, streams) to the supporting foundations (piers and abutments).

Existing drainage ditches would be replaced with curb and gutter, and stormwater would be conveyed to one of four detention ponds at the following general locations:

- North of County KR, between County H and CPRR
- South of County KR, east of 72nd Avenue
- North of County KR, west of the Pike River
- South of County KR, between the Pike River and WIS 31

A 10-foot shared-use path would be built on both sides of the road between County H and 90th Street. The path would be constructed on the north side of County KR between 90th Street and Vicksburg Drive, just east of Old Green Bay Road. The Kenosha County shared-use path on the south side of County KR between 56th Avenue and WIS 31 would be replaced in generally the same configuration. The proposed bridge to carry County KR over the Pike River requires removing the existing bridge for the path over the Pike River. Bicyclists and pedestrians would be rerouted onto a bike/pedestrian lane on the new County KR bridge over the Pike River (See **Appendix B-3** for cross section showing shared-use path on proposed bridge).

Based on construction staging plans, County KR would be closed to through traffic during construction and local access to adjacent properties would be maintained during construction. WisDOT developed two staging options, depending on funding availability. Option 1 would reconstruct County KR over 24 months in four stages. Option 2 would reconstruct County KR over 15 months in three stages. See **Appendix B-9** for proposed detour routes of each option during construction. The existing shared-use path on the south side of County KR, between 56th Avenue and WIS 31 would also be closed during construction and users would be redirected to a detour route.

Access permits for driveways and public road intersections along County KR following construction would be determined by Racine and Kenosha counties.

4. Construction and Operational Energy Requirements

Energy consumption related to roadway construction includes energy required by raw materials and equipment to build and maintain the roadway. Operational energy is the direct consumption of fuel by vehicles using the roadway. Fuel usage is affected by vehicle type, roadway grade, speed, and congestion.

The No-Build Alternative requires no construction energy except for periodic roadway maintenance, which would become more frequent in the future. Operational energy would remain high under the No-Build Alternative as congestion increases in the future and increased maintenance costs of the unimproved roadway.

Because the preferred Build Alternative - Reconstruction requires construction activity, more construction energy is used for excavation, filling, hauling, and pavement construction and material manufacturing than the No-Build alternative. However, the operational energy required would decrease over time with improved traffic operations and improved infrastructure would reduce maintenance costs. The initial construction energy costs for the preferred Build Alternative - Reconstruction is expected to be recovered over time due to long-term savings in operational energy costs and reduced future maintenance energy costs.

5. Land Use Adjoining the Project and Surrounding Area

Existing land use adjacent to County KR and in the surrounding project area is primarily agricultural with some single-family residential use present primarily on the eastern end of the project area. Within a mile to the north and south of the project corridor, the land use is 84 percent agricultural and 6.3 percent residential. Less than one percent of the land is commercial, and no industrial land use is present. Along County KR, between County H and the UPRR, the predominate land use is agricultural. Between the UPRR and the eastern edge of the project, single-family residential clusters can be found amid the agricultural lands.

6. Planning and Zoning

Foxconn Manufacturing Campus/Development Roads

In 2017, Foxconn Technology Group (Foxconn) selected an approximately 3,000-acre site in Mount Pleasant to construct a new LCD panel glass fabrication plant. The site is generally bound by I-94 to the west, 90th Street to the east, County KR to the south and WIS 11 to the north. The \$10 billion facility will include 22 million square feet of new development that is expected to potentially create up to 13,000 jobs. Additional development is planned around the core manufacturing campus that is expected to attract other companies and suppliers to locate near the Foxconn facility. For more information about Foxconn, visit: <https://wisconnvalley.wi.gov/Pages/Home.aspx>.

WisDOT partnered with Mount Pleasant, Racine County and Kenosha County to improve and expand several roadways around the Foxconn development including Braun Road, International Drive, WIS 11, County H and County KR. Also, a new road, Wisconn Valley Way is being planned. For more information about the Wisconn Valley Development Roads, visit: <https://projects.511wi.gov/fdr/>. The County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the Foxconn development plan since the project will accommodate the increased travel demand generated by the manufacturing campus.

Village of Mount Pleasant Land Use Plan

The village of Mount Pleasant amended their 2035 Master Plan land use map in November 2017 (Village of Mount Pleasant, November 2017). The amendment changed the previously planned agricultural land to a "business park" designation along the I-94 corridor and County KR corridor between I-94 and 90th Street in anticipation of the Foxconn development. The land use plan shows the area to the north of County KR between 90th Street and the Pike River as agricultural. The land use plan shows the area to the north of County KR between the Pike River and WIS 31 is planned for residential, commercial and institutional uses. Improving County KR from a rural cross section to an urban cross section as part of the County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the Mount Pleasant land use plan and zoning that anticipate the transition of the existing agricultural uses to urban uses. To view the land use plan, visit:

<http://www.mtpleasantwi.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1285/2035-Master-Land-Use-Plan-2017-Update>.

Village of Mount Pleasant Zoning Ordinance

Mount Pleasant rezoned the Foxconn development area and County KR corridor between I-94 and 90th Street from agricultural to Business Park (B-P). This designation provides space where diverse office, retail and customer service uses may be mixed with industrial uses. The area north of County KR between 90th Street and Old Green Bay Road is zoned agricultural. This zoning designation is for farming and is intended to protect the area from non-agricultural development. The land along the Pike River north of County KR is zoned for Public or Utility Plans (PUL). This zoning designation is for areas under public or utility ownership where the use for public purpose is anticipated to be permanent. The proposed County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the village's zoning ordinance since the village of Mount Pleasant is planning for the transition of agricultural land to urban land uses.

Village of Somers Land Use Plan

The village of Somers adopted the 2050 Land Use Plan Area in July 2018 to update the 2035 planned land uses in the northwest portion of the community to the east of I-94 and south of County KR. Under the 2050 plan, the area to the south of County KR is planned as business/industrial park and medium density residential. Improving County KR from a rural cross section to an urban cross section as part of the County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the Somers land use plan that anticipates the transition of the existing agricultural uses to urban uses. To learn more about the land use plan amendment, visit: <http://www.somers.org/?q=node/897#.W5blhc5KhhE>.

Village of Somers General Zoning and Shoreland/Floodplain Zoning Ordinance

The village of Somers zoning ordinance regulates the use of land within village limits. Most of the land adjacent to County KR is zoned A-1 (Agricultural Preservation District) or A-2 (General Agricultural District). The residential areas on the east side of the project area are zoned R-2 (Suburban Single-Family Residential District) or R-3 (Urban Single-Family Residential District). The proposed County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the village's zoning ordinance since the village of Somers is planning for the transition of agricultural land to urban land uses. According to input from village officials, Somers will consider rezoning land from agricultural to urban uses as development proposals are reviewed through the village's site planning process.

A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Racine County: 2035

Racine County, in coordination with all municipalities in the county, adopted a shared-jurisdictional comprehensive plan in 2009. According to the plan, the land use plan seeks to encourage new urban development within planned urban service areas; it envisions that new residential development outside of planned urban service areas would occur primarily at rural densities; and it calls for the preservation of the primary environmental corridors and the most productive farmlands remaining within the planning area. This plan assumed the area to the north of County KR between I-94 and WIS 31 in Mount Pleasant would remain agricultural through 2035. Also, the functional improvement plan for arterial streets and highways recommended the preservation of right of way along County KR between I-94 and WIS 32 for a future four lane facility. To view the Racine County plan, visit: <http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/CAPR/capr-301-comprehensive-plan-for-racine-county.pdf>.

The more recent land use and economic development plans adopted by the village of Mount Pleasant and the proposed amendment to the amended SEWRPC VISION 2050 supersede the land use and transportation recommendations in the county plan. The County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the updated plans.

Kenosha County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan

Kenosha County adopted a multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan in 2010. This plan involved 10 local units of government including Somers. The plan indicates where urban development should be encouraged and where agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas should be preserved. This plan assumed the area to the south of County KR between I-94 and County EA in Somers would remain agricultural through 2035 and is classified as farmland protection. To view the plan, visit: <http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/CAPR/capr-299-comprehensive-plan-for-kenosha-county.pdf>.

The more recent land use and economic development plans adopted by the village of Somers and the proposed amendment to the amended SEWRPC VISION 2050 supersede the land use and transportation recommendations in the county plan. The County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with the updated plans.

VISION 2050: A Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan

SEWRPC completed VISION 2050, a long-range plan for land use and transportation in Southeastern Wisconsin in July 2016. The plan is an advisory vision for how the seven-county region can achieve the type of land use and transportation infrastructure that will help attract new talent and encourage economic growth. Key plan recommendations include preservation of primary environmental corridors; encouraging more compact development; improving public transit; enhancing bicycle and pedestrian networks; keeping major streets in a state of good repair; and strategically adding capacity to congested roadways and implementing complete streets. The 2050 land use development pattern shows the County KR corridor on the west side of Mount Pleasant and Somers as agricultural. The functional improvement plan for arterial streets and highways recommends the preservation of right of way along County KR between I-94 and WIS 31 for a future four lane facility. SEWRPC amended VISION 2050 on December 5, 2018 to incorporate land use and transportation changes for additional residents and development related to the Foxconn manufacturing campus in Mount Pleasant in Racine County. In addition, the plan amendment incorporates transportation improvements to serve the Foxconn development area and recommends the widening of County KR from two to six travel lanes between I-94 and County H and from two to four travel lanes between County H and WIS 32. The proposed County KR-Phase 2 project is compatible with SEWRPC's amended Vision 2050 plan since the project expands the roadway to four lanes between 90th Street and just east of Old Green Bay Road as recommended by the SEWRPC plan. To learn more about Vision 2050, visit: http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/VISION_2050/2050RegLandUseTranspPlan.htm.

7. Indirect Effects and Cumulative Effects

If any of the following boxes are checked, the Pre-Screening Worksheet for EA and ER Projects For Determining the Need to Conduct a Detailed Indirect Effects Analysis found in Appendix A of the WisDOT report titled *Guidance for Conducting an Indirect Effects Analysis* must be completed and attached to this environmental document.

An alternative being carried forward for detailed consideration includes;

- Economic development as a purpose and need element of the proposed project.
 - Construction of one or more new or additional through lanes.
 - Construction of a new interchange or elimination of an existing interchange.
 - Construction of one or more additional ramps or relocation of a ramp lane to a new quadrant on an existing interchange.
 - Changing an at-grade intersection to a grade-separation with no access or a grade-separation to an at-grade intersection.
 - Construction of one or more additional intersections along the mainline created by a new side road access.
 - One or more new access points along a side road within 500' of the mainline.
- None of the above boxes have been checked, it has therefore been concluded that the proposed action will not result in indirect effects or cumulative effects.
- The proposed action may result in indirect effects or cumulative effects. The Pre-Screening Worksheet for EA and ER Projects For Determining the Need to Conduct a Detailed Indirect Effects Analysis attached as _____ indicates a detailed indirect effects and cumulative effects analysis is not required.
- The proposed action may result in indirect effects or cumulative effects. It has been determined that a detailed indirect effects and cumulative effects analysis is required. See **Appendix D** for indirect and cumulative effects technical report completed for the project.

9. Environmental Justice

| How was information obtained about the presence of populations covered by EO 12898? (check all that apply) | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US Census Data | <input type="checkbox"/> Survey Questionnaire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Real Estate Company | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WisDOT Real Estate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Involvement Meeting | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Government |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Official Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Windshield Survey* |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources Agency Identify agency: Identify plan, approval authority and date of approval: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Identify: | |

*Conducting only a windshield survey is not sufficient to make a determination regarding whether or not populations are present.

Based on data obtained from the methods above, are populations covered by EO 12898 present in the project area?

- a. No
- b. Yes – Factor Sheet B-4 must be completed.

10. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Age Discrimination Act

Indicate whether or not issues have been identified or concerns have been expressed related to Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Age Discrimination Act.

- a. No – Issues related to the above laws were not identified and concerns were not expressed.
- b. Yes – Issues related to the above laws were identified and/or concerns were expressed. Explain:

11. Public Involvement

A. Public Meetings

| Date (m/d/yyyy) | Meeting Sponsor (WisDOT, RPC, MPO, etc.) | Type of Meeting (PIM, Public Hearings, etc.) | Location | Approx. Number of Attendees |
|--------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 7/12/2018 | WisDOT | Public Involvement Meeting | Village of Mount Pleasant, Village Hall | 170 |
| 10/17/18 | WisDOT | Public Involvement Meeting | Village of Mount Pleasant, Village Hall | 154 |

- B. Other methods such as those identified in the Public Involvement Plan and Environmental Justice Plan (if applicable):
N/A
- C. Identify groups that participated in the public involvement process. Include any organizations and special interest groups including but not limited to:

WisDOT notified local units of government, property owners within one-quarter mile of the project corridor, businesses, schools, churches, Gateway Technical College, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, individuals who signed in at previous public meetings, individuals who signed up for information via the project website and state legislators. Participants in the public involvement meetings included property owners, business owners, local officials, Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership/Big Step⁷, as well as individuals with an interest in the project.

- D. Indicate plans for additional public involvement, if applicable:
WisDOT has engaged in stakeholder meetings to discuss impacts and design refinements. See item 12 below. WisDOT will hold a public hearing when the Environmental Assessment is released for public review.

⁷ W RTP/Big Step is a 501(c)3 nonprofit workforce intermediary dedicated to connecting people to family-sustaining jobs. Its mission is to enhance the ability of public and private sector organizations to recruit, develop, and retain a more diverse, qualified workforce in construction, manufacturing and emerging sectors of the regional economy. Source: <http://www.wrtf.org/>
Project ID # 3763-00-04

12. Briefly summarize the results of public involvement.

A. Describe the issues, if any, identified by individuals or groups during the public involvement process:

The primary concerns raised at the July 12, 2018 public information meeting focused on impacts to residential and farm properties; turning movements and cross access along County KR; stormwater runoff and flooding; and bicycle trail connectivity.

The primary concerns raised at the October 17, 2018 public information meeting focused on the impact to residential properties next to the proposed retaining wall for the County KR/UPRR grade separation; cross access restrictions from raised medians at existing intersections and driveways; the location of stormwater ponds that interfere with the future development potential of private property; access for future commercial development; the proximity of the expanded roadway to residences that will not be acquired; the expansion of County KR to the east of WIS 31; the timing for residential acquisitions; tree impacts; and the loss of access from the realignment of County EA with 90th Street. Some meeting participants expressed concern about neighborhood impacts from the proposed access road option that would extend west from 1st Place. Also, a County KR Bypass Alternative was presented to WisDOT by residents that proposes to construct a new roadway to the north of County KR between 90th Street and downtown Racine. The purpose of the bypass is to avoid impacts to residential properties to the east of 90th Street.

B. Briefly describe how the issues identified above were addressed:

Kenosha County is continuing further outreach to local residents to evaluate and finalize decisions on acquisitions on the south side of County KR, east of UPRR. Kenosha County contacted residents impacted⁸ by the retaining wall to gauge desire to have the County purchase their properties. The residents did not unanimously agree to acquisition, and Kenosha County will not purchase the properties.

To address concerns about cross access, WisDOT will provide a painted median between 43rd Avenue and the project's eastern terminus to maintain full access across County KR. WisDOT will maintain a raised median between the UPRR and 56th Avenue to maintain safety but reduce the median width to allow for 8-foot shoulders for acceleration and deceleration from and to driveways. Also, based on public input, WisDOT eliminated the access road option for the UPRR grade separation extending west from 1st Place.

In accordance with the jurisdictional transfer agreement between WisDOT and Kenosha and Racine counties, both WisDOT and the counties have agreed to develop a long-range access management vision of the corridor. The plan's intent is to be used as a comprehensive and collaborative tool for evaluation of future access requests as development and redevelopment occurs adjacent to the County KR corridor.

Residents with questions about the timing for the acquisition process were referred to the county representatives responsible for property acquisitions. Future driveway and roadway intersections would be determined by Racine and Kenosha counties.

Improvements to County KR between Old Green Bay Road and WIS 32 are not currently scheduled or needed based on current and future traffic volumes. Kenosha County and Racine County would be responsible for future improvements through each county's capital improvements plan.

Stormwater would be managed via curb and gutter drainage, which would be directed to detention ponds along the project corridor. Stormwater management would comply with local ordinances. The location of the stormwater ponds near the Pike River will be determined during final design with input from Racine and Kenosha counties, the village of Mount Pleasant and the village of Somers.

WisDOT has committed to follow up during final design to inventory potentially impacted trees. Reconstructed County KR would include shared-use paths and would connect to existing and planned trails in the corridor.

WisDOT evaluated the Bypass Alternative presented by citizens and dismissed the alternative since it did not meet the purpose and need for the project and it would require a much larger footprint with greater environmental impacts and costs than the Build Alternative - Reconstruction. See Summary of Alternatives under Basic Sheet 3 for more information about the Bypass Alternative.

⁸ Impacted residential properties are those served by the proposed access road and would have views of the retaining wall from their property.

13. Local/regional/tribal/federal government coordination

A. Identify units of government contacted and provide the date coordination was initiated.

| Unit of Government (MPO, RPC, City, County, Village, Town, Tribal, Federal, etc.) | Coordination Correspondence Attached (Yes/No) | Coordination Initiation Date (m/d/yyyy) | Coordination Completion Date (m/d/yyyy) | Comments |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| Kenosha and Racine counties, Village of Mount Pleasant | No | 07/09/2018 10/17/18 | 07/09/2018 10/17/18 | WisDOT met with local officials prior to the July 12, 2018 and October 17, 2018 public information meeting to present and discuss public meeting informational materials. |
| Village of Mount Pleasant | No | 07/16/18 | Ongoing | WisDOT meets with the village for input into County KR design. |
| Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) | Yes See Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis (Appendix D) | 7/24/2018 | 7/24/2018 | Interview with SEWRPC staff to obtain input on the indirect and cumulative effects analysis. |
| Village of Somers and Kenosha County | Yes See Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis (Appendix D) | 7/25/2018 | 7/25/2018 | Interview with village and county staff to obtain input on the indirect and cumulative effects analysis. |
| Village of Mount Pleasant | Yes See Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis (Appendix D) | 7/25/2018 | 7/25/2018 | Interview with village staff to obtain input on the indirect and cumulative effects analysis. |
| Racine and Kenosha counties | No | 07/25/2018 | Ongoing | WisDOT hosts bi-weekly meetings with the counties for input into County KR design. |
| Racine and Kenosha counties, Village of Mount Pleasant, Village of Somers | No | 08/20/2018 | 08/20/2018 | Presentation of, and input on design updates. |

B. Describe the issues, if any, identified by units of government during the public involvement process:

Kenosha County and the village of Somers have expressed concern to avoid relocations and to minimize impacts to trees fronting County KR. Local officials also were concerned that the proposed shared-use path provide a safe connection to the Pike River Pathway (under construction) and the existing path on the south side of County KR. The village of Somers expressed concern about impacts of the proposed shared-use path on the south side of County KR, including impacts to landscaping and trees. The proposed reconstruction should also minimize impacts to the recently completed Pike River improvement project on the north side of County KR (in the village of Mount Pleasant). The USACE partially funded and the village constructed the Pike River improvement project.

C. Briefly describe how the issues identified above were addressed:

WisDOT has committed to follow up during final design to inventory potentially impacted trees. Also, based on feedback from the village of Somers and the village of Mount Pleasant, the shared-use path would be located on the north side of County KR where fewer residential properties are located. WisDOT is working with the village of Mount Pleasant to coordinate the Pike River Pathway connection with the County KR shared-use path design and minimize impacts to the Pike River improvement project. Similar coordination is ongoing with Kenosha County and the village of Somers to maintain connectivity of and provide connection to the existing shared-use path on the south side of County KR. Kenosha County (which has jurisdiction over the shared-use path) has agreed with routing the existing shared-use path onto the new County KR bridge over the Pike River. Kenosha County will re-use the existing bridge for other purposes. To minimize impacts to the Pike River improvement project on the north side of County KR, stormwater ponds were placed in areas that would avoid newly restored habitat. WisDOT completed coordination with the USACE and the village of Mount Pleasant to minimize impacts to the Pike River improvement project. WisDOT is continuing coordination with the village of Mount Pleasant during final design to further minimize impacts to the Pike River improvement project, as well as the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park.

D. Indicate any unresolved issues or ongoing discussions:

Kenosha County is continuing further outreach to local residents to evaluate and finalize decisions on acquisitions on the south side of County KR, east of UPRR.

14. Public Hearing Requirement

- This document is an Environmental Assessment.
 - A Notice of Opportunity to Request a Public Hearing **will be** published, or,
 - A Public Hearing **will be** held.
- This document is a Type 2c Categorical Exclusion / Environmental Report.
 - A substantial amount of right-of-way **will** be acquired.
 - The proposed action **will** substantially change the layout or functions of connecting roadways or of the facility being improved.
 - The proposed action **will** have a substantial adverse impact on abutting property.
 - The proposed action **will** have other substantial social, economic, environmental effects.
 - The department has made a determination that a public hearing is in the public interest.
- None of the above boxes have been checked, it has therefore been concluded that a Notice of Opportunity to Request a Public Hearing **will not** be published and a Public Hearing **is not** required, or,
- A Notice of Opportunity to Request a Public Hearing **will be** published, or,
- A Public Hearing **will be** held.

Note: For federally-funded projects, FHWA signature of this environmental document indicates concurrence with the department's Public Hearing requirement determination.

BASIC SHEET 4 – TRAFFIC SUMMARY MATRIX

| | ALTERNATIVES/SECTIONS | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No Build | Build Alternative – Reconstruction (County KR, County H to 90th Street) | | | | |
| TRAFFIC VOLUMES | | | | | | |
| Base Yr. AADT Yr. 2018 | 9500 | 9500 | | | | |
| Const. Yr. AADT Yr. 2022 | 13500 | 13500 | | | | |
| Const. Plus 10 Yr. AADT Yr. 2032 | 18000 | 18000 | | | | |
| Design Yr. AADT Yr. 2042 | 20000 | 20000 | | | | |
| DHV Yr. 2042 | 2190 | 2190 | | | | |
| TRAFFIC FACTORS | | | | | | |
| K [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 / <input type="checkbox"/> 100 / <input type="checkbox"/> 250] (%) | 11.6% | 11.6% | % | % | % | % |
| D (%) | 67% | 67% | % | % | % | % |
| Design Year T (% of AADT) | 6% | 6% | % | % | % | % |
| T (% of DHV) | 8% | 8% | % | % | % | % |
| Level of Service | LOS E | LOS C | | | | |
| SPEEDS | | | | | | |
| Existing Posted | 55 | 45 | | | | |
| Future Posted | 45 | 45 | | | | |
| Design Year Project Design Speed | 50 | 50 | | | | |
| OTHER (specify) | | | | | | |
| P (% of AADT) | 13% | 13% | % | % | % | % |
| K ₈ (% OF AADT) | 12.9% | 12.9% | % | % | % | % |
| Other | | | | | | |

AAADT = Annual Average Daily Traffic

K [_{30/100/200}] : K₃₀ = Interstate, K₁₀₀ = Rural, K₂₅₀ = Urban, % = AADT in DHV

T = Trucks

K₈ = % AADT occurring in the average of the 8 highest consecutive hours of traffic on an average day (required only if CO analysis is required).

DHV = Design Hourly Volume

D = % DHV in predominate direction of travel

P = % AADT in peak hour

1. Identify the agency that generated the data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix.

Traffic Volumes - SEWRPC; Traffic Factors - WisDOT; Level of Service – Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc (TADI); Speeds - WisDOT; Other - WisDOT

2. Identify the date (month/year) that the traffic forecast data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix was developed.

Traffic Volumes - 4/2018; All other data - 6/2018

3. Identify the methodology and/or computer program(s) used to develop the data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix.

Traffic forecasts were prepared by SEWRPC. The traffic factors were prepared by WisDOT using geometric design data spreadsheets updated 6-12-2018, and by using existing intersection peak hour counts (for T (% of DHV)). Level of Service determined by TADI using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 7.5.

4. If a metric other than Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is used for describing traffic volumes such as Average Annual Weekday Traffic (AWDT), explain why a different metric was used and how it compares to AADT.

SEWRPC forecasts were prepared using AWDT due to the large level of development anticipated in the area in and around the proposed Foxconn facility.

BASIC SHEET 4 – TRAFFIC SUMMARY MATRIX

| | ALTERNATIVES/SECTIONS | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No Build | Build Alternative – Reconstruction (County KR, 90th Street to WIS 31) | | | | |
| TRAFFIC VOLUMES | | | | | | |
| Base Yr. AADT Yr. 2018 | 9000 | 9000 | | | | |
| Const. Yr. AADT Yr. 2022 | 12500 | 12500 | | | | |
| Const. Plus 10 Yr. AADT Yr. 2032 | 16500 | 16500 | | | | |
| Design Yr. AADT Yr. 2042 | 18000 | 18000 | | | | |
| DHV Yr. 2042 | 1870 | 1870 | | | | |
| TRAFFIC FACTORS | | | | | | |
| K [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 / <input type="checkbox"/> 100 / <input type="checkbox"/> 250] (%) | 11.8% | 11.8% | % | % | % | % |
| D (%) | 64% | 64% | % | % | % | % |
| Design Year T (% of AADT) | 6% | 6% | % | % | % | % |
| T (% of DHV) | 8% | 8% | % | % | % | % |
| Level of Service | LOS E | LOS B | | | | |
| SPEEDS | | | | | | |
| Existing Posted | 45 | 45 | | | | |
| Future Posted | 45 | 45 | | | | |
| Design Year Project Design Speed | 50 | 50 | | | | |
| OTHER (specify) | | | | | | |
| P (% of AADT) | 14% | 14% | % | % | % | % |
| K ₈ (% OF AADT) | 13.3% | 13.3% | % | % | % | % |
| Other | | | | | | |

AAADT = Annual Average Daily Traffic

DHV = Design Hourly Volume

K [_{30/100/200}] : K₃₀ = Interstate, K₁₀₀ = Rural, K₂₅₀ = Urban, % = AADT in DHV

D = % DHV in predominate direction of travel

T = Trucks

P = % AADT in peak hour

K₈ = % AADT occurring in the average of the 8 highest consecutive hours of traffic on an average day (required only if CO analysis is required).

1. Identify the agency that generated the data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix.

Traffic Volumes - SEWRPC; Traffic Factors - WisDOT; Level of Service - Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc (TADI); Speeds - WisDOT; Other - WisDOT

2. Identify the date (month/year) that the traffic forecast data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix was developed.

Traffic Volumes - 4/2018; All other data - 6/2018

3. Identify the methodology and/or computer program(s) used to develop the data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix.

Traffic forecasts were prepared by SEWRPC. The traffic factors were prepared by WisDOT using geometric design data spreadsheets updated 6-12-2018, and by using existing intersection peak hour counts (for T (% of DHV)). Level of Service determined by TADI using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 7.5.

4. If a metric other than Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is used for describing traffic volumes such as Average Annual Weekday Traffic (AWDT), explain why a different metric was used and how it compares to AADT.

SEWRPC forecasts were prepared using AWDT due to the large level of development anticipated in the area in and around the proposed Foxconn facility.

BASIC SHEET 4 – TRAFFIC SUMMARY MATRIX

| | ALTERNATIVES/SECTIONS | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| | No Build | Build Alternative – Reconstruction (County KR, WIS 31 to Old Green Bay Road) | | | | |
| TRAFFIC VOLUMES | | | | | | |
| Base Yr. AADT Yr. 2018 | 9000 | 9000 | | | | |
| Const. Yr. AADT Yr. 2022 | 10000 | 10000 | | | | |
| Const. Plus 10 Yr. AADT Yr. 2032 | 13500 | 13500 | | | | |
| Design Yr. AADT Yr. 2042 | 15500 | 155000 | | | | |
| DHV Yr. 2042 | 1560 | 1560 | | | | |
| TRAFFIC FACTORS | | | | | | |
| K [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 / <input type="checkbox"/> 100 / <input type="checkbox"/> 250] (%) | 12.2% | 12.2% | % | % | % | % |
| D (%) | 58% | 58% | % | % | % | % |
| Design Year T (% of AADT) | 6% | 6% | % | % | % | % |
| T (% of DHV) | 8% | 8% | % | % | % | % |
| Level of Service | LOS E | LOS B | | | | |
| SPEEDS | | | | | | |
| Existing Posted | 45 | 45 | | | | |
| Future Posted | 45 | 45 | | | | |
| Design Year Project Design Speed | 50 | 50 | | | | |
| OTHER (specify) | | | | | | |
| P (% of AADT) | 15% | 15% | % | % | % | % |
| K ₈ (% OF AADT) | 14% | 14% | % | % | % | % |
| Other | | | | | | |

AADT = Annual Average Daily Traffic

DHV = Design Hourly Volume

K [_{30/100/200}] : K₃₀ = Interstate, K₁₀₀ = Rural, K₂₅₀ = Urban, % = AADT in DHV

D = % DHV in predominate direction of travel

T = Trucks

P = % AADT in peak hour

K₈ = % AADT occurring in the average of the 8 highest consecutive hours of traffic on an average day (required only if CO analysis is required).

1. Identify the agency that generated the data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix.

Traffic Volumes - SEWRPC; Traffic Factors - WisDOT; Level of Service - Traffic Analysis and Design, Inc (TADI); Speeds - WisDOT; Other - WisDOT

2. Identify the date (month/year) that the traffic forecast data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix was developed.

Traffic Volumes - 4/2018; All other data - 6/2018

3. Identify the methodology and/or computer program(s) used to develop the data included in the Traffic Summary Matrix.

Traffic forecasts were prepared by SEWRPC. The traffic factors were prepared by WisDOT using geometric design data spreadsheets updated 6-12-2018, and by using existing intersection peak hour counts (for T (% of DHV)). Level of Service determined by TADI using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 7.5.

4. If a metric other than Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is used for describing traffic volumes such as Average Annual Weekday Traffic (AWDT), explain why a different metric was used and how it compares to AADT.

SEWRPC forecasts were prepared using AWDT due to the large level of development anticipated in the area in and around the proposed Foxconn facility.

BASIC SHEET 5 – AGENCY AND TRIBAL COORDINATION

| Agency | Coordination Required? | Correspondence Attached? | Comments |
|--|---|---|--|
| WisDOT | | | |
| Region Real Estate Section | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A | Coordination is not required because there will be no Fee, PLE or TLE acquisitions. |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Coordination has been completed. Project effects and relocation assistance have been addressed. A Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan is attached in Appendix E . |
| Bureau of Aeronautics | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A | Coordination is not required. The project is not located within 5 miles of a public or military use airport. |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Coordination has been completed and project effects have been addressed. Explain: The project is near Sylvania Airport and Kenosha Airport. BOA recommends further coordination with FAA prior to construction. As suggested by BOA, the project team contacted Kenosha Airport and Sylvania Airport via letter (8/30/2018) and phone messages. The Kenosha Airport Director contacted the project team on 8/31/2018 and expressed no further concerns about the project. No response has been received from Sylvania Airport. |
| Railroads and Harbors Section | <input type="checkbox"/> No | N/A | Coordination is not required because no railways or harbors are in or planned for the project area. |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Coordination is ongoing. Explain: WisDOT Bureau of Railroads and Harbors is coordinating with UPRR and CPRR regarding proposed grade separations. |
| STATE AGENCY | | | |
| Natural Resources (DNR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Wetlands occur throughout the corridor. Fisheries present in Pike River. Recommendations for aquatic connectivity and culvert work; state and federally endangered resources potentially present that may require survey; review for nesting birds on the existing Pike River structure; recommendations to manage for invasive species and viral hemorrhagic septicemia, work in waterways and wetlands and floodplains; considerations for construction site management. The village of Mount Pleasant received Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) funds for the Pike River restoration area completed in 2016. See USACE coordination below. DNR confirmed no state stewardship funds were used to purchase public lands directly adjacent to the project. |
| State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Concurrence that no historic properties affected. SHPO requested notification of any disturbance to the catalogued and uncatalogued Immigrant Burial Site human burial site in close proximity to the proposed project location. If there is any disturbance, SHPO must review and authorize such proposed work within the uncatalogued location. |
| Agriculture (DATCP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Agricultural Impact Statement published October 12, 2018. https://datcp.wi.gov/Documents/AISCounyKRKenRac.pdf |
| Other (identify) Office of the Commissioner of Railroads (OCR) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | WisDOT Railroads and Harbors Section (RHS) is coordinating with OCR for the project. |
| FEDERAL AGENCY | | | |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Coordination letter sent 7/12/2018 to USACE St. Paul District office in Waukesha, WI. No response received. Per communication with DNR and the village of Mount Pleasant, project staff followed up with the USACE Detroit District on 8/3/2018 to discuss the County KR-Phase 2 reconstruction within a portion of the Pike River improvement project, located on the north side of County KR. GLRI funds, provided through the USACE, were used to construct the restoration area. Per Project Partnership Agreement for Pike River improvements Phases 8 and 9, USACE turned over project operations and maintenance to the village. The USACE determined the proposed project is consistent with the original intent of the restoration project and the adverse impact to the ecological functions of the project are minimal and mitigated to the extent practicable. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <p>WisDOT completed an IPaC query online. The query identified three species listed as Threatened, one species listed as Endangered and one species listed as Experimental Population, Non-Essential. WisDOT completed Section 10 consultation in accordance with the Endangered Species Act. WisDOT has determined the proposed project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") any of the species.</p> <p>The USFWS provided technical assistance to determine potential impacts to the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (RPBB). On December 13, 2018, USFWS communicated its conclusions to WisDOT:</p> <p><i>"Based on a closer examination of the impacts, we believe there is no significant risk to RPBB in the proposed action area south of the County Line Road (1st St.) as the forested habitat appears to be either too managed or disturbed to support overwintering habitat for the species. There is still some potential of impact to RPBB within the action area north of the road if tree clearing is occurring between October 15 and March 15, although we believe the risk is relatively low. Out of an abundance of caution, postponing tree clearing until after March 15 would eliminate the risk of overwintering queen RPBBs from being inadvertently crushed or disturbed as their presence in the forested area would be highly unlikely. However, I would not consider this a requirement since our best available information we have at this time shows to area of impact to be a narrow band of trees that are fairly dense and would be less likely to be high quality overwintering habitat for the species. The conservation measures you propose to replant disturbed areas with a pollinator friendly seed mix will result in beneficial effects to RPBB and the loss of 1.29 acres of forested habitat is unlikely to limit overwintering opportunities to RPBB within this High Potential Zone in the future."</i></p> <p>WisDOT will include commitments to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to RPBB habitat, including replanting disturbed areas in the RPBB High Potential Zone (HPZ) and limit tree clearing during overwintering months.</p> |
| Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| U.S. National Park Service (NPS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | WisDOT sent a coordination email on 7/12/18. Based on USCG response, no permit or construction coordination is required. USCG requested a set of as-built plans when complete. |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | Coordination letter sent 7/12/2018. No response received. |
| Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Other (identify) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SOVEREIGN NATIONS | | | |
| American Indian Tribes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | WisDOT sent letters to 11 tribes and the Bureau of Indian Affairs on 6/22/18. One tribe responded; the Forest County Potawatomi requested the archeological survey and SHPO response. WisDOT provided the survey and SHPO response on 10/24/18. |

BASIC SHEET 6 – ALTERNATIVES COMPARISON MATRIX

All estimates including costs are based on conditions described in this document at the time of preparation in the year of expenditure (YOE). Additional agency or public involvement may change these estimates in the future.

| PROJECT PARAMETERS | Unit of Measure | Alternatives/Sections | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | No Build ¹ | Build Alternative Reconstruction | | | | |
| Project Length | Miles | 2.8 | 2.8 | | | | |
| PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE (YOE) | | | | | | | |
| Construction | Million \$ | \$0.92 | \$54 | | | | |
| Real Estate | Million \$ | \$0 | \$5 | | | | |
| TOTAL | Million \$ | \$0.92 | \$59 | | | | |
| LAND CONVERSIONS | | | | | | | |
| Total Area Converted to ROW | Acres | 0 | 68.9 | | | | |
| REAL ESTATE | | | | | | | |
| Number of Farms Affected | Number | 0 | 14 | | | | |
| Total Area Required From Farm Operations | Acres | 0 | 53.4 | | | | |
| AIS Required | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Farmland Rating | Score | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Total Buildings Required | Number | 0 | 15 | | | | |
| Housing Units Required | Number | 0 | 5 | | | | |
| Commercial Units Required | Number | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Other Buildings or Structures Required | Number & Type | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Effects | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Cumulative Effects | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Environmental Justice Populations | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| National Register Eligible Historic Structures in the Area of Potential Effect | Number | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| National Register Eligible Archeological Sites in the Area of Potential Effect | Number | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Burial Site Protection (authorization required) | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 106 MOA Required | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Section 4(f) Evaluation Required | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Section 6(f) Land Conversion Required | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Flood Plain | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Unique Upland Habitat Identified | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Total Wetlands Filled | Acres | 0 | 7.44 | | | | |
| Stream Crossings | Number | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Threatened/Endangered Species | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Noise Analysis Required | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Receptors Impacted | Number | 0 | 23 | | | | |
| Contaminated Sites | Number | 0 | 8 surveyed, 3 require further review | | | | |

¹The estimated cost of routine maintenance through the design year should be included in the "Construction" box for the No Build Alternative.

BASIC SHEET 7 – EIS SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

In determining whether a proposed action is a “major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment,” the proposed action must be assessed in light of the following criteria (1) if significant impact(s) will result, the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) should commence immediately. Indicate whether the issue listed below is a concern for the proposed action or alternative and (2) if the issue is a concern, explain how it is to be addressed or where it is addressed in the environmental document.

1. Will the proposed action stimulate substantial indirect environmental effects?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
See Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis - Appendix D
2. Will the proposed action contribute to cumulative effects of repeated actions?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
See Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis - Appendix D
3. Will the creation of a new environmental effect result from this proposed action?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
4. Will the proposed action impact geographically scarce resources?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
5. Will the proposed action have a precedent-setting nature?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
6. Is the degree of controversy associated with the proposed action high?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
7. Will the proposed action be in conflict with official agency plans or local, state, tribal, or national policies, including conflicts resulting from potential effects of transportation on land use and transportation demand?
 No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.

BASIC SHEET 8 – ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

Attach a copy of this page to the design study report and the PS&E submittal package.

| Factor Sheet | Commitment (If none, include “No special or supplemental commitments required.”) |
|---|---|
| A-1 General Economics | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| A-2 Business | The WisDOT construction project manager will keep County KR open to local traffic during construction. Through traffic will be detoured onto local roads during construction. The WisDOT construction project manager will notify residents and businesses prior to temporary access closures that may occur during construction. |
| A-3 Agriculture | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-1 Community or Residential | Racine County is responsible for acquisitions and relocation assistance in the village of Mount Pleasant and Kenosha County is responsible for acquisitions in Somers; the counties will utilize standard county procedures for property acquisitions and relocations. During final design, WisDOT design project manager will oversee inventory of potentially impacted trees in residential areas in the village of Somers. The WisDOT design project manager will continue working with the village of Mount Pleasant to coordinate connection of the Pike River Pathway and the shared-use path on the north side of County KR. The WisDOT design project manager will design the County KR bridge over the Pike River to accommodate the existing shared-use path over the Pike River that will be removed. The new County KR bridge will be designed according to appropriate design standards for shared-use paths on an urban arterial street. If construction requires temporary closure of the shared-use path, WisDOT construction project manager will maintain a detour route and signage through the duration of construction. In accordance with the jurisdictional transfer agreement between WisDOT and Kenosha and Racine counties, both WisDOT (Southeast Region Systems Planning Unit Supervisor) and the counties have agreed to develop a long-range access management vision of the corridor. The WisDOT construction project manager will notify emergency service providers of the construction schedule and any access changes during construction. |
| B-2 Indirect Effects | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-3 Cumulative Effects | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-4 Environmental Justice | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-5 Historic Resources | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-6 Archaeological/Burial Sites | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-7 Tribal Coordination/Consultation | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| B-8 Section 4(f) and 6(f) or Other Unique Areas | The WisDOT design project manager will coordinate with the village of Mount Pleasant to refine the stormwater detention pond location and associated planting plan in the future Biex Ramcke Homestead park property. The WisDOT construction project manager will use a seed mix similar to that used in Pike River restoration area to restore disturbed areas post construction. |
| B-9 Aesthetics | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| C-1 Wetlands | WisDOT (Southeast Region Technical Services Section Supervisor) will oversee mitigating unavoidable impacts of 7.44 acres of wetlands, at a replacement ratio per the WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guideline, through an in-lieu fee (ILF) payment to DNR. The wetland impacts will occur in the Southwest Lake Michigan watershed. WisDOT will purchase wetland mitigation credits through the Wisconsin Wetland Conservation Trust (ILF) program to satisfy mitigation requirements. |
| C-2 Rivers, Streams and Floodplains | The WisDOT construction project manager will be responsible for all instream work. All instream work that could adversely impact water quality will not occur between March 1 st and June 1 st . The WisDOT design project manager will share plans for structures with DNR to ensure adequate time for review/comment/revisions prior to plan finalization. The Pike River structure spans the river and would avoid and minimize impacts to stream morphology, aquatic organism passage, and water quality. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>The WisDOT design project manager will continue coordinating the results of hydraulic analyses of the Pike River structure with village of Mount Pleasant and Racine county zoning officials to avoid upstream and downstream impacts.</p> <p>The WisDOT design project manager and construction project manager will coordinate with DNR to provide project specific construction site considerations, including an Erosion Control Plan and will require the contractor to outline construction methods in an Erosion Control Implementation Plan.</p> <p>The WisDOT design project manager will continue coordination with DNR during design development of the Pike River structure removal if the structure must be dropped into the waterway before removal.</p> <p>The WisDOT construction project manager will continue coordination with DNR if a temporary channel is needed for construction. The WisDOT construction project manager will share channel lining methods and demonstrate the temporary channel or culvert can carry all stream flows during construction and maintain a suitable depth and velocity to allow passage of migrating fish and aquatic species. During construction, stranded fish in dewatered areas or temporary channels should be captured and returned to the active channel immediately.</p> |
| C-3 Lakes or other Open Water | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| C-4 Groundwater, Wells and Springs | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| C-5 Upland Wildlife and Habitat | To avoid potential impacts to migratory birds at the Pike River crossing, the WisDOT design project manager will include special provisions noting project construction will either occur only between August 30 and May 1st. (non-nesting season) or the WisDOT construction manager will utilize measures to prevent nesting (e.g., remove unoccupied nests during the non-nesting season and install barrier netting prior to May 1). If netting is used, the WisDOT construction manager will ensure it is properly maintained, then removed as soon as the nesting period is over. If neither of these options is practicable, the WisDOT construction manager will notify the Southeast Region Technical Services Section Supervisor who will contact USFWS to apply for a depredation permit. |
| C-6 Coastal Zones | No special or supplemental commitments required |
| C-7 Threatened and Endangered Species | <p>The WisDOT design project manager will include special provisions for native flowering seed mix #70 or 70A in disturbed areas within the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee High Potential Zone (RPBB HPZ). The WisDOT design project manager will include special provisions to avoid tree clearing in the RPBB HPZ, in the forested area north of County KR between October 15 and March 15. The WisDOT construction manager will oversee planting disturbed areas and avoid tree clearing in the RPBB HPZ as described in the special provisions.</p> <p>If Prairie Crayfish are observed during construction, the WisDOT construction project manager will instruct the contractor to remove crayfish from the construction area and store them in a plastic bucket with soil from where the crayfish was found. The WisDOT construction project manager will contact the DNR who will relocate them off the project. See also item C-5 above for commitments regarding migratory birds.</p> |
| D-1 Air Quality | The WISDOT Project Manager will assure the project is placed in the SERPC TIP prior to construction. SEWRPC TIP approval anticipated February 2019 |
| D-2 Construction Stage Sound Quality | WisDOT Standard Specifications 107.8(6) and 108.7.1 will apply. |
| D-3 Traffic Noise | None |

| | |
|---|---|
| D-4 Hazardous Substances or Contamination | <p>Having completed a Phase 1 investigation for the improvement under consideration, WisDOT has determined that further investigation of 3 sites is merited. Two of the sites are railroad properties. For the railroad properties, the WisDOT design project manager will include a contract special provision that identifies a high likelihood of encountering contaminated soil, and then conduct test pits and characterization after project LET date, as construction begins. Investigations for the third site are in the process of being scheduled.</p> <p>Disturbance near potentially contaminated sites would be minimized to the extent possible and practicable. As applicable, the WisDOT design project manager will include a Notice to Contractor in the contract special provisions describing the potential contamination with names and locations of the sites. The areas of potential contamination would be marked on the plan sheets with reference to check the Notice to Contractor in the special provisions.</p> <p>The WisDOT design project manager will include special provisions to notify contractors of potential presence of petroleum underground storage tanks or potential contaminated soils and/or groundwater before proceeding with any construction activities at those sites.</p> |
| D-5 Storm Water | <p>During final design, the WisDOT design project manager will refine the location of stormwater detention ponds in the vicinity of the Pike River through coordination with the village of Mount Pleasant and the village of Somers, and Kenosha and Racine counties.</p> <p>For stormwater detention facilities, the WisDOT design project manager will follow recommendations outlined in FAA guidance on wildlife attractants on or near airports in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33.</p> |
| D-6 Erosion Control | <p>The WisDOT design project manager will obtain coverage under the WisDOT Transportation Construction General Permit (TCGP) prior to construction activities.</p> |
| E-1 Other Federal Aviation Administration | <p>The WisDOT design project manager will coordinate with FAA. The 'Notice Criteria Tool' on the FAA's Obstruction Evaluation and Airport Airspace Analysis (OE/AAA) website should be used to see if any temporary equipment or permanent structures will require study. If required to file for a study, the FAA requests submittal at least 45 days prior to the start of construction.</p> <p>For stormwater detention facilities, the WisDOT design project manager will follow recommendations outlined in FAA guidance on wildlife attractants on or near airports in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33.</p> |
| E-2 U.S. Coast Guard | <p>The WisDOT design project manager will forward a set of the Pike River bridge "as-built" plans to USCG via ftp file transfer if the file proves to be cost-prohibitive to print/mail.</p> |

BASIC SHEET 9 – ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS MATRIX (check all that apply)

| Factors | Adverse | Benefit | None Identified | Factor Sheet Attached | Effects |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p>A. ECONOMIC FACTORS <i>Factor Sheet A-1, General Economics, must be included if Factor Sheet A-2 or A-3 is completed.</i></p> | | | | | |
| A-1 General Economics | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The proposed project supports ongoing economic development and mobility goals of local governments. See Factor Sheet A-1 |
| A-2 Business | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No business acquisitions required. Proposed action supports future business development in accordance with local plans. During construction, County KR will remain open to local traffic and through traffic will be detoured. WisDOT will notify businesses prior to temporary access closures that may occur during construction. |
| A-3 Agriculture | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 53.4 acres of farmland impacted from project. Of that total, the village of Mount Pleasant has already purchased 23 of those acres for the Foxconn project. DATCP prepared an Agricultural Impact Statement. See Factor Sheet A-3. |
| <p>B. SOCIAL/CULTURAL FACTORS</p> | | | | | |
| B-1 Community or Residential | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>Mount Pleasant: The frontage of residential properties on the north side of County KR would be impacted by the expansion of the roadway and grading activities. Where feasible, the project would realign driveways to match the new road profile. In areas where driveway access cannot be restored, the property would be purchased, and the households would be relocated. This would require the full acquisition of 5 properties between 90th Street and just east of UPRR. Of those five properties to be acquired, four households would be relocated since one housing unit is vacant. The proposed right of way for the project would also require strip takings along the back yards of residential properties and out lots in the Deer Run at Campbell Woods subdivision.</p> <p>Somers: The frontage of some residential properties on the south side of County KR would be impacted requiring the realignment of some driveways to match new road profiles. No residential relocations are required. For the UPRR/County KR grade separation, the frontages of five residential properties to the south of County KR and east of UPRR would be impacted by a new access road that would be constructed to access these properties. Also, a retaining wall that ranges in height from 2-feet to 28-feet would be constructed as part of the grade separation and visible to these residences.</p> <p>The proposed raised medians along the corridor would restrict driveways to right-in/right-out only access for some properties in both municipalities. The following design changes were made to address residential access concerns: 1) Between UPRR and 56th Avenue, the raised median width was reduced to 22-feet and the shoulder width was increased to 8-feet to provide space for vehicles to decelerate to and accelerate from residential driveways; 2) East of Old Green Bay Road, where traffic volumes decline, the median will not be raised, and it will instead be painted to provide full access to residential areas in this section.</p> <p>Both communities would benefit from an added shared-use path along County KR that will provide a safe bike/pedestrian connection to other existing and planned regional paths in the project area. Also, the residents and communities would have added safety benefits with improved roadway and intersection designs and the grade separation of County KR with UPRR and CPRR.</p> <p>See Factor Sheet B-1, Mount Pleasant and Factor Sheet B-1, Somers.</p> |
| B-2 Indirect Effects | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Indirect effects analysis completed. See Appendix D . Indirect effects to resources may occur from the Build Alternative-Reconstruction if induced development occurs. Local, state and federal regulations and policies are in place to manage resources and minimize indirect effects. |
| B-3 Cumulative Effects | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cumulative effects analysis completed. See Appendix D . The project's direct impacts and indirect effects, in combination with other projects implemented by |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | other parties may contribute to cumulative effects on resources. Local, state and federal regulations and policies are in place to minimize cumulative effects. |
| B-4 Environmental Justice | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No disproportionate impacts anticipated. Low-income and minority populations in study area are low compared to low-income and minority populations in the surrounding municipalities and counties. Conversations with local officials did not identify known minority or low-income groups along the project corridor. WisDOT real estate staff did not identify minority, low-income or disabled resident concerns associated with residential relocations. |
| <i>For B-5 through B-8, if any of these resources are present on the project, involve the REC early because of possible project schedule implications.</i> | | | | | |
| B-5 Historic Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Historic survey conducted; no resources impacted |
| B-6 Archaeological/Burial Sites | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Archeological survey conducted. The proposed action will avoid a catalogued and uncatalogued burial site. No other resources impacted. |
| B-7 Tribal Coordination /Consultation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Eleven tribes with interest in projects in Racine and Kenosha counties contacted. Forest County Potawatomi requested archeological survey and SHPO response. WisDOT provided the requested survey and SHPO response on 10/28/18. No other responses received. |
| B-8 Section 4(f) and 6(f) or Other Unique Areas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The project does not require a FHWA Action, Section 4(f) is not applicable. No Section 6(f) funds were used for properties impacted by County KR-Phase 2 project. Up to 0.38 acres of the Pike River restoration area, on the north side of County KR would be impacted by roadway widening and the construction of new bridges over the Pike River. Also, 2.08 acres of the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park would be impacted by a proposed stormwater detention pond (1.35 acres) and roadway widening (0.73 acres). The Pike River Pathway, currently under construction north of County KR, will match into the proposed shared-use path on the north side of County KR. See Factor Sheet B-8. |
| B-9 Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The view of the facility would change from a road with rural characteristics to a road with urban characteristics. Due to the expansion of the roadway, some residents along the project corridor would have a view of the roadway that is physically closer than the view of the roadway under existing conditions. The acquisition and removal of five residential homes on the north side of County KR would change the character of the landscape in those areas from residential and agricultural to vacant. The proposed retaining wall associated with the UPRR/County KR grade separation would change views of residential properties along the south side of County KR, east of the UPRR corridor. See Factor Sheet B-9. |
| C. NATURAL RESOURCE FACTORS | | | | | |
| C-1 Wetlands | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 7.44 acres of wetlands filled for roadway, bridge and stormwater detention pond construction. See Factor Sheet C-1 |
| C-2 Rivers, Streams and Floodplains | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A new Pike River crossing will impact 2.7 acres of floodplains. See Factor Sheet C-3. |
| C-3 Lakes or Other Open Water | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No lakes or other open water impacted. |
| C-4 Groundwater, Wells, and Springs | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No groundwater, wells, or springs identified. |
| C-5 Upland Wildlife and Habitat | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | The project impacts up to 2.27 acres of secondary environmental corridor and 1.22 acres of isolated natural areas. Impacts are limited to abutting vegetation degraded by human activity, including ditching and mowing. SEWRPC proposes to reclassify the Pike River corridor to the north of County KR, including the Pike River Restoration area, as a primary environmental corridor. ⁹ See Item B-8 above and Factor Sheet B-8 for anticipated impacts in the Pike River Restoration area. |
| C-6 Coastal Zones | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | No coastal area impacted. |

⁹ SEWRPC delineates environmental corridors and isolated natural areas for Southeastern Wisconsin. Primary environmental corridors are concentrations of significant natural resources at least 400 acres in area, at least two miles in length, and at least 200 feet in width. Secondary environmental corridors are concentrations of significant natural resources at least 100 acres in area and at least one mile in length. Isolated natural resource areas are those remaining significant natural resources at least five acres in area and at least 200 feet in width. (<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/LandUse/EnvironmentalCorridors.htm>).

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| C-7 Threatened and Endangered Species | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>WisDOT completed Section 10 consultation in accordance with the Endangered Species Act. WisDOT has determined the proposed project will not intentionally take (or “result in prohibited take of”) federally listed species.</p> <p>The USFWS provided technical assistance to determine potential impacts to the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (RPBB). On December 13, 2018, USFWS communicated its conclusions to WisDOT:</p> <p><i>“Based on a closer examination of the impacts, we believe there is no significant risk to RPBB in the proposed action area south of the County Line Road (1st St.) as the forested habitat appears to be either too managed or disturbed to support overwintering habitat for the species. There is still some potential of impact to RPBB within the action area north of the road if tree clearing is occurring between October 15 and March 15, although we believe the risk is relatively low. Out of an abundance of caution, postponing tree clearing until after March 15 would eliminate the risk of overwintering queen RPBBs from being inadvertently crushed or disturbed as their presence in the forested area would be highly unlikely. However, I would not consider this a requirement since our best available information we have at this time shows to area of impact to be a narrow band of trees that are fairly dense and would be less likely to be high quality overwintering habitat for the species. The conservation measures you propose to replant disturbed areas with a pollinator friendly seed mix will result in beneficial effects to RPBB and the loss of 1.29 acres of forested habitat is unlikely to limit overwintering opportunities to RPBB within this High Potential Zone in the future.”</i></p> <p>WisDOT will include commitments to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to RPBB habitat, including replanting disturbed areas in the RPBB High Potential Zone (HPZ) and limit tree clearing during overwintering months.</p> <p>No state listed species were identified in a survey completed October 2018. See Factor Sheet C-7.</p> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|

D. PHYSICAL FACTORS

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| D-1 Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>No air quality impacts would result from proposed action. This project was amended into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in May 2018. https://wisconsindot.gov/Documents/doing-bus/local-gov/astnce-pgms/highway/stip/amend-0518.pdf.</p> <p>The project is included in an amendment to the regional land use and transportation plan for Southeast Wisconsin which was adopted by SEWRPC on December 5, 2018. See Factor Sheet D-1.</p> |
| D-2 Construction Stage Sound Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>Noise would be generated by construction equipment used to reconstruct the roadway. Typical construction equipment would include dump trucks, graders, cranes, bulldozers, piledriving equipment and pavement construction equipment. The noise generated by this construction equipment would vary greatly, depending upon the equipment type and model, mode and duration of operation, and specific type of work effort; however, typical noise levels may occur in the 75-to-95-dBA range (at 50 feet). See Factor Sheet D-2.</p> |
| D-3 Traffic Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>The traffic noise analysis indicates that design year traffic noise levels would approach or exceed the criteria at 23 residences. No receptors in the project study area would be exposed to an increase in sound levels of 15 dBA or more. Traffic noise mitigation is not feasible since all 23 residences have driveway access to County KR. See Factor Sheet D-3</p> |
| D-4 Hazardous Substances or Contamination | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>A Phase I Hazardous Materials Assessment identified eight sites with environmental conditions of note. Five sites did not warrant further investigation. Three sites indicated potential contamination sources that may impact the County KR-Phase 2 project and warrant further investigation. See Factor Sheet D-4.</p> |
| D-5 Stormwater | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>Stormwater management includes curb and gutter drainage and stormwater detention ponds. Post construction stormwater management is designed to meet local and DNR NR 151 requirements. The project includes detention ponds for peak flow reduction and bio swales for Total Suspended Solids (TSS) water quality. Since the roadway will be transferred back to local jurisdiction after construction, local governments will be responsible for long term maintenance of the stormwater facilities. See Factor Sheet D-5.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| D-6 Erosion Control and Sediment Control | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Erosion control during construction will be addressed through standard WisDOT processes and contract Special Provisions. The contractor is required to provide an Erosion Control Implementation Plan to WisDOT and DNR for review and approval prior to construction. WisDOT will use its standard erosion control inspection process during construction. |
| E. OTHER FACTORS | | | | | |
| E-1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

GENERAL ECONOMICS EVALUATION

Factor Sheet A-1

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | |

1. Briefly describe the existing economic characteristics of the area around the project:

| Economic Activity | Description |
|-----------------------|--|
| a. Agriculture | <p>The area surrounding the project is predominately agricultural use, specifically cropland. There is a specialty aquaponics facility adjacent to the project corridor that sells lettuce, herbs, and fish. According to the Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) from the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), none of the land that could be acquired for the project is part of an Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA).</p> <p>According to the AIS, the main crops in Kenosha County and Racine County are corn for grain, soybeans, winter wheat, and alfalfa hay. From 1997 to 2012, the acres of land in farms decreased by 10.6 percent in Racine County and 9.6 percent in Kenosha County.</p> |
| b. Retail business | <p>No retail facilities are present in the project area. Concentrations of retail are in the cities of Racine and Kenosha and along the WIS 20 corridor in Racine County and WIS 50 corridor in Kenosha County. The Regency Mall in Racine is within 2 miles of the project area to the north.</p> <p>Retail available near the project area includes grocery stores, clothing, dollar stores, department stores, and "big box" retailers.</p> |
| c. Wholesale business | <p>No wholesale businesses are present in the project area. In Racine and Kenosha, there are several wholesalers for products such as agricultural goods, home improvement supplies, and alcohol.</p> |
| d. Heavy industry | <p>No heavy industry is present in the project area. There are some heavy industrial facilities in and outside the cities of Racine and Kenosha. These facilities produce materials including charcoal, chemicals, power, and steel.</p> |
| e. Light industry | <p>No light industry is currently present in the project area. This will change with the new Foxconn manufacturing plant that is being constructed north of County KR between I-94 and 90th Street in Mount Pleasant. Foxconn, an electronic device manufacturer, is building 22 million square feet of light industrial development on former agricultural land. The initial phases of the factory broke ground in June 2018 and will open in 2020. The Foxconn plant is expected to increase demand for other development and suppliers to the area.</p> <p>Other light industry in the area includes an industrial park in Kenosha with bottling, automotive, and packaging facilities. Additional facilities exist throughout Racine and Kenosha.</p> |
| f. Tourism | <p>Regional tourism is mostly focused on Milwaukee and Chicago. However, there are some destinations in Racine and Kenosha counties, although none are in the project area. These destinations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Racine Zoo • Racine Art Museum • Wustum Art Museum • Civil War Museum • Kenosha Public Museum • Dinosaur Discovery Museum |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| g. Recreation | <p>There is an off-road vehicle track that will be impacted by the project, but it is for private use only and is not part of a business. There are also bike trails and planned parks in the project area. The recently completed Pike River restoration area is located immediately north of County KR. It will include a recreational pathway on the west side of the river, which is under construction. A shared-use path is located along the south side of County KR in Somers between 56th Avenue and WIS 31. The path extends south along the east side of WIS 31 to the Petrifying Springs County Park. The Trefoil Oaks Program Center owned by the Girl Scouts of Wisconsin Southeast is located on the south side of County KR just east of the project terminus.</p> <p>Nearby, there are recreational facilities such as golf courses, athletic fields and centers associated with UW-Parkside, county recreation centers, parks, beaches, and marinas.</p> |
| h. Forestry | <p>No forestry businesses are in the project area. Most land in the project area has been cleared for residential or farm use. Only isolated wooded areas remain and are not used for forestry related businesses.</p> |

2. Discuss the economic advantages and disadvantages of the proposed action and whether advantages would outweigh disadvantages. Indicate how the project would affect the characteristics described in item 1 above:

The Build Alternative - Reconstruction would support the Foxconn manufacturing campus and other planned economic development in the project area by providing the roadway infrastructure needed to support the travel demand generated by new development. In addition, the capacity and intersection improvements for the Build Alternative - Reconstruction would maintain mobility along an important east-west arterial that serves the existing population and employment base in the cities of Racine and Kenosha. According to the Eastern Racine County Transportation Task Force, slow east-west travel times from I-94 to Racine are problematic for workers and for economic development purposes since Racine is the largest city in Wisconsin that does not have direct access to an interstate. Maintaining mobility along County KR is important because it is one of the few east-west roadways in Racine County that currently does not have major impediments to traffic flow.

The main disadvantage of the Build Alternative - Reconstruction is that the expansion of right of way would convert existing agricultural use to transportation use. The impact is minimized to the extent practicable by ensuring that farms are not split or landlocked. However, some residential and farm facility acquisitions would be necessary for the project.

3. What effect will the proposed action have on the potential for economic development in the project area?

The proposed project will have no effect on economic development.

The proposed project will have an effect on economic development.

Increase, describe:

The project would support the economic development that is already planned in the area, especially related to the Foxconn plant. Although further economic development is not explicitly planned as part of the project, the project would facilitate it, and it is part of the future land use plans for Mount Pleasant and Somers.

Decrease, describe: _____

AGRICULTURE EVALUATION

Factor Sheet A-3

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 Length of This Alternative 2.8 |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Total acquisition interest, by type of agricultural land use:

| Type of Land Acquired from Farm Operations | Type of Acquisition (acres) | | Total Area Acquired (acres) |
|--|-----------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|
| | Fee Simple | Easement | |
| Crop land and pasture | 29.8 | 10.7 | 40.5 |
| Woodland | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| Land of undetermined or other use (e.g., wetlands, yards, roads, etc.) | 8.6 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
| Totals | 42.7 | 10.7 | 53.4 |

Note: Of the total agricultural land impacted by the County KR-Phase 2 project (53.4 acres), the village of Mount Pleasant has already purchased 23 of those acres for the Foxconn project.

2. Indicate number of farm operations from which land will be acquired:

| Acreage to be Acquired | Number of Farm Operations |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Less than 1 acre | 6 |
| 1 acre to 5 acres | 8 |
| More than 5 acres | 0 |

3. Is land to be converted to highway use covered by the Farmland Protection Policy Act?

- No
 - The land was purchased prior to August 6, 1984 for the purpose of conversion.
 - The acquisition does not directly or indirectly convert farmland.
 - The land is clearly not farmland
 - The land is already in, or committed to urban use or water storage.
- Yes (This determination is made by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) via the completion of the Farmland Impact Conversion Rating Form, NRCS Form AD-1006)
 - The land is prime farmland which is not already committed to urban development or water storage.
 - The land is unique farmland.
 - The land is farmland which is of statewide or local importance as determined by the appropriate state or local government agency.

4. Has the Farmland Impact Conversion Rating Form (AD-1006) been submitted to NRCS?

- No - Explain: NRCS coordination is not required for projects that do not use federal funds
- Yes
 - The Site Assessment Criteria Score (Part VI of the form) is less than 60 points for this project alternative.
Date Form AD-1006 completed. _____
 - The Site Assessment Criteria Score is 60 points or greater.
Date Form AD-1006 completed. _____

5. Is an Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) Required?

- No
- Eminent Domain will not be used for this acquisition
 - The project is a "Town Highway" project
 - The acquisition is less than 1 acre
 - The acquisition is 1-5 acres and DATCP chooses not to do an AIS.
 - Other. Describe _____

- Yes
- Eminent Domain may be used for this acquisition.
 - The project is not a "Town Highway" project
 - The acquisition is 1-5 acres and DATCP chooses to do an AIS.
 - The acquisition is greater than 5 acres

6. Is an Agricultural Impact Notice (AIN) Required?

No, the project is not a State Trunk Highway Project - AIN not required but complete questions 7-16.

Yes, the project is a State Trunk Highway Project - AIN may be required.

Is the land acquired "non-significant"?

Yes - (All must be checked) An AIN is not required but complete questions 7-16.

- Less than 1 acre in size
- Results in no severances
- Does not significantly alter or restrict access
- Does not involve moving or demolishing any improvements necessary to the operation of the farm
- Does not involve a high value crop

No

- Acquisition 1 to 5 acres - **AIN required**. Complete Pages 1 and 2, Form DT1999, (Pages 1 and 2, Figure 1, Procedure 21-25-30.)
- Acquisition over 5 acres - **AIN required**. Complete Pages 1, 3 and 4, Form DT1999. (Pages 1, 3 and 4, Figure 1, Procedure 21-25-30)

If an AIN is completed, do not complete the following questions 7-16.

7. Identify and describe effects to farm operations because of land lost due to the project:

- Does Not Apply.
- Applies – Discuss.

8. Describe changes in access to farm operations caused by the proposed action:

- Does Not Apply.
- Applies – Discuss.

9. Indicate whether a farm operation will be severed because of the project and describe the severance (include area of original farm and size of any remnant parcels):

- Does Not Apply.
- Applies – Discuss.

10. Identify and describe effects generated by the acquisition or relocation of farm operation buildings, structures or improvements (e.g., barns, silos, stock watering ponds, irrigation wells, etc.). Address the location, type, condition and importance to the farm operation as appropriate:

- Does Not Apply.
- Applies – Discuss.

11. Describe effects caused by the elimination or relocation of a cattle/equipment pass or crossing. Attach plans, sketches, or other graphics as needed to clearly illustrate existing and proposed location of any cattle/equipment pass or crossing:

- Does Not Apply.
- Replacement of an existing cattle/equipment pass or crossing is not planned. Explain.
- Cattle/equipment pass or crossing will be replaced.
- Replacement will occur at same location.
- Cattle/equipment pass or crossing will be relocated. Describe.

12. Describe the effects generated by the obliteration of the old roadway:

- Does Not Apply.
- Applies – Discuss.

13. Identify and describe any proposed changes in land use or indirect development that will affect farm operations and are related to the development of this project:

- Does Not Apply.
- Applies – Discuss.

14. Describe any other project-related effects identified by a farm operator or owner that may be adverse, beneficial or controversial:

- No effects indicated by farm operator or owner.
- Applies – Discuss.

15. Indicate whether minority or low-income population farm owners, operators, or workers will be affected by the proposal: (Include migrant workers, if appropriate.)

- No
- Applies – Discuss.

16. Describe measures to minimize adverse effects or enhance benefits to agricultural operations:

COMMUNITY OR RESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

Factor Sheet B-1

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Give a brief description of the community or neighborhood affected by the proposed action:

| Name of Community/Neighborhood Village of Mount Pleasant. This factor sheet focuses on the residences on the north side of County KR between 90 th Street and WIS 31 and the Deer Run at Campbell Woods subdivision located between Old Green Bay Road and the eastern terminus of the project. The village of Mount Pleasant acquired the land and residences to the north of County KR between County H and 90 th Street as part of the Foxconn development project. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|-----------------|-------|----|------------------|---|-------|---|-------|---|------------------|---|-------------------|----|
| Incorporated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Population 513 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demographic Characteristics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Census Year 2010</th> <th>% of Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>African American</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic Origin*</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Age 65 or Greater</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Census Year 2010 | % of Population | White | 96 | African American | 2 | Asian | 1 | Other | 1 | Hispanic Origin* | 3 | Age 65 or Greater | 15 |
| Census Year 2010 | % of Population | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 96 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| African American | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic Origin* | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Age 65 or Greater | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Those of Hispanic origin may also identify as other races | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

2. Identify and discuss existing modes of transportation and their importance within the community or Neighborhood:

Personal vehicles are the dominant mode of transportation for residents in the community of Mount Pleasant and are essential for accessing jobs, goods and services since the residences in the project area are outside the Racine and Kenosha transit service areas.

No dedicated bike or pedestrian facilities are currently located along the north side of County KR. The Pike River Pathway, which is under construction, will run along the west side of the river and connect with the shared-use path proposed for the north side of County KR. The Pike River Pathway is primarily used for recreational purposes and is important to the community's quality of life.

An amendment to the SEWRPC Vision 2050 recommends the addition of a commuter bus route from downtown Racine to the Foxconn campus along County KR to accommodate employees travelling to work.

3. Identify and discuss the probable changes resulting from the proposed action to the existing modes of transportation and their function within the community or neighborhood:

The project would improve personal vehicle transportation by providing additional capacity on County KR to meet the anticipated increase in travel demand due to the opening of the Foxconn plant and other planned local development. The project would improve safety for vehicles and train traffic by replacing the grade crossings with new bridges at the CPRR and UPRR crossings. The project would improve safety for vehicles by addressing roadway deficiencies and congestion that would occur under the No Build Alternative and making intersection improvements. Also, the project would maintain mobility along an important east-west local arterial that conveys traffic from I-94 to WIS 32. The project may cause short-term delays and detours for vehicles along County KR due to construction-related activities.

The proposed project includes shared-use paths along County KR, which would improve non-vehicular (pedestrian and bicycle) access in the project area and provide safe connections to other existing and planned shared-use paths including the Pike River Pathway. The proposed shared-use path on the north side of County KR would extend to Vicksburg Drive and be accessible to residents of the Deer Run at Campbell Woods subdivision. The shared-use path proposed for the project would be used for recreational purposes but could also be used to access jobs, goods and services as the area develops.

The project's proposed improvements would accommodate the commuter bus route along County KR that is recommended by the SEWRPC Vision 2050 plan amendment. If implemented, this would bring transit service to this area and connect the area with the greater Racine transit system.

4. Briefly discuss the proposed action's direct and indirect effect(s) on existing and planned land use in the community or neighborhood:

The project would require new right of way that would directly impact 45.6 acres of existing land use along the project corridor in Mount Pleasant. This includes 35.6 acres of agricultural use and 10 acres of residential use that would be converted to transportation use. Of these totals, the village of Mount Pleasant has already purchased 23 acres of agricultural use and 2.2 acres of residential use to the west of 90th Street as part of the Foxconn development and would be within the project's proposed right of way.

An indirect effects analysis was completed for the project and is included in Appendix D. The indirect effects analysis determined the reconstruction and capacity expansion of County KR between County H and Old Green Bay Road would provide transportation infrastructure needed to support local plans for urban/suburban development patterns. As a result, the Build Alternative - Reconstruction has the potential to facilitate development in accordance with local land use plans that call for a transition of existing agricultural use to industrial, commercial and residential uses. Indirect effects to resources may occur from the Build Alternative - Reconstruction if induced development occurs. Potential indirect effects to land use and other resources in the study area would be minimized by local, state and federal regulations and policies that are intended to manage growth and protect resources.

5. Address any changes to emergency or other public services during and after construction of the proposed project:

County KR would be closed to through traffic during construction but would remain open to local traffic and emergency services. Emergency services would be notified of the construction schedule and any access changes during construction. In comparison to the No Build Alternative, emergency and public services would experience more reliable travel under the Build Alternative - Reconstruction resulting from increased capacity and grade separations at two railroad crossings. Improved roadway design, such as improved stopping sight distances and protected turn lanes, and traffic signals would also facilitate safe traffic operations.

6. Describe any physical or access changes that will result. This could include effects on lot frontages, side slopes or driveways (steeper or flatter), sidewalks, reduced terraces, tree removals, vision corners, etc.:

The frontage of residential properties on the north side of County KR would be impacted by the expansion of the roadway and grading activities. Where feasible, driveways would be realigned to match the new road profile. In a few cases, driveways would become steeper and have 10 percent grades, but would still be within acceptable design parameters. In areas where driveway access cannot be restored, the property would be acquired, and the households would be relocated. The project requires full acquisition of five properties between 90th Street and just east of UPRR. Of those five properties to be acquired, four households would be relocated since one housing unit is vacant. (See Question 10 below for more information about residential acquisitions). These impacts would occur along the north side of County KR primarily between 90th Street and WIS 31 since many of the residential properties to the west of 90th Street were acquired by the village of Mount Pleasant for the Foxconn development. Racine County is responsible for acquisitions and relocations in the Village of Mount Pleasant.

The proposed right of way for the project would result in strip acquisitions along the back yards of residential properties and out lots in the Deer Run at Campbell Woods subdivision, located east of Old Green Bay Road, to accommodate the expanded roadway and shared-use path.

The project proposes to include raised medians along some sections of County KR with openings for cross access at public road intersections. The raised median would limit cross access along County KR and limit turns to right-in and right-out only access at residential driveways. To address residential access concerns, the following design changes were made: 1) Between UPRR and 56th Avenue, the raised median width was reduced to 22 feet and the shoulder width was increased to 8 feet to provide space for vehicles to decelerate to and accelerate from residential driveways; and 2) East of Old Green Bay Road, where traffic volumes decline, the median will not be raised, and it will instead be painted to provide full access to residential areas including the Deer Run at Campbell Woods subdivision off Vicksburg Drive.

7. Indicate whether a community/neighborhood facility will be affected by the proposed action and indicate what effect(s) this will have on the community/neighborhood:

WisDOT and the village of Mount Pleasant are coordinating the design and construction of the Pike River Pathway with the design for the County KR-Phase 2 project. The design of the Pike River Pathway may need to be revised

slightly just north of County KR to provide a safe and contiguous connection with the proposed shared-use path along County KR.

The project would not impact the Mount Pleasant lift station on the north side of County KR to the west of the Pike River.

8. Identify and discuss factors that residents have indicated to be important or controversial:

The primary concerns identified by residents are related to frontage impacts of residential properties; the timing for residential acquisitions; raised medians that will restrict turning movements and cross access along County KR, especially at the Deer Run at Campbell Woods Subdivision; stormwater and flooding; and bicycle trail connectivity.

To address impacts to residences, WisDOT would replace driveway access where feasible and minimize the project footprint to the greatest practicable extent. Residents with questions about the timing for the acquisition process were referred to the county representatives responsible for property acquisitions.

To address residential access concerns, WisDOT evaluated median access options between UPRR and 56th Avenue and to the east of Old Green Bay Road. As discussed in Question 6 above, modifications were made to the Build Alternative - Reconstruction to provide safe access along these sections of County KR. Between UPRR and 56th Avenue, a raised median will be retained to maintain safety, but the median width was reduced to allow 8-foot shoulders for acceleration and deceleration from and to driveways. To the east of Old Green Bay Road, the median will be painted to provide full access to residential areas including the Deer Run at Campbell Woods subdivision off Vicksburg Drive.

In accordance with the jurisdictional transfer agreement between WisDOT and Kenosha and Racine counties, both WisDOT and the counties have agreed to develop a long-range access management vision for the corridor. The plan's intent is to be used as a comprehensive and collaborative tool for evaluation of future access requests as development and redevelopment occurs adjacent to the County KR corridor.

To manage stormwater and avoid flooding, stormwater would be managed via curb and gutter drainage, which would be directed to detention ponds along the project corridor. Stormwater management would comply with local ordinances.

To address bicycle trail connectivity, reconstructed County KR would include shared-use paths that would connect to existing and planned trails in the corridor. WisDOT is coordinating with the village of Mount Pleasant to design the connection between the County KR shared-use path and the Pike River Pathway.

9. List any Community Sensitive Design considerations, such as design considerations and potential mitigation measures.

There are no planned Community Sensitive Design measures as part of this project. Kenosha and Racine counties would be responsible for planning, design and the cost of lighting, decorative enhancements and landscaping, if desired, along County KR.

10. Indicate the number and type of any residential buildings that will be acquired because of the proposed action. If either item a) or b) is checked, items 11 through 18 do not need to be addressed or included in the environmental document. If item c) is checked, complete items 11 through 18 and attach the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan to the environmental document:

- a. None identified.
- b. No occupied residential building will be acquired as a result of this project. Provide number and description of non-occupied buildings to be acquired.
- c. Occupied residential building(s) will be acquired. Provide number and description of buildings, e.g., single family homes, apartment buildings, condominiums, duplexes, etc.

11. Anticipated number of households that will be relocated from the occupied residential buildings identified in item 10c, above:

| |
|--|
| Total Number of Households to be Relocated. 4 |
|--|

(Note that this number may be greater than the number shown in 10c) above because an occupied apartment building may have many households.)

a. Number by Ownership

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of Households Living in Owner Occupied Building 3 | Number of Households Living in Rented Quarters 1 |
|---|---|

b. Number of households to be relocated that have.

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| 1 Bedroom 1 | 2 Bedroom 0 | 3 Bedroom 3 | 4 or More Bedrooms 0 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|

c. Number of relocated households by type and price range of dwelling.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Number of Single Family Dwelling. 3 | Price Rang. \$160,000 to \$330,000 |
| Number of Multi-Family Dwellings 0 | Price Range N/A |
| Number of Apartment 1 single family home with 1 bedroom | Price Range \$600 to \$800 |

12. Describe the relocation potential in the community:

a. Number of Available Dwellings

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Bedroom N/A | 2 Bedrooms N/A | 3 Bedrooms 56 | 4 or More Bedrooms N/A |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

b. Number of Available and Comparable Dwellings by Location

| | |
|---|---|
| 35 within 2.7 miles that have 3 bedrooms 56 within Mount Pleasant that have 3 bedrooms | 223 within Racine County that have 3 bedrooms |
|---|---|

c. Number of Available and Comparable Dwellings by Type and Price. (Include dwellings in price ranges comparable to those being dislocated, if any.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Single Family Dwellings 16 3-bedroom homes 16 3 (or more) bedroom homes 24 3 (or more) bedroom homes | Price Range \$160,000 to \$200,000 \$201,000 to \$250,000 \$251,000 to \$330,000 |
| Multi-Family Dwellings N/A | |
| Apartments 13 2-bedroom apartments available for rent in Mount Pleasant and Racine | \$600 to \$800 |

13. Identify all the sources of information used to obtain the data in item 12:

- WisDOT Real Estate Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan
- Newspaper Listing(s)
- Multiple Listing Service (MLS)
- Other – Internet and WisDOT SE Region DTSD Real Estate Unit

14. Indicate the number of households to be relocated that have the following special characteristics:

- None identified.
- Yes - _____ total households to be relocated. Complete table below

| Special Characteristics | Number of Households with Individuals with Special Characteristics |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Elderly | 0 |
| Disabled | 0 |
| Low income | 0 |
| Minority | 0 |
| Household of large family (5 or more) | 0 |
| Not Known | |
| No special characteristics | N/A |

15. Describe how relocation assistance will be provided in compliance with the WisDOT Relocation Manual or FHWA regulation 49 CFR Part 24:

Residential acquisitions and relocations will be completed in accordance with the "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), as amended." In addition to providing for payment of "Just Compensation" for property acquired, additional benefits are available to eligible displaced persons required to relocate from their residence. Some available benefits include relocation advisory services, reimbursement of moving expenses, replacement housing payments, and down payment assistance. In compliance with State law, no person would be displaced unless a comparable replacement dwelling would be provided. Federal law also requires that decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwelling must be made available before any residential displacement can occur.

Compensation is available to all displaced persons without discrimination. Before initiating property acquisition activities, property owners would be contacted and given an explanation of the details of the acquisition process and Wisconsin's Eminent Domain Law under Section 32.05, Wisconsin Statutes. Any property to be acquired would be inspected by one or more professional appraisers. The property owner would be invited to accompany the appraiser during the inspection to ensure the appraiser is informed of every aspect of the property. Property owners will be given the opportunity to obtain an appraisal by a qualified appraiser that will be considered by WisDOT in establishing just compensation. Based on the appraisal(s) made, the value of the property would be determined, and that amount offered to the owner.

Identify other relocation assistance requirements not identified above.

Racine County is responsible for acquisitions and relocation assistance in the village of Mount Pleasant and will utilize standard county procedures for acquisitions and relocations.

16. Identify any difficulties or unusual conditions for relocating households displaced by the proposed action:

None identified.

17. Indicate whether Special Relocation Assistance Service will be needed. Describe any special services or housing programs needed to remedy identified difficulties or unusual conditions noted in item #14 above:

None identified

Yes - Describe services that will be required

18. Describe any additional measures that will be used to minimize adverse effects or provide benefits to those relocated, those remaining, or to community facilities affected:

None required.

COMMUNITY OR RESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

Factor Sheet B-1

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Give a brief description of the community or neighborhood affected by the proposed action:

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Name of Community/Neighborhood Village of Somers. This factor sheet focuses on the residences on the south side of County KR in the Village of Somers. Residential clusters are present along County KR between UPRR and just east of 56th Avenue and between Old Green Bay Road and the project's eastern terminus. | |
| Incorporated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| Total Population 423 | |
| Demographic Characteristics | |
| | |
| Census Year 2010 | % of Population |
| White | 92% |
| African American | 3% |
| Asian | 2% |
| Other | 4% |
| Hispanic Origin* | 5% |
| Age 65 or Greater | 18% |
| *Those of Hispanic origin may also identify as other races | |

2. Identify and discuss existing modes of transportation and their importance within the community or Neighborhood:

Personal vehicles are the dominant mode of transportation for residents in the community of Somers and are essential for accessing jobs, goods and services since the residences in the project area are outside the Kenosha and Racine transit service areas.

A Kenosha County shared-use path is present along the south side of County KR between 56th Avenue and WIS 31. The path connects with a shared-use path along WIS 31 that links to the Petrifying Springs Park and other regional shared-use paths. These paths are used primarily for recreational purposes and are important to the community's quality of life.

An amendment to the SEWRPC Vision 2050 recommends the addition of a commuter bus route from downtown Racine to the Foxconn campus along County KR to accommodate employees travelling to work.

3. Identify and discuss the probable changes resulting from the proposed action to the existing modes of transportation and their function within the community or neighborhood:

The project would improve personal vehicle transportation by providing additional capacity on County KR to meet the anticipated increase in travel demand due to the opening of the Foxconn plant and other planned local development. The project would improve safety for vehicles and train traffic by replacing the grade crossings with new bridges at the CPRR and UPRR crossings. The project would improve safety for vehicles by addressing roadway deficiencies and congestion that would occur under the No Build Alternative. Also, the project would maintain mobility along an important east-west local arterial that conveys traffic from I-94 to WIS 32. The project may cause short-term delays and detours for vehicles along County KR due to construction-related activities.

The proposed project includes shared-use paths along County KR, which would improve non-vehicular (pedestrian and bicycle) access in the project corridor and provide safe connections to other existing and planned shared-use paths including the existing path on the south side of County KR, along WIS 31 in the village of Somers and the Pike River Pathway. The shared-use paths proposed for the project would be used for recreational purposes but could also be used to access jobs, goods and services as the area develops.

The shared-use path on the south side of County KR between 56th Avenue and WIS 31 would be maintained in generally the same configuration. Construction requires removing the existing path bridge over the Pike River. Bicyclists and pedestrians would be rerouted onto a bike/pedestrian lane on the new County KR bridge over the Pike

River. The new County KR bridge will be designed according to appropriate design standards for shared-use paths on an urban arterial street. If construction requires temporary closure of the shared-use path, WisDOT construction project manager will maintain a detour route and signage through the duration of construction.

The project's proposed improvements would accommodate the commuter bus route along County KR that is recommended by the SEWRPC Vision 2050 plan amendment, bringing transit service to the project area. If implemented, this would bring transit service to this area and connect the area with the greater Racine transit system.

4. Briefly discuss the proposed action's direct and indirect effect(s) on existing and planned land use in the community or neighborhood:

The project would require new right of way that would directly impact 23.3 acres of existing land use along the project corridor in Somers. This includes 17.8 acres of agricultural use and 1.7 acres of residential use that would be converted to transportation use.

An indirect effects analysis was completed for the project and is included in Appendix D. The indirect effects analysis determined the reconstruction and capacity expansion of County KR between County H and Old Green Bay Road would provide transportation infrastructure needed to support local plans for urban/suburban development patterns. As a result, the Build Alternative - Reconstruction has the potential to facilitate development in accordance with local land use plans that call for a transition of existing agricultural use to industrial, commercial and residential uses. Indirect effects to resources may occur from the Build Alternative - Reconstruction if induced development occurs. Potential indirect effects to land use and other resources in the study area would be minimized by local, state and federal regulations and policies that are intended to manage growth and protect resources.

5. Address any changes to emergency or other public services during and after construction of the proposed project:

County KR would be closed to through traffic during construction but would remain open to local traffic and emergency services. Emergency services would be notified of the construction schedule and any access changes during construction. In comparison to the No Build Alternative, emergency and public services would experience more reliable travel under the Build Alternative - Reconstruction resulting from improved capacity and grade separations at two railroad crossings. Improved roadway design, such as improved stopping sight distances and protected turn lanes, and traffic signals would also facilitate safe traffic operations.

6. Describe any physical or access changes that will result. This could include effects on lot frontages, side slopes or driveways (steeper or flatter), sidewalks, reduced terraces, tree removals, vision corners, etc.:

The frontage of some residential properties on the south side of County KR in Somers would be impacted. The grading for the project would require realigning some driveways to match new road profiles. In a few cases, driveways would become steeper and have 10 percent grades, but would still be within acceptable design parameters. Grading for the project may impact existing trees and landscaping on the south side of County KR in Somers in residential areas. During final design, WisDOT would inventory potentially impacted trees in residential areas in Somers.

The frontages of five residential properties on the south side of County KR in Somers to the east of UPRR would be impacted by the proposed UPRR/County KR grade separation. A retaining wall that ranges in height from 2 feet to 28 feet would be constructed as part of the grade separation. It would be visible to these residences. (The visual effects of the retaining wall are discussed in Factor Sheet B-9, Aesthetics.) Also, an access road from County KR would be constructed to maintain access to these residences. The retaining wall and access road avoids the acquisition of these five residential properties.

The project proposes to include raised medians along some sections of County KR with openings for cross access at public road intersections. The raised median would limit cross access along County KR and limit turns to right-in and right-out only access at residential driveways. To address residential access concerns, the following design changes were made: 1) Between UPRR and 56th Avenue, the raised median width was reduced to 22 feet and the shoulder width was increased to 8 feet to provide space for vehicles to decelerate to and accelerate from residential driveways; and 2) East of Old Green Bay Road, where traffic volumes decline, the median will not be raised, and it will instead be painted to provide full access to residential areas in this section.

7. Indicate whether a community/neighborhood facility will be affected by the proposed action and indicate what effect(s) this will have on the community/neighborhood:

The project's grading would impact the existing shared-use path on the south side of KR in Somers between 56th Avenue and WIS 31. The project would restore the path in generally the same configuration except for the bridge section. The project would remove the bridge that carries the shared-use path over the Pike River on the south side of County KR and reroute the path on County KR using design standards for bicyclists and pedestrians on urban arterial

streets. During construction, the shared-use path in Somers would be temporarily closed and users would be redirected to a detour route.

The only other community facility along the project corridor in Somers is the Trefoil Oaks Program Center owned by the Girl Scouts of Wisconsin Southeast. The project would not impact the facility, but the facility may experience short-term delays along County KR due to construction-related activities. Access to the facility would be maintained during construction.

8. Identify and discuss factors that residents have indicated to be important or controversial:

Residents in Somers have expressed concerns about the proximity of the expanded roadway to residences along County KR. A County KR Bypass Alternative was presented to WisDOT by residents that proposes to construct a new roadway to the north of County KR between 90th Street and downtown Racine. WisDOT evaluated the Bypass Alternative and dismissed the alternative since it did not meet the purpose and need for the project and it would require a much larger footprint with greater environmental impacts and costs than the Build Alternative - Reconstruction. See Summary of Alternatives under Basic Sheet 3 for more information about the Bypass Alternative.

Residents expressed concern about tree and landscaping impacts along County KR from the project and the proposed shared-use trail on the south side of County KR between 90th Street/72nd Avenue and WIS 31. Due to residential concerns, the design was modified, and the proposed path was moved to the north side of the road for this section. During final design, WisDOT would inventory potentially impacted trees in residential areas in Somers.

Residents to the east of UPRR expressed concerns about visual impacts of the retaining wall at the UPRR/County KR grade separation. The retaining wall and access road associated with the grade separation would change the view of adjacent residential properties, but it avoids residential relocations on the south side of County KR in Somers.

Residents expressed concerns about safe turning movements and reduced access along County KR from residential driveways. To address residential access concerns, WisDOT evaluated median access options between UPRR and 56th Avenue and to the east of Old Green Bay Road. As discussed in Question 6 above, modifications were made to the Build Alternative – Reconstruction to provide safe access along these sections of County KR. Between UPRR and 56th Avenue, a raised median will be retained to maintain safety, but the median width was reduced to allow 8-foot shoulders for acceleration and deceleration from and to driveways. To the east of Old Green Bay Road, the median will be painted to provide full access to residential areas.

In accordance with the jurisdictional transfer agreement between WisDOT and Kenosha and Racine counties, both WisDOT and the counties have agreed to develop a long-range access management vision of the corridor. The plan's intent is to be used as a comprehensive and collaborative tool for evaluation of future access requests as development and redevelopment occurs adjacent to the County KR corridor.

9. List any Community Sensitive Design considerations, such as design considerations and potential mitigation measures.

There are no planned Community Sensitive Design measures as part of this project. Kenosha and Racine counties would be responsible for planning, design and the cost of lighting, decorative enhancements and landscaping, if desired, along County KR.

10. Indicate the number and type of any residential buildings that will be acquired because of the proposed action. If either item a) or b) is checked, items 11 through 18 do not need to be addressed or included in the environmental document. If item c) is checked, complete items 11 through 18 and attach the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan to the environmental document:

- a. None identified.
- b. No occupied residential building will be acquired as a result of this project. Provide number and description of non-occupied buildings to be acquired.
- c. Occupied residential building(s) will be acquired. Provide number and description of buildings, e.g., single family homes, apartment buildings, condominiums, duplexes, etc.

11. Anticipated number of households that will be relocated from the occupied residential buildings identified in item 10c, above:

| |
|--|
| Total Number of Households to be Relocated. 0 |
|--|

(Note that this number may be greater than the number shown in 10c) above because an occupied apartment building may have many households.)

a. Number by Ownership

| | |
|--|--|
| Number of Households Living in Owner Occupied Building | Number of Households Living in Rented Quarters |
|--|--|

b. Number of households to be relocated that have.

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|
| 1 Bedroom | 2 Bedroom | 3 Bedroom | 4 or More Bedrooms |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|

c. Number of relocated households by type and price range of dwelling.

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Number of Single Family Dwelling. | Price Rang. |
| Number of Multi-Family Dwellings | Price Range |
| Number of Apartment | Price Range |

12. Describe the relocation potential in the community:

a. Number of Available Dwellings

| | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|
| 1 Bedroom | 2 Bedrooms | 3 Bedrooms | 4 or More Bedrooms |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------------|

b. Number of Available and Comparable Dwellings by Location

| | |
|--------|--------|
| within | within |
| within | within |

c. Number of Available and Comparable Dwellings by Type and Price. (Include dwellings in price ranges comparable to those being dislocated, if any.)

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| Single Family Dwellings | Price Range |
| Multi-Family Dwellings | |
| Apartments | |

13. Identify all the sources of information used to obtain the data in item 12:

- WisDOT Real Estate Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan Multiple Listing Service (MLS)
 Newspaper Listing(s) Other – Identify

14. Indicate the number of households to be relocated that have the following special characteristics:

- None identified.
 Yes - _____ total households to be relocated. Complete table below

| Special Characteristics | Number of Households with Individuals with Special Characteristics |
|-------------------------|--|
| Elderly | |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Disabled | |
| Low income | |
| Minority | |
| Household of large family (5 or more) | |
| Not Known | |
| No special characteristics | |

15. Describe how relocation assistance will be provided in compliance with the WisDOT Relocation Manual or FHWA regulation 49 CFR Part 24:

Residential acquisitions and relocations will be completed in accordance with the “Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), as amended.” In addition to providing for payment of “Just Compensation” for property acquired, additional benefits are available to eligible displaced persons required to relocate from their residence. Some available benefits include relocation advisory services, reimbursement of moving expenses, replacement housing payments, and down payment assistance. In compliance with State law, no person would be displaced unless a comparable replacement dwelling would be provided. Federal law also requires that decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwelling must be made available before any residential displacement can occur.

Compensation is available to all displaced persons without discrimination. Before initiating property acquisition activities, property owners would be contacted and given an explanation of the details of the acquisition process and Wisconsin’s Eminent Domain Law under Section 32.05, Wisconsin Statutes. Any property to be acquired would be inspected by one or more professional appraisers. The property owner would be invited to accompany the appraiser during the inspection to ensure the appraiser is informed of every aspect of the property. Property owners will be given the opportunity to obtain an appraisal by a qualified appraiser that will be considered by WisDOT in establishing just compensation. Based on the appraisal(s) made, the value of the property would be determined, and that amount offered to the owner.

Identify other relocation assistance requirements not identified above.

16. Identify any difficulties or unusual conditions for relocating households displaced by the proposed action:

17. Indicate whether Special Relocation Assistance Service will be needed. Describe any special services or housing programs needed to remedy identified difficulties or unusual conditions noted in item #14 above:

- None identified
- Yes - Describe services that will be required

18. Describe any additional measures that will be used to minimize adverse effects or provide benefits to those relocated, those remaining, or to community facilities affected:

SECTION 4(f) AND 6(f) OR OTHER UNIQUE AREAS

Factor Sheet B-8

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway: 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative: 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Property Name: Pike River improvements project

2. Location: The Pike River improvements project includes publicly-owned Pike River restoration area along the Pike River in the village of Mount Pleasant and the Pike River Pathway. The project also includes publicly-owned land to the west of the Pike River that is part of the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park. See **Appendix F** for a map of the Pike River improvements project area.

3. Ownership or Administration: Village of Mount Pleasant

4. Type of Resource:

- Public Park.
- Recreational lands.
- Ice Age National Scenic Trail.
- NRCS Wetland Reserve Program.
- Wildlife Refuge.
- Waterfowl Refuge.
- Historic/Archaeological Site eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).
- Other – Identify: Riverine and habitat restoration, recreational pathway

5. Do FHWA requirements for section 4(f) apply to the project's use of the property?

- No - Check all that apply:
 - Project is not federally funded.
 - No land will be acquired in fee or PLE and the alternative will not affect the use.
 - Property is not on or eligible for the NRHP.
 - Property is on or eligible for the NRHP however includes a *de minimus* effect finding.
 - Interstate Highway System Exemption.
 - Other - Explain: _____
- Yes - Check all that apply:
 - Indicate which of the Programmatic/Negative Declaration 4(f) Evaluation(s) applies.
 - Historic Bridge.
 - Park minor involvement.
 - Historic site minor involvement.
 - Independent bikeway or walkway.
 - Great River Road.
 - Net Benefit to Section 4(f) Property. Explain: _____
 - Full 4(f) evaluation approved on _____.

6. Was special funding used to acquire the land or to make improvements on the property?

- No - Special funding was not used for the acquisition of this property.
- Yes:
 - s.6(f) LWCF (Formerly LAWCON).
 - Dingell-Johnson (D/J funds).
 - Pittman-Robertson (P/R funds).
 - Other – Describe: Mount Pleasant Storm Water Drainage Utility District and Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (through USACE)

7. Describe the significance of the property:

For other unique areas, include or attach statements of significance from officials having jurisdiction.

The Mount Pleasant Storm Water Drainage Utility District led a multi-year, multi-phase Pike River Improvement project to restore the riverine environment along the Pike River within the village limits. The project involved roughly 5.2 miles of the Pike River that stretches from the headwaters near Old Spring Street and Airline Road to County Line Road (County KR). Roughly 450 acres of land were purchased by or donated to the District within the river corridor. In addition to controlling flooding, the project restored natural stream features, enhanced the aquatic habitat, improved water quality, and reversed the progressive deterioration of this urbanizing stream. Native prairie vegetation and trees were planted and have begun to thrive throughout the project area, providing a natural corridor along the river.

The project was divided into nine phases with each phase approximately ½ mile in length. Construction of the initial phases began in 2001 and construction of all phases was completed in 2017. The District has received over \$9 million in local, state, and federal grants for the project. The Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) facilitated the construction of Phases 8 and 9, to which they contributed about \$5 million through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

In addition to these physical improvements within the river corridor, the village of Mount Pleasant is also constructing a paved bike trail, the Pike River Pathway. This bike trail runs parallel to the Pike River and provides appealing views of the Pike River improvements. The bike trail has been completed for Phases 1-6, with additional trail construction initiated for Phases 7-9 in 2018. The additional trail will provide a connection to the southern village limits and future connectivity to the Kenosha County trail system running south to Petrifying Springs Park.

The future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park is undeveloped, and improvements are not yet scheduled. The property was used to store fill material during the Pike River Restoration area construction.

8. Describe the proposed alternative's effects on this property:

- a. Describe any effects on or uses of land from the property. For other areas, include or attach statements from officials having jurisdiction over the property which discusses the alternative's effects on the property: **(A map, sketch, plan, or other graphic which clearly illustrates use of the property and the project's use and effects on the property must be included.)**

Up to 0.38 acres of the Pike River Restoration area would be impacted by roadway widening and construction of new bridges over the Pike River. The Pike River Pathway, currently under construction north of County KR, will match into the proposed shared-use path on the north side of County KR. Up to 2.08 acres of the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park would be impacted by a proposed stormwater detention pond (1.35 acres) and roadway widening (0.73 acres) (See **Appendix F** for an illustration of impact areas).

WisDOT is continuing refinement of the location of a stormwater detention pond in the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park. In coordination with Racine County and the Village of Mount Pleasant, WisDOT will refine the pond's precise location during final design. Depending on final location of the stormwater detention pond, a drainage easement would also be required to connect the pond to the Pike River. Racine County will be responsible for the long-term maintenance of the stormwater detention pond and drainage easement.

The Pike River Restoration area was developed with federal Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funds through a 2015 Project Partnership Agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). Per the agreement, the village is responsible for operating and maintaining the restoration area in a manner compatible with the authorized purposes of the restoration project. The agreement also notes the village shall prevent "obstructions or encroachments on the Project (including prescribing and enforcing regulations to prevent such obstructions or encroachments) such as any new developments on Project lands, easements, and rights-of-way or the addition of facilities which might reduce the outputs produced by the Project, hinder operation and maintenance of the Project or interfere with the Project's proper function."

The proposed project encroachments will not change the public ownership of the restoration area, or impact existing or planned recreational features in the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park. The proposed bridges over the Pike River would maintain design flows.

The project avoids the portion of the Pike River Restoration area that includes the newly realigned Pike River and associated restoration improvements, including floodplain excavations and establishment of wetlands, sedge meadow, wet-mesic and mesic prairie restoration area. Maintaining the County KR widening and bridge construction in the immediate vicinity of existing County KR avoids impacting the long-term function of the restoration area. The remaining vegetated areas that would be disturbed from the construction of County KR in the Pike River Restoration area would

be planted with a seed mix to mimic vegetation of the restoration area. During final design for the stormwater detention pond, WisDOT will coordinate with the village of Mount Pleasant to develop a planting plan to accommodate and benefit future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park plans.

The USACE concluded the County KR-Phase 2 project is consistent with the original intent of the restoration project and the adverse impacts to the ecological functions of the project are minimal and mitigated to the extent practicable (See Appendix H). The village of Mount Pleasant generally concurred with the USACE determination that the project will cause minimal floodplain and ecological impacts to the restoration project along the Pike River. The village also generally concurred with updated plans to locate the proposed stormwater detention pond in the future Biex Ramcke Park and to coordinate final details of pond placement and construction (See Appendix H).

b. Discuss the following alternatives and describe whether they are feasible and prudent and why:

1. Do nothing alternative.

The No Build Alternative would not meet the project purpose and need. The No Build Alternative would not accommodate anticipated travel demand from local land use plans and development projects anticipated along the corridor including the Foxconn campus. The road would experience unacceptable levels of congestion under the No Build Alternative, which would diminish mobility and safety along an important east-west arterial that connects I-94 with WIS 32.

2. Improvement without using the Pike River improvement Area or the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park. Shifting the County KR alignment and Pike River bridges to the south would impact the existing shared-use path on the south side of the road and further impact residential properties on the south side of County KR. Locating the stormwater detention pond outside the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park would impact residential properties or the Pike River Restoration area. WisDOT located the stormwater detention ponds to minimize private property impacts. WisDOT is continuing coordination with Racine County and the village of Mount Pleasant to minimize impacts of the proposed stormwater detention pond to the future Biex Ramcke Homestead Park. The final pond location will be determined during final design.

3. Alternatives on new location.

An alternative on a new location would not meet the project purpose and need to accommodate travel demand in the project corridor.

9. Indicate which measures will be used to minimize adverse effects, mitigate for unavoidable adverse effects or enhance beneficial effects:

- Replacement of lands used with lands of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location, and of at least comparable value.
- The Small Conversion Policy for Lands Subject to Section 6(f) will be used.
- Replacement of facilities impacted by the project including sidewalks, paths, lights, trees, and other facilities.
- Restoration and landscaping of disturbed areas.
- Incorporation of design features and habitat features where necessary to reduce or minimize impacts to the section 4(f) property.
- Payment of the fair market value of the land and improvement taken.
- Improvements to the remaining 4(f) site equal to the fair market value of the land and improvements taken.
- Such additional or alternative mitigation measures determined necessary based on consultation with officials having jurisdiction. The additional or alternative mitigation measures are listed or summarized below:

- Property is a historic property or an archeological site. The conditions or mitigation stipulations are listed or summarized below:

- Other – Describe:

10. Briefly summarize the results of coordination with other agencies that were consulted about the project and its effects on the property:

(For historic and archeological sites, refer to Factor Sheet B-5 and/or B-6 for documentation. For other unique areas, attach correspondence from officials having jurisdiction that documents concurrence with impacts and mitigation measures.)

WisDOT has been coordinating regularly with the village of Mount Pleasant and Racine County to receive input on project design (see Basic Sheets, pages 9 and 10). The location of the County KR alignment, as well as the shared-use path and stormwater detention pond location are based on local input on design. WisDOT also coordinated with the USACE, who concluded the proposed work is consistent with the original intent of the Pike River restoration project and the adverse impacts to the ecological functions of the project are minimal and mitigated to the extent practicable. (See **Appendix H**).

Factor Sheet B-9

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative – Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway: 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative: 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Landscape Characteristics:

a. Identify and briefly describe the visual character of the landscape:

The existing two-lane undivided roadway is surrounded by a rural landscape with farm structures, cropland and scattered residential homes. The landscape at the eastern end of the corridor (east of UPRR) transitions into suburban style residential homes with scattered agricultural uses. Small patches of trees line the road on some sections of the project corridor, particularly where residences are located. The project area includes two railroad crossings and a culvert crossing at the Pike River. A shared-use path is located on the south side of County KR in Somers between 56th Avenue and WIS 31. The project area also includes a section of WIS 31 that is a four-lane highway with a grass median. Other minor arterial streets, generally two-lane roads, are also present in the landscape.

b. Indicate the visual quality of the view-shed and identify landscape elements which would be visually sensitive:

The existing view-shed has a rural quality. Visually sensitive landscape elements include the views of agricultural lands, landscaping and trees along the roadway in residential areas, and the Pike River crossing.

2. User/viewer Characteristics:

b. Identify and discuss the viewers who will have a view of the improved transportation facility:

Single-family residents and residences associated with farms along the project route would have a view of the improved transportation facility.

c. Identify and discuss users of the transportation facility who will have a view from the facility:

The transportation facility serves both local and regional traffic in Racine and Kenosha counties. Users that will have a view from the transportation facility include autos driving on the roadway, bicyclists and pedestrians using the existing and proposed shared-use trails along the project corridor. These users may include existing and future residents in the surrounding project area, employees of the new Foxconn plant, and people accessing future businesses along the project corridor as planned industrial and commercial development occurs per local land use plans.

3. Effects:

a. Describe whether and how the project would affect the visual character of the landscape:

The project would reconstruct the existing two-lane undivided rural roadway into a four-lane median divided urban roadway with curb and gutter and 10-foot shared-use path on both sides of the road between County H and 90th Street and on the north side of the road between 90th Street and Vicksburg Drive, just east of Old Green Bay Road. This would change the visual character of the road from a roadway with rural characteristics to a roadway with urban characteristics. The change in character is consistent with local land use and development plans that anticipate a transition of existing agricultural uses to industrial, commercial and residential uses at urban/suburban densities along the corridor.

The project would encroach upon existing agricultural land, as well as the lots, driveways and potentially landscaping of existing residences in some locations. Also, five residential homes would be removed due to acquisitions associated with the project. The removal of these residences and farm structures would change the character of the landscape in those areas to vacant land until the local governments approve development plans.

Additionally, the project would include two new bridges to replace the existing at-grade railroad crossings, and a new bridge would replace the existing culvert over the Pike River. The height of the Pike River bridge would be about 4 feet higher than the existing road profile. The new railroad bridges would introduce elevated structures

into the existing generally flat topography. The bridges over the UPRR and CPRR tracks would be approximately 30 feet high, at their highest point. Also, the UPRR/County KR grade separation would include a retaining wall that varies in height from 2 feet to 28 feet on the south side of County KR. This would introduce a hardscape feature that would block views of the existing open space environment for adjacent residential properties.

b. Indicate the effects the project would have on the viewer groups:

Due to the expansion of the roadway, some residents along the project corridor will have a view of the roadway that is physically closer than the view of the roadway under existing conditions. The view of the facility will also change from a road with rural characteristics to a road with urban characteristics.

Residents on the south side of County KR to the east of UPRR would have a view of the proposed retaining wall associated with the proposed grade separation aspect of the project. This would contrast with the resident's current view of agricultural cropland and farm structures on the north side of the road. The farm on the north side of County KR would be purchased and existing farm structures would be removed. See Appendix C for renderings that show the view of the grade separation and the retaining wall from the affected residences.

For automobile drivers, the visual impact would be related to currently driving on a rural character roadway to driving on an urban character roadway when the project is complete. For bicyclists and pedestrians, with the inclusion of the shared-use path along County KR, the viewers will have their own dedicated space on which to travel.

4. Mitigation:

a. Have aesthetic commitments been made?

- No – Local governments would be responsible for any future aesthetic improvements.
 Yes - Discuss:

WETLANDS EVALUATION

(9/2013)

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet C-1

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Describe Wetlands: See attached list of all wetlands for detailed information

| | Wetland 1 | | Wetland 2 | | Wetland 3 | |
|--|-------------|----|-------------|----|-------------|----|
| Name (if known) or wetland number¹ | | | | | | |
| County | | | | | | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | | | | | | |
| Location (Latitude) | | | | | | |
| Location (Longitude) | | | | | | |
| Location Map | | | | | | |
| Wetland Type(s)² | | | | | | |
| Wetland Loss | Acres _____ | | Acres _____ | | Acres _____ | |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply)³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| • Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | | | | | | |
| • Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | | | | | | |
| • If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | | |
| ¹ Use wetland numbering from the project wetland delineation report. ² Use wetland types as specified in the "WisDOT FDM 24-5 Attachment 10.2 Wetland Type Correspondence Table" ³ If wetland is contiguous to a stream, complete Factor Sheet C-2, Rivers, Streams and Floodplains Impact Evaluation. If wetland is contiguous to a lake or other water body, complete Factor Sheet C-3, Lake or Water Body Impact Evaluation. | | | | | | |

2. Are any impacted wetlands considered "wetlands of special status" per WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guideline, page 10 (6 categories)?

- No
- Yes:
 - Advanced Identification Program (ADID) Wetlands
 - Public or private expenditure has been made to restore, protect, or ecologically manage the wetland on either public or private land
 - Other – Describe: _____

3. Describe proposed work in the wetland(s), e.g., excavation, fill, marsh disposal, other:

Work in the wetlands would consist of filling for roadway expansion, including grading and filling for slopes alongside the roadway, and constructing new bridges at UPRR and CPRR crossings and the Pike River crossing.

4. List any observed or expected waterfowl and wildlife inhabiting or dependent upon the wetland: (List should include permanent, migratory and seasonal residents).

Wildlife tolerant of habitats disturbed by agricultural and urban development. Typically observed species include game and non-game species, such as rabbits, shrews, mice and woodchucks; predators such as fox and mink; game birds including pheasant and turkey; and marsh furbearers, such as muskrats and beaver. Waterfowl and deer are present. (Source: <http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/CAPR/capr-316-root-river-restoration-plan-part-I.pdf>)

5. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Wetland Policy:

- Not Applicable - Explain
This project is not using federal funding.
- Individual Wetland Finding Required – Summarize why there are no practicable alternatives to the use of the wetland.
- Statewide Wetland Finding: **NOTE: All three boxes below must be checked for the Statewide**

Wetland Finding to apply.

- Project is either a bridge replacement or other reconstruction within 0.3 mile of the existing location.
- The project requires the use of 7.4 acres or less of wetlands.
- The project has been coordinated with the DNR and there have been no significant concerns expressed over the proposed use of the wetlands.

6. Erosion control or storm water management practices which will be used to protect the wetland are indicated on form: (Check all that apply)

- Factor Sheet D-6, Erosion Control Evaluation.
- Factor Sheet D-5, Stormwater Evaluation.
- Neither Factor Sheet – Briefly describe measures to be used

7. U S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Jurisdiction – Section 404 Permit (Clean Water Act)

- Not Applicable – No fill to be placed in wetlands or wetlands are not under USACE jurisdiction.
- Applicable – Fill will be placed in wetlands under the jurisdiction of the USACE.

Indicate area of wetlands filled: Acres 7.44

Type of 404 permit anticipated:

- Individual Section 404 Permit required.
- General Permit (GP) or Letter Of Permission (LOP) required to satisfy Section 404 Compliance.

Indicate which GP or LOP is required:

- Transportation Regional General Permit** issued February 21, 2018 (expires 2/20/23)
- Non-Reporting GP** [GP-002-WI (expires 5/31/16) or GP-004-WI (expires 12/31/17)]
- Reporting GP** [GP-002-WI, GP-003-WI (expires 12/31/17), or GP-004-WI]
- Letter of Permission** [LOP-06-WI (in effect 4/17/06, no expiration date)]
- Programmatic GP** [Applies to projects not covered under the DOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement]

8. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Coordination – Section 401 Water Quality Certification

- DNR has provided concurrence on the project wetland delineation. Received on: (Date)
- Other- Explain
WisDOT will obtain Section 401 Certification upon submittal of Section 404 permit and DNR stormwater permit, anticipated in Fall 2019.

9. Section 10 Waters (Rivers and Harbors Act). For navigable waters of the United States (Section 10) indicate which 404 permit is required:

- No Section 10 Waters
- Section 10 Waters
 - Reporting GP** [GP-003-WI (expires 12/31/17)]
 - Reporting GP** [GP-004-WI (expires 12/31/17)]

Indicate whether Pre-Construction Notification (PCN) to the USACE is:

- Not applicable.
- Required: Submitted on: (Date)

Status of PCN

USACE has made the following determination on: (Date)

USACE is in the process of review, anticipated date of determination is: (Date)

10. Wetland Avoidance and Impact Minimization: [Note: Required before compensation is acceptable]

A. Wetland Avoidance:

1. Describe methods used to avoid the use of wetlands, such as using a lower level of improvement or placing the roadway on new location, etc.:

To greatest practicable extent, WisDOT will utilize the existing roadway footprint and locate stormwater ponds outside wetlands. WisDOT realigned the 90th Street alignment and intersection with 72nd Avenue to minimize impacts to Wetlands W-16 and W-19. WisDOT also reduced the north-south project limits on WIS 31 and Old Green Bay Road.

2. Indicate the total area of wetlands avoided:
Acres: < 1 acre

B. Minimize the amount of wetlands affected:

1. Describe methods used to minimize the use of wetlands, such as increasing side slopes or use of retaining walls or beam guard, equalizer pipes, upland disposal of hydric soils, etc.:

WisDOT will implement 3:1 sideslopes instead of 4:1 sideslopes in wetland areas.

2. Indicate the total area of wetlands saved through minimization:
Acres: <1 acre

11. Compensation for Unavoidable Wetland Loss:

According to Section 404(b)(1), of the Clean Water Act, wetland compensatory mitigation procedures and sequencing will conform to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) joint rule on Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources (33 CFR Parts 325 and 332; and 40 CFR Part 230 – dated April 10, 2008). Compensatory mitigation will be consistent with amendments to the Cooperative Agreement between DNR and WisDOT on compensatory mitigation for unavoidable wetland losses (July 2012), and the WisDOT Interagency Coordination Agreement and Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guidelines with DNR, USACE, EPA, USFWS and FHWA (March 2002).

| | Type | Acre(s) Loss | Ratio | Compensation Type and Acreage | |
|--------|--|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | On-site | DOT Mitigation Bank site |
| RPF(N) | Riparian wetland (wooded) | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| RPF(D) | Degraded riparian wetland (wooded) | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| RPE(N) | Riparian wetland (emergent) | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| RPE(D) | Degraded riparian wetland (emergent) | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| M(N) | Wet and sedge meadows, wet prairie, vernal pools, fens | 6.211 | 1:1.25 | N/A | N/A |
| M(D) | Degraded meadow | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| SM | Shallow marsh | 0.466 | 1:1.25 | N/A | N/A |
| DM | Deep marsh | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| AB(N) | Aquatic bed | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| AB(D) | Degraded aquatic bed | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| SS | Shrub Swamp, shrub carr, alder thicket | 0.197 | 1:1.25 | N/A | N/A |
| WS(N) | Wooded swamp | 0.562 | 1:1.25 | N/A | N/A |
| WS(D) | Degraded wooded swamp | 0 | | N/A | N/A |
| Bog | Open and forested bogs | 0 | | N/A | N/A |

D = Degraded
N = Non-degraded

12. If compensation is not possible within the drainage area and floristic province thru the use of the DOT mitigation bank, explain why and describe how a search for an on-site compensation site was conducted:

Per agreement with DNR, WisDOT will mitigate unavoidable wetland impacts through an in-lieu fee (ILF) payment to DNR. The impacts occur in the Southwest Lake Michigan watershed. WisDOT will purchase wetland mitigation credits through the Wisconsin Wetland Conservation Trust (ILF) program to satisfy mitigation requirements of 9.30 acres within the Southwest Lake Michigan watershed.

13. Summarize the coordination with other agencies regarding the compensation for unavoidable wetland losses. Attach appropriate correspondence.

WisDOT has been coordinating with DNR on a bi-weekly basis since May 2018 to review project impacts and determine appropriate mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts. See **Appendix H** for initial review correspondence.

| | Wetland 1 | | Wetland 2 | | Wetland 3 | | Wetland 4 | | Wetland 5 | | Wetland 6 | |
|--|--------------------|-------|------------|-------|--------------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|--|-------|------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number ¹ | W-1 | | W-2 | | W-3 | | W-4 | | W-5 | | W-6 | |
| County | Racine | | Racine | | Racine/Kenosha | | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 33-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 4-2N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.669202 | | 42.669600 | | 42.669244 | | 42.669672 | | 42.669345 | | 42.669663 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.911548 | | -87.907512 | | -87.907462 | | -87.906057 | | -87.906024 | | -87.905601 | |
| Location Map | Page 1 | | Page 1 | | Page 1 | | Page 1 | | Page 1 | | Page 2 | |
| Wetland Type(s) ² | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Wet Meadow | | Partially farmed, Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Wooded Swamp | | Fresh (wet) Meadow, Shallow Marsh, Scrub-shrub | | Wet Meadow | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.009 | acres | 0.055 | acres | 0.559 | acres | 0.264 | acres | 0.514 | acres | 0.011 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply) ³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | | X | X | | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | Unnamed Pond | | | | | | | |

| | Wetland 7 | | Wetland 8 | | Wetland 9 | | Wetland 10 | | Wetland 11 | | Wetland 12 | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|----------------|-------|--------------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number ¹ | W-7 | | W-8 | | W-9 | | W-10 | | W-11 | | W-12 | |
| County | Racine/Kenosha | | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | | Kenosha | | Racine | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 4-2N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 4-2N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.669132 | | 42.669230 | | 42.669103 | | 42.669102 | | 42.668936 | | 42.669344 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.905411 | | -87.904339 | | -87.9033 | | -87.900951 | | -87.900294 | | -87.899492 | |
| Location Map | Page 2 | | Page 2 | | Page 2 | | Page 2 | | Page 2 | | Page 2 | |
| Wetland Type(s) ² | Fresh (wet) Meadow, Shallow Marsh | | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Farmed wetland | | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Farmed wetland | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.012 | acres | 0.151 | acres | 0.037 | acres | 0.016 | acres | 0.019 | acres | 0.069 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply) ³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Wetland 13 | | Wetland 14 | | Wetland 15 | | Wetland 16 | | Wetland 17 | | Wetland 18 | |
|---|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|---------------|-------|------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number¹ | W-13 | | W-14 | | W-15 | | W-16 | | W-17 | | W-18 | |
| County | Kenosha | | Kenosha | | Kenosha | | Kenosha | | Racine | | Racine | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 4-2N-22E | | 4-2N-22E | | 4-2N-22E | | 3-2N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.668925 | | 42.668920 | | 42.668865 | | 42.667907 | | 42.669479 | | 42.671053 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.898675 | | -87.897439 | | -87.895777 | | -87.895419 | | -87.89486 | | -87.894828 | |
| Location Map | Page 2 | | Page 3 | | Page 3 | | Page 3 | | Page 3 | | Page 3 | |
| Wetland Type(s)² | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Shallow Marsh | | Wet Meadow | | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Fresh (wet) Meadow | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.030 | acres | 0.011 | acres | 0.003 | acres | 0.048 | acres | 0.041 | acres | 0.073 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply)³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Wetland 19 | | Wetland 20 | | Wetland 21 | | Wetland 22 | | Wetland 23 | | Wetland 24 | |
|---|--|-------|--|-------|---|-------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number¹ | W-19 | | W-20 | | W-21 | | W-22 | | W-23 | | W-24 | |
| County | Kenosha | | Racine | | Racine/Kenosha | | Racine | | Kenosha | | Racine | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 3-2N-22E | | 3-2N-22E | | 3-2N-22E | | 34-2N-22E | | 3-2N-22E | | 34-2N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.66878 | | 42.668774 | | 42.668739 | | 42.669253 | | 42.668748 | | 42.668908 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.894757 | | -87.892257 | | -87.890323 | | -87.886348 | | -87.885631 | | -87.88532 | |
| Location Map | Page 3 | | Page 4 | | Page 4 | | Page 4 | | Page 4 | | Page 4 | |
| Wetland Type(s)² | Partially farmed, Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Partially farmed, Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Fresh (wet) Meadow, Shallow Marsh | | Wet Meadow (M) | | Wet Meadow (M) | | Wet Meadow (M) | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.300 | acres | 0.073 | acres | 0.571 | acres | 0.845 | acres | 0.104 | acres | 0.073 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply)³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Wetland 25 | | Wetland 26 | | Wetland 27 | | Wetland 28 | | Wetland 29 | | Wetland 30 | |
|---|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number¹ | W-25 | | W-26 | | W-27 | | W-28 | | W-29 | | W-30 | |
| County | Racine | | Racine | | Kenosha | | Racine | | Kenosha | | Kenosha | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 34-2N-22E | | 34-2N-22E | | 2-2N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 2-2N-22E | | 2-2N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.668761 | | 42.669 | | 42.668609 | | 42.668782 | | 42.668383 | | 42.667018 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.876215 | | -87.87779 | | -87.875259 | | -87.869919 | | -87.872633 | | -87.869966 | |
| Location Map | Page 5 | | Page 5 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | |
| Wetland Type(s)² | Wet Meadow | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.061 | acres | 1.242 | acres | 0.351 | acres | 0.203 | acres | 0.014 | acres | 0.054 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply)³ | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | | X | | X | | X | | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | Pike River | | Pike River | | Pike River | | | |

| | Wetland 31 | | Wetland 32 | | Wetland 33 | | Wetland 34 | | Wetland 35 | | Wetland 36 | |
|---|--------------------|-------|----------------|-------|----------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number¹ | W-31 | | W-32 | | W-33 | | W-34 | | W-35 | | W-36 | |
| County | Racine | | Kenosha | | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | | Kenosha | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 34-2N-22E | | 2-2N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 2-2N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.670337 | | 42.668054 | | 42.668916 | | 42.669831 | | 42.668659 | | 42.668411 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.877806 | | -87.868823 | | -87.868068 | | -87.868082 | | -87.866232 | | -87.865717 | |
| Location Map | Page 5 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | | Page 6 | |
| Wetland Type(s)² | Fresh (wet) Meadow | | Wet Meadow (M) | | Wet Meadow (M) | | Wet Meadow | | Wet Meadow | | Wet Meadow (M) | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.173 | acres | 0.501 | acres | 0.162 | acres | 0.025 | acres | 0.133 | acres | 0.211 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply)³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | | X | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | Unnamed Pond | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Wetland 37 | | Wetland 38 | | Wetland 39 | | Wetland 40 | | Wetland 41 | | Wetland 42 | |
|--|------------|-------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number ¹ | W-37 | | W-38 | | W-39 | | W-40 | | W-41 | | W-42 | |
| County | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | | Racine | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 35-3N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 35-3N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.669239 | | 42.66984 | | 42.668526 | | 42.668515 | | 42.668534 | | 42.669933 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.863795 | | -87.863183 | | -87.862438 | | -87.861801 | | -87.85829 | | -87.911033 | |
| Location Map | Page 7 | | Page 7 | | Page 7 | | Page 7 | | Page 7 | | Page 1 | |
| Wetland Type(s) ² | Wet Meadow | | Shrub Scrub | | Wet Meadow | | Shrub Scrub | | Wooded Swamp | | Wet Meadow | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.007 | acres | 0.000 | acres | 0.012 | acres | 0.026 | acres | 0.298 | acres | 0.026 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply) ³ | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Wetland 43 | | Wetland 44 | |
|--|----------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| Name (if known) or wetland number ¹ | W-43 | | W-44 | |
| County | Kenosha | | Racine | |
| Location (Section-Township-Range) | 3-2N-22E | | 33-3N-22E | |
| Location (Latitude) | 42.668106 | | 42.6696278 | |
| Location (Longitude) | -87.893134 | | -87.8949735 | |
| Location Map | Page 3 | | Page 3 | |
| Wetland Type(s) ² | Wet Meadow (M) | | Wet Meadow (M) | |
| Wetland Loss | 0.027 | acres | 0.023 | acres |
| Wetland is: (Check all that apply) ³ | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body | X | | X | |
| Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 100-year floodplain | X | | X | |
| If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body | | | | |

RIVERS, STREAMS AND FLOODPLAINS EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet C-2

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. **Stream Name:** North Branch Pike River and associated floodplain

2. **Stream Type: (Indicate Trout Stream Class, if known)**

- Unknown
- Warm water
- Cold water

If trout stream, identify trout stream classification: NA

Wild and Scenic River

3. **Size of Upstream Watershed Area: (Square miles or acres)**

16.9 square miles

4. **Stream flow characteristics:**

- Permanent Flow (year-round)
- Temporary Flow (dry part of year)

5. **Stream Characteristics:**

A. Substrate:

- 1. Sand
- 2. Silt
- 3. Clay
- 4. Cobbles
- 5. Other-describe:

B. Average Water Depth: 3.5 feet

C. Vegetation in Stream

Absent South side of County KR: Reed canarygrass, tall manna grass, reed grass on banks, no vegetation in stream.

Present - If known describe: Pike River on north side of County KR was recently reconstructed to restore wetlands and prairie habitat by creating an oxbow, riffles, pools, log jams, boulder clusters and adjacent wetlands. Restored habitat includes sedge meadow and wet-mesic prairie wetlands.

D. Identify Aquatic Species Present:

Coldwater fishes are common to uncommon (<10 per 100 m), transitional fishes are abundant to common, and warm water fishes are uncommon to absent. Headwater species are abundant to common, mainstem species are common to absent, and river species are absent.

Fish Species Found in the Pike River Watershed: Bigmouth Shiner, Black Bullhead, Black Crappie, Blacknose Dace, Blacknose Shiner, Bluegill Bluntnose Minnow, Brook Stickleback, Brook Trout, Brown Bullhead, Central Mudminnow, Coho Salmon, Common Carp, Common Shiner, Creek Chub, Fathead Minnow, Gizzard Shad, Golden Shiner, Goldfish, Green Sunfish, Green-Bluegill Hybrid, Green-Pumpkinseed Hybrid, Largemouth Bass, Pumpkinseed, Rainbow Trout, Southern Redbelly Dace, Sand Shiner, Sunfish Hybrid, White Sucker, Yellow Bullhead, and Yellow Perch. Source: <https://dnr.wi.gov/water/waterDetail.aspx?WBIC=1900>

E. If water quality data is available, include this information:

The 2018 assessments of the North Branch Pike River showed impairment by chloride; new chloride sample data exceeded the 2018 WisCALM listing criteria for the Fish and Aquatic Life use.

Source: <https://dnr.wi.gov/water/waterDetail.aspx?WBIC=1900>

F. Is this river or stream on the WDNR's "Impaired Waters" list?

- No
 Yes

6. If bridge or box culvert replacement, are migratory bird nests present?

- Not Applicable
 None identified
 Yes – Identify Bird Species present: There is evidence of past migratory bird nesting on the existing culvert conveying the Pike River
Estimated number of nests is: Unknown – bridge is overtopped by 5-year flood events and washes out nests.

7. Is a Fish & Wildlife Depredation Permit required to remove swallow nests?

- Not Applicable
 Yes
 No - Describe mitigation measures: Work to replace the existing culvert would occur only between August 30 and May 1st during the non-nesting season, or WisDOT will utilize measures to prevent nesting such as removal of unoccupied nests during the non-nesting season and installation of barrier netting prior to May 1.

8. Describe land adjacent to stream:

The land use surrounding the North Branch Pike River in the project area is agricultural with some nearby residential homes. The land immediately adjacent to the stream is floodplain and contains vegetation consisting of grasses and deciduous trees and shrubs. The north side of the river in Mount Pleasant was part of a Pike River improvement project, completed in 2017, that restored natural stream features and planted in native prairie vegetation and trees.

9. Identify upstream or downstream dischargers or receivers (if any) within 0.8 kilometers (1/2 mile) of the project site:

None identified on DNR website resources <https://dnrmaps.wi.gov/H5/?Viewer=SWDV>.

10. Describe proposed work in, over, or adjacent to stream. Indicate whether the work is within the 100-year floodplain and whether it is a crossing or a longitudinal encroachment: [Note: Coast Guard must be notified when Section 10 waters are affected by a proposal. Also see Wetland Evaluation, Factor Sheet C-1, Question 8.]
Crossing

The project crosses the North Branch Pike River and floodplain to the west of WIS 31. The project would reconstruct and expand the existing 2-lane undivided roadway into a 4-lane divided roadway. The expansion of the roadway near the North Branch Pike River would occur to the north of the existing roadway. A new 233-foot slab span bridge would replace the existing 3-cell (12-foot x 13.5-foot/cell) box culvert that conveys the Pike River under County KR. This work would occur in the 100-year floodplain. The proposed work would cross the floodplain and include excavating and filling approximately 2.7 acres within the floodplain.

11. Discuss the effects of any backwater which would be created by the proposed action. Indicate whether the proposed activities would be in compliance with NR 116 by creating 0.01 ft. backwater or less:

SEWRPC is completing a study to define updated floodplain limits in the study area. WisDOT's bridge design will accommodate the 100-year flood event and will comply with NR 116 and local flood management requirements.

12. Describe and provide the results of coordination with any floodplain zoning authority:

WisDOT is continuing coordination with SEWRPC and floodplain zoning authorities in the villages of Mount Pleasant and Somers to ensure consistency with local floodplain ordinances and updated floodplain studies. The proposed bridge will convey the current Flood Insurance Study (FIS) flood flows.

13. Would the proposal or any changes in the design flood, or backwater cause any of the following impacts?

- No impacts would occur.
 Significant interruption or termination of emergency vehicle service or a community's only evacuation route.
 Significant flooding with a potential for property loss and a hazard to life.
 Significant impacts on natural floodplain values such as flood storage, fish or wildlife habitat, open space, aesthetics, etc.

14. Discuss existing or planned floodplain use and briefly summarize the project's effects on that use:

North of County KR, the Pike River floodplain is within publicly owned land to be preserved as open space and natural habitat to support the Pike River restoration activities (See Factor Sheet B-8). Based on current land use plans in the village of Somers, the Pike River floodplain, south of County KR, is expected to remain in residential and commercial land use, subject to local floodplain regulations.

15. Discuss probable direct impacts to water quality within the floodplain, both during and after construction. Include the probable effects on plants, animals, and fish inhabiting or dependent upon the stream:

During construction, possible impacts include erosion and stormwater runoff into the floodplain and the Pike River. In-stream work will require excavation activities for culvert removal, which can impact aquatic habitats and potentially disrupt aquatic spawning activities. Filling for roadway capacity and bridge widening would impact disturbed natural areas and could also impact recently restored wetland and prairie habitats along the Pike River, north of County KR. During construction, WisDOT would use best management practices, to manage stormwater and erosion to avoid and minimize impacts to water quality. Disturbed natural areas would be restored with native seed mixes.

To avoid impacts to aquatic species, all instream work that could adversely impact water quality would not occur between March 1st and June 1st. The new Pike River bridge spans the river channel and would avoid and minimize impacts to stream morphology, aquatic organism passage, and water quality.

WisDOT will continue coordination with DNR if a temporary channel is needed for construction. WisDOT will share channel lining methods and demonstrate the temporary channel or culvert can carry all stream flows during construction and maintain a suitable depth and velocity to allow passage of migrating fish and aquatic species. During construction, stranded fish in dewatered areas or temporary channels should be captured and returned to the active channel immediately.

The proposed design will maintain the low flow channel and improve river connectivity for fish passage upstream and downstream. The wider bridge opening would also improve wildlife passage in the Pike River corridor. After construction, the proposed action would benefit water quality by directing stormwater runoff to detention ponds via curb and gutter drainage. The detention ponds would reduce total suspended solids and other pollutants entering the Pike River.

16. Are measures proposed to enhance beneficial effects?

No

Yes. Describe: The new bridge would be sized to accommodate the 100-year flood event. The bridge will protect the roadway from washout during larger storm events. The current culvert is overtopped during flood events.

**THREATENED, ENDANGERED and
PROTECTED RESOURCES EVALUATION**

Factor Sheet C-7

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | Project ID: 3763-00-04 |
|---|---|---------------------------|

Federal Resources

1. Complete the following table using the Official Species List from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS).

Date of Official Species List: 7/12/18

Document all species identified on Official Species List, including proposed species.

| Species Common Name | Species Scientific Name | Federal Status | Effect Determination | Justification/ Explanation |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Northern Long-eared Bat | Myotis septentrionalis | Threatened | Project will not result in prohibited take | Tree removal will not occur within 0.25 miles of a known hibernacula at any time of the year, nor will the activity remove a known maternity roost tree or any other tree within 150 feet of a known maternity roost tree from June 1-July 31. |
| Red Knot | Calidris canutus rafa | Threatened | Project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") | The project limits do not overlap with potential suitable habitat. |
| Whooping crane | Grus americana | Experimental Population, Non-Essential | Project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") | The federal status in the study area indicates the population is being introduced outside the species' current range, but within its historic range. No impact given the transient nature of the species in the project area, and the scope of the project. |
| Rusty Patched Bumble Bee | Bombus affinis | Endangered | Project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") | Forested habitat in High Potential Zone (HPZ) south of County KR is too managed or disturbed to support overwintering habitat. Potential impact to HPZ north of County KR is minimized by avoiding tree clearing between October 15-March 15 and replanting disturbed areas with pollinator friendly seed mix. |

| Species Common Name | Species Scientific Name | Federal Status | Effect Determination | Justification/ Explanation |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid | Platanthera leucopaea | Threatened | Project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") | No individuals observed during wetland delineations. A September 2018 field survey concluded that it is unlikely that suitable habitat exists since the wetlands were all managed, degraded, and/or densely shaded. One wetland met the minimum requirement to be potential habitat, but it is not one of the preferred habitat types. The project will not impact federal lands. |

2. Is there designated or proposed critical habitat in the vicinity of the project?

No

Yes – Describe critical habitat, proximity to project, and potential impacts to the critical habitat.

3. Has Section 10 consultation with FWS been completed?

No – Explain:

Yes – Describe consultation efforts and conclusions:

WisDOT has completed consultation in accordance with the Endangered Species Act. WisDOT determined the proposed project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") federally listed species.

The USFWS provided technical assistance to determine potential impacts to the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (RPBB). On December 13, 2018, USFWS communicated its conclusions to WisDOT (See also **Appendix H**):

"Based on a closer examination of the impacts, we believe there is no significant risk to RPBB in the proposed action area south of the County Line Road (1st St.) as the forested habitat appears to be either too managed or disturbed to support overwintering habitat for the species. There is still some potential of impact to RPBB within the action area north of the road if tree clearing is occurring between October 15 and March 15, although we believe the risk is relatively low. Out of an abundance of caution, postponing tree clearing until after March 15 would eliminate the risk of overwintering queen RPBBs from being inadvertently crushed or disturbed as their presence in the forested area would be highly unlikely. However, I would not consider this a requirement since our best available information we have at this time shows to area of impact to be a narrow band of trees that are fairly dense and would be less likely to be high quality overwintering habitat for the species. The conservation measures you propose to replant disturbed areas with a pollinator friendly seed mix will result in beneficial effects to RPBB and the loss of 1.29 acres of forested habitat is unlikely to limit overwintering opportunities to RPBB within this High Potential Zone in the future."

WisDOT will include commitments to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to RPBB habitat, including replanting disturbed areas in the RPBB High Potential Zone (HPZ) and limit tree clearing during overwintering months.

4. Are avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures required?

No

Yes – Describe. Include commitments on Basic Sheet 8, Environmental Commitments.

As recommended by USFWS to reduce the risk of impact to the RPBB, WisDOT will include special provisions for native flowering seed mix #70 or 70A in disturbed areas within the RPBB HPZ. WisDOT will also include special provisions to avoid tree clearing in the RPBB HPZ, in the forested area north of County KR between October 15 and March 15.

State Resources

1. Are threatened or endangered species known to occur in the vicinity of the project?

- None identified.
 Yes – Complete the following table and include the date of the most recent NHI review by WDNR.

Date of Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database review: 6/28/18

| Species Common Name | Species Scientific Name | State Status | Effect Determination | Justification/ Explanation |
|--|--|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Forked Aster | Eurybia furcata | Threatened | No Effect | No individuals identified during field surveys. |
| Heart-leaved Skullcap | Scutellaria ovata ssp. Ovata | Special Concern | No Effect | No individuals identified during field surveys. |
| Cooper's Milkvetch | Astragalus neglectus | Endangered | No Effect | Habitat not present. |
| Twingleaf | Jeffersonia diphylla | Special Concern | No Effect | No individuals identified during field surveys. |
| Smooth Black-haw | Viburnum prunifolium | Special Concern | No Effect | No individuals identified during field surveys. |
| Migratory Bird Concentration Site | Migratory Bird Concentration Site | Special Concern | No Effect | Mitigation measures in place to avoid impact. |
| Waxleaf Meadowrue | Thalictrum revolutum | Special Concern | No Effect | No individuals identified during field surveys. |
| False Hop Sedge | Carex lupuliformis | Endangered | No Effect | Habitat not present. |
| Prairie Crayfish | Procambarus gracilis | Special Concern | No Effect | Mitigation measures in place to avoid impact. |
| Blanchard's Cricket Frog | Acris blanchardi | Endangered | No Effect | Habitat not present |
| Rusty Patched Bumble Bee Federal High Potential Zone | Rusty Patched Bumble Bee Federal High Potential Zone | State special concern species | Project will not intentionally take (or "result in prohibited take of") | Forested habitat in High Potential Zone (HPZ) south of County KR too managed or disturbed to support overwintering habitat. Potential impact to HPZ north of County KR is minimized by avoiding tree clearing between October 15-March 15 and replanting disturbed areas with pollinator friendly seed mix. |

2. Has threatened and endangered resource coordination with WDNR been completed?

- No – Explain:
 Yes – Attach and reference location in this document:

See Environmental Commitments for threatened and endangered species, page 25 of Basic Sheets.

3. Are avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures required?

- No
 Yes – Describe. Include commitments on Basic Sheet 8, Environmental Commitments.

WisDOT will include special provisions for native flowering seed mix #70 or 70A in disturbed areas within the RPBB HPZ. WisDOT will also include special provisions to avoid tree clearing in the RPBB HPZ, in the forested area north of County KR between October 15 and March 15.

If Prairie Crayfish are observed during construction, WisDOT will instruct the contractor to remove crayfish from the construction area and store them in a plastic bucket with soil from where the crayfish was found. WisDOT will contact the DNR who will relocate them off the project.

Other Protected Resources

Bald and Golden Eagles

1. Are bald and/or golden eagles known to occur in the vicinity of the project?
 None identified.
 Yes
2. Will there be adverse or beneficial effects on bald and/or golden eagles as a result of the project?
 No – Explain: NA
 Yes – Describe general proximity to project and potential impacts:
3. Has bald and golden eagle-related coordination with WDNR and/or FWS been completed?
 No – Explain: N/A
 Yes – Attach and reference location in this document:
4. Are avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures required?
 No
 Yes – Describe. Include commitments on Basic Sheet 8, Environmental Commitments.

Migratory Birds

1. Are migratory birds known to occur in the vicinity of the project?

None identified.
 Yes

DNR initial review indicates evidence of migratory birds nesting on the Pike River structure, no specific species identified. The Whooping Crane may use farm fields as temporary resting/feeding areas during migration.

2. Will there be adverse or beneficial effects on migratory birds as a result of the project?

No – Explain: See avoidance and minimization measures described in Question 4.
 Yes – Describe general proximity to project and potential impacts:

3. Has migratory bird-related coordination with WDNR and/or FWS been completed?

No – Explain:
 Yes – Attach and reference location in this document:

See Appendix H, DNR initial review letter. Coordination with USFWS will continue during the Section 404 permit process.

4. Are avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures required?

No
 Yes – Describe. Include commitments on Basic Sheet 8, Environmental Commitments.

To avoid potential impacts to migratory birds at the Pike River crossing, project construction will either occur only between August 30 and May 1st. (non-nesting season) or WisDOT will utilize measures to prevent nesting (e.g., remove unoccupied nests during the non-nesting season and install barrier netting prior to May 1). If netting is used, WisDOT will ensure it is properly maintained, then removed as soon as the nesting period is over. If neither of these options is practicable, WisDOT will contact USFWS to apply for a depredation permit.

AIR QUALITY EVALUATION

Factor Sheet D-1

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 Length of This Alternative 2.8 |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified | |

1. Ozone:

A. Is the project located in a county which is designated non-attainment or maintenance for ozone?

No

Yes – If Yes, one of the following boxes must be checked:

This project is included in the approved Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) endorsed by the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The TIP was found to conform by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. Provide RTP Name, TIP name, MPO name, TIP number and conformity finding date(s):

RTP Name

TIP Name

(See "Other" below)

MPO Name

TIP Number

Southeast Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

Conformity Finding Date(s):

This project is located outside of a Metropolitan Planning Organization's boundaries and has received a positive conformity determination per the rural conformity section of the WisDOT/WDNR Memorandum of Agreement regarding determination of conformity. Provide conformity finding date.

This project is located outside of a Metropolitan Planning Organization's boundaries and is exempt from conformity requirements per 40 CFR 93.126

This project has been determined to be Not Regionally Significant

Other, describe: This is a state funded project. This project was amended into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in May 2018. <https://wisconsin.gov/Documents/doing-bus/local-gov/astnce-pgms/highway/stip/amend-0518.pdf>. The project is included in an amendment to the regional land use and transportation plan for Southeast Wisconsin which was adopted by SEWRPC on December 5, 2018. SEWRPC is in the process of amending the 2019-2022 TIP to include County KR-Phase 2 by February 2019.

2. Carbon Monoxide:

A. Is this project exempt from air quality analysis under Wisconsin Administrative Code – NR 411?

No – NR 411 exemptions do not apply.

Yes – NR 411 exemption(s) apply – Identify exemption(s) and explain why project is exempt.

The project is exempt from air quality analysis because it meets the following criteria:

1. The maximum increase in volume on the modified County KR segment will be 485 vehicles per hour in the design year during the AM peak hour between WIS 31 and 90th Street.

(Criteria: Increased in volume cannot exceed 1200 vehicles per hour)

2. The maximum shift in the nearest roadway exceeds 12 feet, the maximum number of approach through lanes is 2. There are no receptors in any of the four quadrants of the WIS 31/County KR intersection. There are four residences abutting the County KR/56th Avenue intersection, nearest residence is 65' from the proposed roadway edge. The maximum approach volume will be 1190 vehicles per hour in the design year in the WIS 31/County KR intersection.

(Criteria: When the shift is more than 12 feet, the number of through lanes cannot exceed 2, any potential receptor is located more than 25 feet from nearest proposed roadway edge, peak hour traffic volume on each approach of less than 1800 vehicles per hour)

B. Was an air quality analysis required?

No

Yes – Identify the air quality modeling technique or program used to perform the analysis. Complete the Maximum Projected Carbon Monoxide (CO) Concentrations Table to illustrate the results:

Factor Sheet D-2

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | |

1. Identify and describe residences, schools, libraries, or other noise sensitive areas near the proposed action and which will be in use during construction of the proposed action. Include the number of persons potentially affected:

There are 138 residences (Land Use Category B) abutting the proposed roadway improvement within the project limits.

2. Describe the types of construction equipment to be used on the project. Discuss the expected severity of noise levels including the frequency and duration of any anticipated high noise levels:

Noise will be generated by construction equipment used to construct and reconstruct the study-area local roadway system. Typical construction equipment would include dump trucks, graders, cranes, bulldozers, and pavement construction equipment. The noise generated by this type of construction equipment will vary greatly, depending upon the equipment type and model, mode and duration of operation, and specific type of work effort; however, typical noise levels may occur in the 75 to 95 dBA range (at 50 feet). Other distance-typical noise level ranges are shown on **Table 1: Construction Noise/Distance Relationships**.

Variations in building setbacks and land use, local intensity of specific construction activities, and sequencing and timing of construction will result in varying degrees of exposure to construction noise and hence varying levels of resulting construction noise impacts. Adverse effects related to construction noise are anticipated to be of a localized, temporary, and transient nature.

3. Describe the construction stage noise abatement measures to minimize identified adverse noise effects. Check all that apply:

- WisDOT Standard Specifications 107.8(6) and 108.7.1 will apply.
- WisDOT Standard Specifications 107.8(6) and 108.7.1 will apply with the exception that the hours of operation requiring the engineer's written approval for operations will be changed to _____ P.M. until _____ A.M.
- Special construction stage noise abatement measures will be required. Describe:

**Table 1: Construction Noise/
Distance Relationships**

| Distance from Construction Site (feet) | Range of Typical Noise Levels (dBA)¹ |
|---|--|
| 25 | 82 – 102 |
| 50 | 75 – 95 |
| 100 | 69 – 89 |
| 200 | 63 – 83 |
| 300 | 59 – 79 |
| 400 | 57 – 77 |
| 500 | 55 – 75 |
| 1000 | 49 – 69 |

¹ Point sources = 6 dBA reduction per doubling of distance

Source: FDM 23-40, Attachment 1.1

| | |
|---|---|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 2.8 miles Length of This Alternative 2.8 miles |
| Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | |

1. Need for Sound Level Analysis:

Is the proposed action considered a Type I project or WisDOT Retrofit Project per FDM 23-10-1?

- No – Complete only Factor Sheet D-2, Construction Stage Sound Quality Evaluation.
- Yes – Complete Factor Sheet D-2, Construction Stage Sound Quality Evaluation, and the rest of this sheet.

2. Traffic Data:

Indicate whether traffic volumes for sound prediction are different from the Design Hourly Volume (DHV) on Basic Sheet 6, Traffic Summary Matrix:

- No
- Yes – Indicate volumes and explain why they were used:

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Automobiles | Veh/hr |
| Trucks | Veh/hr |
| Or Percentage (T) | % |

3. Sound Level Analysis Technique

Identify and describe the noise analysis technique or program used to identify existing and future sound levels: (See attached receptor location map as Exhibits D-3-1 through D-3-5 in **Appendix G**).

Aerial photos and land use data of the entire study area were reviewed to select 138 representative noise receivers (N1 – N138) representing 138 receptors. Receiver/receptor locations are identified on Exhibits D-3-1 through D-3-5 in **Appendix G**.

Existing noise level measurements were conducted on August 8, 2018, at 2 representative residential areas adjacent to the County KR. The noise measurement data and validation are presented in **Appendix G**.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Traffic Noise Model, v 2.5 (TNM[®]2.5) was used to model existing (2010) and future (2042) peak hour noise levels at the 138 representative noise receptors.

4. Sensitive Receptors

Identify sensitive receptors, e.g., schools, libraries, hospitals, residences, etc. potentially affected by traffic sound: (See attached receptor location map – Exhibits D-3-1 through D-3-5 in **Appendix G**).

There are 138 residences (Land Use Category B) abutting the proposed roadway improvement within the project limits.

5. Noise Impacts

If this proposal is implemented will future sound levels produce a noise impact?

- No
- Yes - The impact will occur because:
 - The Noise Level Criteria (NLC) is approached (1 dBA less than the NLC) or exceeded.
 - Existing sound levels will increase by 15 dBA or more.

The future noise levels developed with TNM indicate that twenty-three (23) residences would be exposed to L_{eq} noise levels that approach or exceed the criteria. No receptors in the project study area would be exposed to an increase in sound levels of 15 dBA or more. Traffic noise mitigation is not feasible since all 23 residences have driveway access to County KR. The results of the TNM analysis are presented on Factor Sheet D-3, Pages 3 of 5 through 5 of 5.

6. Abatement

Will traffic noise abatement measures be implemented?

- Not applicable – Traffic noise impacts will not occur.
- No – Traffic noise abatement is not reasonable or feasible (explain why). In areas currently undeveloped, local units of government shall be notified of predicted sound levels for land use planning purposes. A copy of this written notification shall be included in the final environmental document.

[A copy of this written notification shall be included in the final environmental document.](#)

- Yes – Traffic noise abatement has been determined to be feasible and reasonable. Describe any traffic noise abatement measures which are proposed to be implemented. Explain how it will be determined whether or not those measures will be implemented:

Various methods were reviewed to mitigate the noise impact of the proposed project. Among these were vertical and horizontal alignment shifts, restriction of truck traffic to specific times of the day, a total prohibition of truck traffic, the use of berms and the use of sound barriers.

Shifts in the alignment are not practical because of limited right-of-way and the need to terminate the project at specific intersections. Prohibition of truck traffic is not feasible for this project. Limited right-of-way also would not permit the construction of berms. Noise barriers, to be effective, must be solid with no gaps. There are 23 residences abutting County KR that would be exposed to design hour noise levels of 66 to 68 dBA L_{eq} ¹ that approach or exceed 67 dBA L_{eq} . These properties require access to the proposed project, prohibiting the construction of an effective sound barrier. Additionally, it is impossible to construct a noise barrier for individual properties that meets the feasibility and reasonableness criteria of FDM 23 Noise.

There are several undeveloped areas adjacent to County KR. West of 90th Street the 66 dBA L_{eq} setback would be 65 feet. Between 90th Street and Green Bay Road the setback would be 75 feet. These setback distances indicate that noise levels within this distance, measured perpendicular to the centerline of the nearest lane in either direction, is 66 dBA L_{eq} or greater. This setback distance was developed to assist local planning authorities in developing land use control over the remaining undeveloped lands along the project to prevent further development of incompatible land use.

¹ L_{eq} is the nomenclature assigned to the equivalent continuous sound level.
Project ID # [3763-00-04](#)

| Receptor Location or Site Identification (See attached map) | Distance from C/L of Near Lane to Receptor in feet (ft.) | Number of Families or People Typical of this Receptor Site | Sound Level L_{eq}^2 (dBA) | | | Impact Evaluation | | |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| | | | Noise Level Criteria ³ (NLC) | Future Sound Level ⁴ | Existing Sound Level | Difference in Future and Existing Sound Levels (Col. e minus Col. f) | Difference in Future Sound Levels and Noise Level Criteria (Col. e minus Col. d) | Impact ⁵ or No Impact |
| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) | (i) |
| N1 ⁵ | 120.4 | 1 | 66 | R | 61 | - | - | - |
| N2 ⁵ | 61.0 | 1 | 66 | R | 64 | - | - | - |
| N3 ⁵ | 208.8 | 1 | 66 | R | 56 | - | - | - |
| N4 ⁵ | 237.0 | 1 | 66 | R | 54 | - | - | - |
| N5 ⁵ | 103.7 | 1 | 66 | R | 62 | - | - | - |
| N6 ⁵ | 182.5 | 1 | 66 | R | 58 | - | - | - |
| N7 | 113.3 | 1 | 66 | R | 54 | - | - | - |
| N8 | 92.5 | 1 | 66 | 66 | 62 | 4 | 0 | I |
| N9 | 113.3 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 62 | 5 | 1 | I |
| N10 | 103.4 | 1 | 66 | R | 63 | - | - | - |
| N11 | 90.7 | 1 | 66 | R | 64 | - | - | - |
| N12 | 57.5 | 1 | 66 | R | 66 | - | - | - |
| N13 | 248.6 | 1 | 66 | 60 | 54 | 6 | -6 | N |
| N14 | 123.2 | 1 | 66 | R | 60 | - | - | - |
| N15 | 85.1 | 1 | 66 | R | 63 | - | - | - |
| N16 | 183.8 | 1 | 66 | 64 | 56 | 8 | -2 | N |
| N17 | 184.9 | 1 | 66 | 64 | 56 | 8 | -2 | N |
| N18 | 139.0 | 1 | 66 | 68 | 58 | 10 | 2 | I |
| N19 | 137.5 | 1 | 66 | 68 | 59 | 9 | 2 | I |
| N20 | 149.2 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 58 | 9 | 1 | I |
| N21 | 145.5 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 58 | 9 | 1 | I |
| N22 | 137.5 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 60 | 7 | 1 | I |
| N23 | 149.2 | 1 | 66 | 68 | 61 | 7 | 2 | I |
| N24 | 145.5 | 1 | 66 | 65 | 62 | 3 | -1 | N |
| N25 | 135.2 | 1 | 66 | 63 | 59 | 4 | -3 | N |
| N26 | 127.8 | 1 | 66 | 59 | 56 | 3 | -7 | N |
| N27 | 87.0 | 1 | 66 | 58 | 55 | 3 | -8 | N |
| N28 | 97.8 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 54 | 2 | -10 | N |
| N29 | 129.9 | 1 | 66 | 54 | 53 | 1 | -12 | N |
| N30 | 129.7 | 1 | 66 | 55 | 55 | 0 | -11 | N |
| N31 | 122.9 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 56 | 0 | -10 | N |
| N32 | 121.5 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 56 | 0 | -10 | N |
| N33 | 142.7 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 53 | 0 | -13 | N |
| N34 | 152.9 | 1 | 66 | 58 | 58 | 0 | -8 | N |
| N35 | 164.9 | 1 | 66 | 52 | 49 | 3 | -14 | N |
| N36 | 132.6 | 1 | 66 | 49 | 47 | 2 | -17 | N |
| N37 | 139.9 | 1 | 66 | 47 | 46 | 1 | -19 | N |
| N38 | 90.0 | 1 | 66 | 51 | 50 | 1 | -15 | N |

² Use whole numbers only.

³ Insert the actual Noise Level Criteria from FDM 23-30, Table 1.

⁴ R = Relocation.

⁵ An impact occurs when future sound levels exceed existing sound levels by 15 dB or more, **or**, future sound levels approach or exceed the Noise Level Criteria ("approach" is defined as 1 dB less than the Noise Level Criteria, therefore an impact occurs when Column (h) is -1 dB or greater). I = Impact, N = No Impact.

⁵ Village of Mount Pleasant has already purchased these properties for future development plans.

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|---|----|----|----|----|-----|---|
| N39 | 85.6 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 55 | 1 | -10 | N |
| N40 | 146.4 | 1 | 66 | 46 | 44 | 2 | -20 | N |
| N41 | 67.9 | 1 | 66 | 45 | 44 | 1 | -21 | N |
| N42 | 81.7 | 1 | 66 | 45 | 43 | 2 | -21 | N |
| N43 | 260.8 | 1 | 66 | 46 | 44 | 2 | -20 | N |
| N44 | 485.3 | 1 | 66 | 46 | 44 | 2 | -20 | N |
| N45 | 322.9 | 1 | 66 | 51 | 49 | 2 | -15 | N |
| N46 | 211.8 | 1 | 66 | 50 | 48 | 2 | -16 | N |
| N47 | 167.4 | 1 | 66 | 50 | 49 | 1 | -16 | N |
| N48 | 69.3 | 1 | 66 | 52 | 49 | 3 | -14 | N |
| N49 | 216.7 | 1 | 66 | 54 | 53 | 1 | -12 | N |
| N50 | 193.8 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 52 | 1 | -13 | N |
| N51 | 63.4 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 52 | 1 | -13 | N |
| N52 | 68.2 | 1 | 66 | 55 | 52 | 3 | -11 | N |
| N53 | 74.6 | 1 | 66 | 55 | 53 | 2 | -11 | N |
| N54 | 105.0 | 1 | 66 | 54 | 51 | 3 | -12 | N |
| N55 | 77.5 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 50 | 3 | -13 | N |
| N56 | 97.5 | 1 | 66 | 51 | 49 | 2 | -15 | N |
| N57 | 264.5 | 1 | 66 | 49 | 48 | 1 | -17 | N |
| N58 | 380.3 | 1 | 66 | 50 | 47 | 3 | -16 | N |
| N59 | 402.1 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 50 | 3 | -13 | N |
| N60 | 284.6 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 53 | 3 | -10 | N |
| N61 | 184.0 | 1 | 66 | 60 | 57 | 3 | -6 | N |
| N62 | 142.3 | 1 | 66 | 63 | 59 | 4 | -3 | N |
| N63 | 86.8 | 1 | 66 | 61 | 58 | 3 | -5 | N |
| N64 | 78.6 | 1 | 66 | 64 | 62 | 2 | -2 | N |
| N65 | 152.2 | 1 | 66 | 59 | 57 | 2 | -7 | N |
| N66 | 70.8 | 1 | 66 | 58 | 57 | 1 | -8 | N |
| N67 | 49.9 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 66 | 1 | 1 | I |
| N68 | 126.6 | 1 | 66 | 61 | 58 | 3 | -5 | N |
| N69 | 65.3 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 52 | 1 | -13 | N |
| N70 | 74.6 | 1 | 66 | 52 | 50 | 2 | -14 | N |
| N71 | 100.7 | 1 | 66 | 51 | 49 | 2 | -15 | N |
| N72 | 223.1 | 1 | 66 | 52 | 50 | 2 | -14 | N |
| N73 | 328.9 | 1 | 66 | 52 | 50 | 2 | -14 | N |
| N74 | 281.1 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 54 | 2 | -10 | N |
| N75 | 349.8 | 1 | 66 | 55 | 53 | 2 | -11 | N |
| N76 | 194.2 | 1 | 66 | 54 | 52 | 2 | -12 | N |
| N77 | 106.7 | 1 | 66 | 54 | 51 | 3 | -12 | N |
| N78 | 71.1 | 1 | 66 | 60 | 57 | 3 | -6 | N |
| N79 | 106.0 | 1 | 66 | 63 | 59 | 4 | -3 | N |
| N80 | 59.2 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N81 | 120.3 | 1 | 66 | 59 | 59 | 0 | -7 | N |
| N82 | 105.8 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 59 | -2 | -9 | N |
| N83 | 108.6 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 59 | -2 | -9 | N |
| N84 | 150.1 | 1 | 66 | 55 | 56 | -1 | -11 | N |
| N85 | 197.5 | 1 | 66 | 53 | 53 | 0 | -13 | N |
| N86 | 107.5 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 59 | -3 | -10 | N |
| N87 | 291.0 | 1 | 66 | 51 | 50 | 1 | -15 | N |
| N88 | 324.6 | 1 | 66 | 50 | 49 | 1 | -16 | N |
| N89 | 160.8 | 1 | 66 | 55 | 55 | 0 | -11 | N |
| N90 | 536.1 | 1 | 66 | 49 | 47 | 2 | -17 | N |
| N91 | 151.2 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 55 | 1 | -10 | N |
| N92 | 100.5 | 1 | 66 | 59 | 59 | 0 | -7 | N |
| N93 | 102.3 | 1 | 66 | 59 | 58 | 1 | -7 | N |
| N94 | 152.7 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 55 | 1 | -10 | N |
| N95 | 144.1 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 56 | 1 | -9 | N |
| N96 | 346.8 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 57 | 0 | -9 | N |
| N97 | 301.4 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 54 | 3 | -9 | N |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|---|----|----|----|----|-----|---|
| N98 | 113.0 | 1 | 66 | 64 | 59 | 5 | -2 | N |
| N99 | 101.0 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 54 | 3 | -9 | N |
| N100 | 75.1 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 54 | 2 | -10 | N |
| N101 | 67.6 | 1 | 66 | 58 | 55 | 3 | -8 | N |
| N102 | 168.3 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N103 | 266.5 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N104 | 332.1 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N105 | 329.3 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N106 | 354.9 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 51 | 5 | -10 | N |
| N107 | 328.6 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N108 | 309.5 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N109 | 330.4 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N110 | 338.9 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 51 | 5 | -10 | N |
| N111 | 326.3 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N112 | 319.1 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 52 | 4 | -10 | N |
| N113 | 293.9 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 52 | 5 | -9 | N |
| N114 | 383.2 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 50 | 6 | -10 | N |
| N115 | 84.0 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 63 | 4 | 1 | I |
| N116 | 96.8 | 1 | 66 | 66 | 62 | 4 | 0 | I |
| N117 | 72.2 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N118 | 75.9 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N119 | 73.2 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N120 | 73.0 | 1 | 66 | 63 | 61 | 2 | -3 | N |
| N121 | 71.9 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N122 | 72.2 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N123 | 70.1 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N124 | 68.6 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 2 | 1 | I |
| N125 | 69.2 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 64 | 3 | 1 | I |
| N126 | 65.6 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 2 | 1 | I |
| N127 | 67.3 | 1 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 2 | 1 | I |
| N128 | 65.9 | 1 | 66 | 63 | 62 | 1 | -3 | N |
| N129 | 68.1 | 1 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 1 | 0 | I |
| N130 | 79.0 | 1 | 66 | 65 | 63 | 2 | -1 | N |
| N131 | 280.2 | 1 | 66 | 59 | 53 | 6 | -7 | N |
| N132 | 94.0 | 1 | 66 | 62 | 62 | 0 | -4 | N |
| N133 | 95.0 | 1 | 66 | 61 | 62 | -1 | -5 | N |
| N134 | 65.1 | 1 | 66 | 57 | 58 | -1 | -9 | N |
| N135 | 164.7 | 1 | 66 | 52 | 51 | 1 | -14 | N |
| N136 | 213.5 | 1 | 66 | 50 | 49 | 1 | -16 | N |
| N137 | 109.1 | 1 | 66 | 56 | 55 | 1 | -10 | N |
| N138 | 345.4 | 1 | 66 | 49 | 47 | 2 | -17 | N |

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES, CONTAMINATION and ASBESTOS EVALUATION

Factor Sheet D-4

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| Alternative Build Alternative – Reconstruction | Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | Project ID: 3763-00-04 |
|---|---|---------------------------|

1. Briefly describe the results of the Phase 1 Hazardous Materials Assessment for this alternative. Do not use property identifiers including owner name, address or business name. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

| Site Reference # | Land Use of Concern (Past or Present) | Contaminants of Concern | Phase 1 Recommendations (No further action, or is a phase 2, 2.5 or 3 recommended for this site, and why?) |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Agricultural | Mineral oil | No further action |
| 2 | Agricultural | Epoxy | No further action |
| 3 | Agricultural | Diesel UST | No further action |
| 4 | Residential | Fuel oil UST | No further action |
| 5 | Transportation | Railroad corridor | Phase 2, Phase 2.5 |
| 6 | Transportation | Railroad corridor | Phase 2, Phase 2.5 |
| 7 | Agricultural | SHWMS facility / small generator status | No further action |
| 8 | Institutional | Diesel Fuel | Phase 2, Phase 2.5 |

Additional comments:

2. Were any parcels not included in the Phase 1 assessment?

- No
 Yes – How many:
 Why were the parcels not reviewed?

3. Are there any sites with continuing obligations or deed restrictions?

- No
 Yes – Complete the table for each site closed with continuing obligations or deed restrictions.

| Site Reference # | Soil or Excavation Restrictions | Groundwater Restrictions | Cover Restrictions | Other Restrictions | DNR Notification Required? |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, DNR has been notified. DNR response is attached. |
| | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, DNR has been notified. DNR response is attached. |
| | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, DNR has been notified. DNR response is attached. |

4. Have Phase 2, 2.5 or 3 Assessments been completed? Discuss the results.

| Site Reference # | Phase 2, 2.5 or 3 Recommendations | Materials Handling Plan or Remediation Recommended? | | Is WisDOT a Responsible Party? | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----|--------------------------------|----|
| | | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

5. Describe the results of any additional investigations performed by WisDOT or others (Include the number of sites investigated, the level of investigation and results for each site that relates to this project).

N/A

6. Describe any design elements that have been incorporate into this alternative to avoid any contaminated sites.

None, avoidance is not practicable.

7. Describe the remediation and waste management practices to be included in the design for areas where contamination cannot be avoided (e.g., materials handling plan, remediation of contamination, design changes to minimize disturbances).

Sites 5 and 6 are railroad properties and owners do not allow soil or groundwater testing during the project design phase. WisDOT will include a contract special provision that identifies a high likelihood of encountering contaminated soil, and then conduct test pits and characterization as construction begins.

Disturbance near potentially contaminated sites would be minimized to the extent possible and practicable. As applicable, the contract special provisions would include a Notice to Contractor describing the potential contamination with names and locations of the sites. The areas of potential contamination would be marked on the plan sheets with reference to check the Notice to Contractor in the special provisions.

WisDOT will include special provisions to notify contractors of potential presence of petroleum underground storage tanks or potential contaminated soils and/or groundwater before proceeding with any construction activities at those sites.

8. List any parcels with known contamination which are proposed for acquisition.

The project requires partial acquisitions of Sites 1, 2, 3 (also includes relocation), 4 and 7, which have potential contaminants of concern, but no further action is recommended. No acquisition is anticipated on the Sites 5 and 6, which are railroad properties. WisDOT will complete a Phase 2/2.5 investigation on Site 8 (partial acquisition) prior to construction.

9. ASBESTOS

Have the bridges been inspected for the presence of asbestos containing material (ACM)?

- No – Explain:
 Yes – Fill out the table. Insert additional rows as needed.

| Bridge Number | Results of Asbestos Sampling | Proposed Work (brief description) | List the Appropriate Special Provision |
|---|--|--|--|
| N/A – the structure is Pike River box culvert | No asbestos containing material identified | Demolition and replacement can proceed | 107-125 |

Note: All structures to be acquired and demolished or relocated require asbestos inspections and will be inspected once acquisition has taken place.

STORMWATER EVALUATION

Factor Sheet D-5

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| Alternative Build Alternative - Reconstruction | Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified | Project ID: 3763-00-04 |
|---|---|---------------------------|

1. Indicate whether the proposed action may cause a discharge or will discharge to the waters of the state (Trans 401.03).

Yes. Project discharges to the Pike River.

2. Special consideration should be given to areas that are sensitive to water quality degradation. Indicate whether or not a sensitive area is present and provide specific recommendations on the level of protection needed.

- No water special natural resources are affected by the alternative.
- Yes – Water special natural resources exist in the project area.
 - River/stream
 - Wetland
 - Lake
 - Endangered species habitat
 - Other – Describe:

Describe protection recommendations: Curb and gutter and a storm sewer drainage system will replace existing ditches where practical and complement at locations where necessary and unavoidable. The storm sewer system will direct runoff to stormwater detention ponds.

3. Indicate whether circumstances exist in the project vicinity that require additional or special consideration, such as an increase in peak flow, total suspended solids (TSS) or water volume.

- No additional or special circumstances are present.
- Yes – Additional or special circumstances exist. Indicate all that are present.
 - Areas of groundwater discharge
 - Stream relocations
 - Long or steep cut or fill slopes
 - Cold water stream
 - Large quantity flows
 - Increased backwater
 - Other – Describe any unique, innovative, or atypical stormwater management measures to be used to manage additional or special circumstances: Stormwater detention ponds will be installed throughout project to treat runoff prior to discharge to waters of the state.
 - Areas of groundwater recharge
 - Overland flow/runoff
 - High velocity flows
 - Impaired waterway
 - Exceptional/outstanding resource waters
 - Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

4. Describe the overall stormwater management strategy to minimize adverse and enhance beneficial effects.

Four stormwater detention ponds are proposed along the project corridor (see Appendix B-1). Stormwater detention ponds (also known as wet detention ponds) have a permanent pool of water and are designed to improve water quality and reduce peak flow rates. Well designed and maintained stormwater detention ponds can remove 80% to 90% of total suspended solids (TSS) and remove pollutants associated with TSS such as Cadmium, Copper, lead, Zinc, and hydrocarbons. Peak flow rate control is dependent on basin size and inlet and outlet configurations. See FDM 10-35-15.

5. Indicate how the stormwater management plan will be compatible with fulfilling Trans 401 requirements.

Because this is a highway reconstruction project, TRANS 401 requires TSS reduction to the maximum extent practicable, or up to 40%. The stated potential TSS reduction ability of stormwater detention ponds of 80% to 90% should be in compliance with and fulfill the TRANS 401 requirements.

6. Identify the stormwater management measures to be utilized.

- Swale treatment (parallel to flow) Trans 401.106(10)
- In-line storm sewer treatment, such as catch basins, non-mechanical treatment systems.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetated filter strips (perpendicular to flow) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detention/retention basins – Trans 401.106(6)(3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Constructed storm water wetlands | <input type="checkbox"/> Distancing outfalls from waterway edge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Buffer areas – Trans 401.106(6) | <input type="checkbox"/> Infiltration – Trans 401.106(5) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Describe: |

7. Indicate whether any Drainage District may be affected by the project.

- No – None identified
 Yes
 Has initial coordination with a drainage board been completed?
 No – Explain why:
 Yes – Discuss results:

8. Indicate whether the project is within WisDOT’s Phase I or Phase II stormwater management areas.

Note: See Procedure 20-30-1, Figure 1, Attachment A4, the Cooperative Agreement between WisDOT and WisDNR. Contact Regional Stormwater/erosion Control Engineer if assistance is needed to complete the following:

- No – The project is outside of WisDOT’s stormwater management area.
 During construction, this project will be covered under WisDOT’s Transportation Construction General Permit (TCGP) WPDES Permit No. WI-S066796-1.
- Yes – The project affects one of the following and is regulated by a WPDES stormwater discharge permit, issued by the WisDNR:
- A WisDOT storm sewer system, located within a municipality with a population greater than 100,000.
 - A WisDOT storm sewer system located within the area of a notified owner of a municipal separate storm sewer system.
 - An urbanized area, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, NR216.02(3).
 - A municipal separate storm sewer system serving a population less than 10,000.

9. Has the effect on downstream properties been considered?

- No – Explain why:
 Yes – Coordination has been completed or is in process, describe: The project stormwater management provisions have been, will continue to be coordinated with the villages of Mount Pleasant and Somers and adhere to applicable local runoff/discharge limits. In general, the proposed stormwater detention basins will be designed to limit peak flow discharge rates and should not affect regional hydrology and/or flood elevations along the Pike River.