

US 18/151 FREEWAY CONVERSION PLAN

DODGEVILLE TO VERONA

DANE AND IOWA COUNTIES

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

WisDOT I.D.: 1200-08-00

November 2013



ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION OF FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Basic Sheet 1

Project ID 1200-08-00 (entire corridor) 1200-02-75 (Section 2 construction)	Project Termini From: US 18 interchange at Dodgeville in Iowa County To: West Verona Avenue interchange in Dane County	Funding Sources - Check all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> Local								
Route Designation (if applicable) US 18/151 National Highway System (NHS) Route <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Nearest Community Cities of Dodgeville and Verona; Villages of Ridgeway, Barneveld, Blue Mounds, Mount Horeb; Towns of Dodgeville, Ridgeway, Brigham, Blue Mounds, Springdale, Verona	Estimated Project Cost \$109.60 (million) Real Estate Acquisition Portion of Estimated Cost \$ 8.16 (million)								
Project Name: US 18/151 Freeway Conversion Plan										
County Iowa and Dane Counties	Section-Township-Range T6N, R3E: Section 25 T6N, R4E: Sections 11- 15, 21, 22, 29,30, T6N, R5E; Sections 7-12 T6N, R6E; Sections 7-10, 15 T6N, R7E: Sections 13 – 16 T 6N, R8E; Sections 17, 19, 20,	Right of Way Acquisition <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;"></th> <th style="width: 50%;">Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fee</td> <td style="text-align: center;">479.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TLE</td> <td style="text-align: center;">To be determined in final design</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PLE</td> <td style="text-align: center;">To be determined in final design</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Acres	Fee	479.8	TLE	To be determined in final design	PLE	To be determined in final design
	Acres									
Fee	479.8									
TLE	To be determined in final design									
PLE	To be determined in final design									
Bridge Number(s), if applicable B-13-0052 & b-13-0383 (Sugar River)	Scheduled start date (Kickoff Meeting) June 29, 2007									

Functional Classification of Existing Route	Urban	Rural
Freeway/Expressway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Principal Arterial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minor Arterial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Collector		<input type="checkbox"/>
Minor Collector		<input type="checkbox"/>
Collector	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No Functional Class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

WisDOT Project Classification	
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 type="checkbox"/>
A "Majors" Project	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHRM	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preventive Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>
Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, Describe	<input type="checkbox"/>

FHWA Categorical Exclusion, Type 2c

FHWA Environmental Assessment. No significant Impacts Indicated by Initial Assessment.

James J. [Signature] 10-14-13 Project Manager Rebecca [Signature] 10/21/2013 (Title)
 (Signature) (Company/Org.) (Date) (Title) (Signature) (Date) (Title)
 (Director, Bureau of Technical Services)

Larry [Signature] 10-17-13 Proj. Manager Johnny M. Gerbitz 11-15-2013 Field Ops Eng (Title)
 (Signature) (Company/Org.) (Date) (Title) (Signature) (Date) (Title)
 Region Aeronautics Rails & Harbors FHWA FAA FTA FRA

After reviewing public comments and coordinating with other agencies, it is determined that this action:

A) Will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. This document is a:
 Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

B) Has potential to significantly affect the quality of the human environment:
 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Required

_____ (Signature) _____ (Date) _____ (Title) _____ (Signature) _____ (Date) _____ (Title)
 (Signature) (Company/Org.) (Date) (Title) (Signature) (Date) (Title)
 (Director, Bureau of Equity & Environmental Services)

_____ (Signature) _____ (Date) _____ (Title) _____ (Signature) _____ (Date) _____ (Title)
 (Signature) (Company/Org.) (Date) (Title) (Signature) (Date) (Title)
 Region Aeronautics Rails & Harbors FHWA FAA FTA FRA

Basic Sheet 2

1. Purpose and need of proposed action:

The Proposed Action would affect US 18/151 from the US 18 interchange at Dodgeville in Iowa County to the West Verona Road interchange in the City of Verona in Dane County. This 29 mile long portion of US 18/151 is a rural four-lane divided highway with both at-grade and interchange access. See Exhibit 1, Project Location Map.

US 18/151 functions as the primary east/west route connecting the Madison metropolitan area to Iowa and points beyond. It is classified as a principal arterial highway with the primary purpose of providing interstate and interregional mobility and is designated as a backbone route in the state's long range multi-modal plan Connections 2030. The Connections 2030 plan includes a network of existing and improved roadways that consists of a backbone network and connector highways. The backbone network consists of divided highways that connect each region of the state and major economic centers. The connector highways tie economic and tourism centers to that backbone. The plan achieves its objectives by striving to ensure that these routes have adequate capacity and service.

Backbone routes are envisioned to be freeways in order to achieve the highest level of service and safety, while carrying relatively high volumes of traffic. The 29-mile study segment of US 18/151 currently has approximately 65 access points, including driveways and public roads. This condition is contrary to the vision for the state's backbone routes to be limited access freeways.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to improve the level of safety and service of the project portion of US 18/151 to that which is consistent with its function as backbone route on the Connections 2030 network.

Three primary needs for the Proposed Action have been identified for this portion of US 18/151.

- Long-term highway corridor preservation
- Emerging safety and operational concerns
- Land use/transportation planning and coordination

Long-term highway corridor preservation

Between 2000 and 2010 most of the corridor communities have experienced population growth. (See details in Factor Sheet B-1). Though the growth rate varies among the communities, population forecasts predict growth trends to continue for most of the communities along the corridor. As populations grow, there are increased demands for access to housing, education, and employment. Traffic volumes are predicted to increase as populations increase within the local communities and the larger cities in the area, increasing the importance of maintaining this portion of US 18/151 as a safe and efficient backbone corridor.

Developing a proactive plan to limit access points along the highway and preserve a corridor for the investment the public has already made in this facility ensures that the best preservation solutions are not precluded by past or future development decisions. Lands needed for grade separation structures (interchanges and over/underpasses) and local connecting roads can be preserved.

Emerging safety and operational concerns

Operational and safety needs for US 18/151 are expected to grow as traffic volumes and development along the corridor increases. In 2009 and 2010, traffic volumes along this section of US 18/151 ranged from 14,500 vehicles per day (vpd) to 20,400 vpd. Future traffic volumes are anticipated to increase to 19,100 to 33,600 by the year 2037. See Traffic Forecast Reports in Appendix B. Note that forecasts are included for the existing expressway facility and connecting county roads and for the future freeway facility when the conversion is completely constructed.

The table below shows the number of crashes with injuries and fatalities, and the total number of crashes for sections of US 18/151. The statewide average crash rate for rural expressways is 55 crashes per hundred million vehicles miles (HMVM). Five of the 11 sections shown exceed the statewide crash rate. The table also shows that five of the 11 sections exceed the statewide rate for injury crashes (18.4) and 6 of 11 sections exceed the statewide rate for fatality crashes (0.8).

As mainline and side road traffic volumes increase along this high-speed rural facility, the ability to get on, off or across US 18/151 will become more difficult because the frequency and duration of gaps in US 18/151 traffic will

decrease. If all other conditions remain unchanged, this may increase the frequency of drivers using smaller than desirable gaps when accessing the highway from side roads and driveways. This may result in more crashes overall and of particular concern, an increase in the number of severe crashes, given the significant speed differential between vehicles on the four-lane highway compared to those entering. Input from members of the public indicates a common and growing concern with the increasing difficulty in safely accessing the highway, and the risk associated with making these movements.

**Crashes and Crash Rates On US 18/151: US 18 Interchange to County G Interchange
Years 2007 – 2011**

	Section	Property Damage Only	Injury Crashes	Fatality Crashes	Total Crashes	Miles	Crash Rate (crashes/HMVM)	Crash Rate Exceeding Statewide Average	Injury Crashes Exceeding Statewide Average	Fatality Crashes Exceeding Statewide Average
1	US 18 to County Y/County YZ	11	10	1	22	3.0	23.78			X
2	County Y/YZ to County BB	3	1	0	4	1.4	10.51			
3	County BB to County H underpass *	47	29	1	77	2.8	90.23	X	X	X
4	County H underpass to Pikes Peak Road	13	9	1	23	1.7	43.35			X
5	Pikes Peak Rd to County K*	46	27	1	74	3.9	60.45	X	X	X
6	County K to East Brigham Road	16	2	0	18	1.9	35.8			
7	East Brigham Road to County F	3	4	0	7	1.0	26.45			
8	County F to County JG (underpass) *	65	33	1	99	5.1	57.81	X	X	X
9	County JG (underpass) to County PD *	56	25	0	81	3.4	56.51	X	X	
10	County PD to County J *	48	48	1	97	2.4	117.18	X	X	X
11	County J to County G/Dairy Ridge Rd	23	17	0	40	2.3	46.71			
	Totals	331	205	6	542					

Notes; Statewide crash rate for four-lane rural expressways of 55 crashes per hundred million miles, injury crash rate is 18.4 (for A, B, & C injury type crashes) and fatality crash rate is 0.8.

WisDOT will continue to monitor safety conditions along the corridor and if warranted, make improvements that focus on maintaining expressway safety, such as extending right and left turn lanes. The need to convert US 18/151 to a freeway due to increasing volumes would still remain, but the timing of construction could be delayed to some extent through these short-term actions.

The capacity of highways with at-grade access is lower than for freeways with access provided at interchanges only. Conversion to freeway would therefore extend the operational service life of US 18/151 as a four lane highway, increasing the value of the new investment in the corridor to the traveling public.

Local land use/transportation planning and coordination

Land use changes in the area are contributing to increases in traffic on US 18/151. Identifying future changes in access can help communities ensure that development plans are compatible with the planned transportation system. Joint efforts on the part of WisDOT and local communities to plan and develop in ways that are compatible with the eventual building of alternative access and safe crossings would ease the conversion of US 18/151 to a freeway

facility, reducing negative impacts on communities and property owners. Another principal benefit of the planning and mapping process is to provide certainty to land owners and local communities as to the location and amount the right of way needed for changes to the highway system. This would avoid potentially costly relocations and disruptions for property owners in the future as the corridor is converted to a freeway.

Proposed Action Summary

To achieve the purpose and need, the Proposed Action would eliminate all public and private at-grade access on US 18/151. New access by interchange and grade-separated crossings of most intersection side roads plus additions and alterations to the local road network are necessary to provide suitable routes for traveling to and accessing US 18/151. These alternate routes must provide for safe travel without unreasonable indirection and ensure that an adequate response time for emergency services is maintained.

This US 18/151 Freeway Conversion Plan and Environmental Assessment (EA) was programmed as a *planning* action with no associated final design or construction funding¹. However, the study was conducted such that the EA is fully compliant with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It was intended to serve as the environmental document of record for the design and construction of as much of the Preferred Alternative identified within it as possible. WisDOT expects to fund and construct the Preferred Alternative in three or more separate pieces. As each segment is programmed, WisDOT and FHWA will need to determine if this EA can be used as is, with specific modifications, would need to be re-evaluated or not at all. This decision will be influenced by the amount of time that passes between each significant action related to the Preferred Alternative and the extent that significant changes to the setting, environmental laws, highway standards, etc.

Section 2 improvements (described in detail below) are programmed for construction in 2017. This EA will be the environmental document of record. For each subsequent programmed project, WisDOT and FHWA will determine if this EA can be used as is, needs specific modifications, needs to be formally re-evaluated or is no longer valid and a new document is needed. This includes Section 4 improvements (also described in detail below) that are expected to be programmed for 2020. The extent to which the EA is eventually used will be influenced by the amount of time that passes between each significant action related to the Preferred Alternative and the extent that significant changes to the setting, environmental laws, highway standards, etc.

Following the issuance of the EA-FONSI, WisDOT will determine the extent to which the right-of-way needed to convert un-programmed sections of the Preferred Alternative to a freeway should be Officially Mapped under Wisconsin State Statute 84.295(10). This statute provides the Department the authority to purchase Officially Mapped lands as right-of-way and serves as a link between the planning and preservation process and the final project design.

Construction of the Proposed Action would eventually result in designating this portion US 18/151 as a Freeway under Wisconsin State Statute 84.295. Prior to either action under 84.295, WisDOT would hold a public hearing.

2. Summary of alternatives considered and if they are not proposed for adoption, why not:

In 2006, WisDOT completed the *US 18/151 Highway Access Study*. This preliminary study gathered background information about the corridor and developed high-level conceptual alternatives for removing access to US 18/151, largely focusing on the possible placement of interchanges and grade-separated crossings. This study included a substantial public involvement element. The US 18/151 Freeway Conversion study used the concepts developed in this study as a starting point for developing study alternatives.

Due to the length of the project area, the project has been divided into six sections. No improvements are proposed for Section 5, which is already a freeway bypass around Mount Horeb. Two or more alternatives were developed for the other five sections. See Exhibit 2 for an overview of the Preferred Alternative and Exhibit 3 for a more detailed view of the Preferred Alternative. Exhibit 4 shows the interchange location alternatives that were considered and not selected.

¹ As part of the EA process, Project Initiation Letters were sent to federal, state and local officials to notify them of the project and invite them to participate in the process (see Appendix 1). See Appendix A2 for the agency scoping letter and mailing list. Tribal officials were also notified about the study and invited to participate. See Appendix A3 for the tribal scoping letter and mailing list.

No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative would include performing routine maintenance only on all of the sections. This alternative would not address safety and operational issues at intersections within the project area. The No Build Alternative would not provide highest level of service and safety envisioned for a Connections 2030 backbone route. For this reason, the No Build Alternative does not fulfill the project purpose and need, but is retained in this document as a baseline for comparison against other alternatives.

BUILD ALTERNATIVES

All build alternatives described below would close all existing at-grade public and private access to US 18/151 and construct new and alter existing local roads as needed to provide reasonable alternate access to one or more existing or proposed new interchanges.

All build alternatives would retain the existing two lanes of traffic in each direction and the grass median separating them, and replace existing right and left turn lanes with normal width shoulders. Median openings would be removed except as needed to accommodate maintenance and emergency vehicles. All would construct new and alter existing local roads as needed to provide reasonable alternate access to one or more existing or proposed new interchanges.

All build alternatives were developed to satisfy the purpose and need while avoiding significant environmental resources if possible, and minimizing impacts to those that could not be avoided. All were developed to be compatible with the conversion alternatives on either side and the conversion of the entire corridor in general. Extensive coordination with local government and property owners was conducted as alternatives were developed and compared to ensure local preferences were known and accommodated to the extent possible. None of the alternatives were found to have fatal flaws, so all are considered to be reasonable alternatives.

Traffic volumes were forecast for the year 2037, which is the 20 years after the programmed construction year of the first section to be funded for final design and construction. The capacity of existing four-lane US 18/151 was analyzed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). A level of service (LOS) A or B is predicted for all sections within the study limits. See Basic Sheet 6. A completion year for the construction in the other four sections is not known but 2030 is a reasonable estimate. A straight line increase of 2037 projections to the year 2050, using the annual percentage increase forecast to occur between 2027 and 2037, indicates a K30 volume of 4,153 vehicles per hour and one way volume of 2,492 vehicles per hour. This corresponds to LOS C. Based on these projections, capacity expansion of US 18/151 is not recommended as part of any build alternatives.

Future US 18/151 bridges, pavement (mainline or shoulders), or interchanges needs in terms of maintenance, rehabilitation or replacement of were not addressed as specific parts of any build alternatives. These needs would continue to be monitored, prioritized and programmed independently of prioritizing and programming individual sections of the preferred build alternative. Construction of both should be scheduled to occur concurrently if this would benefit the general public (design or construction time or cost savings, construction zone safety, etc.)

Each build alternative was designed to a level of detail sufficient to allow a fair comparison of significant impacts within each section. Primary considerations for selecting the Preferred Alternative in each section included impacts to land, property improvements and the Military Ridge State Trail (MRST), effects on the circulation of local traffic, the extent to which local preferences were accommodated and cost.

Section 1: US 18 to East of County Y/YZ

The alternatives for this section considered the location for an interchange at or near the existing County Y/YZ intersection, described as follows:

- **Alternative 1A:** Interchange shifted approximately 775 feet west of existing County Y (partial cloverleaf or diamond interchange)
- **Alternative 1B (Preferred Alternative):** Diamond interchange at existing County Y (partially east of existing Y)
- **Alternative 1C:** Interchange shifted approximately 880 feet west of existing County Y (partial cloverleaf or diamond interchange)

An overpass with no access to US 18/151 for County Y was briefly discussed and dismissed from further consideration because the community felt access to US 18/151 at this location was critical.

All three alternatives include dead-ended frontage roads near the interchange and in the vicinity of County Z in order to remove direct driveway access to the highway. Alternative 1 B was selected because it was preferred by the Town of Dodgeville and would have a significantly lower severance impact. Alternative 1B would require shifting a portion of the Military Ridge State Trail (MRST) slightly to accommodate a frontage road near the proposed interchange. The impact of Alternatives 1A and 1C on the MRST would be similar to Alternative 1B.

Section 2: County BB to west of County HHH (west)

The alternatives considered for this section involved the location for an interchange on the west side of the Village of Ridgeway.

- **Alternative 2A:** Interchange east of the existing connection of County HHH to US 18/151 within the Village of Ridgeway, the extension of County BB to the new interchange and a new local road to connect Ridgeway Road the Village of Ridgeway.
- **Alternative 2B (Preferred Alternative):** Interchange east of County BB in the Town of Ridgeway and an overpass and extension west to the interchange for existing County HHH (on the west side of Ridgeway).

Alternative 2B was selected as the Preferred Alternative because Alternative 2A would consume land within the village limits of Ridgeway and have noise impacts on developed areas within the village. In addition, Alternative 2B provided a more direct connection of County BB to US 18/151 and was strongly preferred by the Village and Town of Ridgeway. This alternative requires that a portion of the MRST be relocated in order to accommodate the interchange.

Section 3: County H to Mounds View Road

The alternatives for this section considered the placement of an interchange on or near the east side of the Village of Ridgeway and the closure of the County K intersection east of the Village of Barneveld.

- **Alternative 3A:** Diamond interchange at West Brigham Road/Pikes Peak Road and overpasses at County HHH/Hi-Point Road and County K
- **Alternative 3B (Preferred Alternative):** Partial cloverleaf interchange at County HHH/Hi-Point Road, underpass at Pikes Peak Road, relocation of County K to the County ID interchange

Alternative 3B was selected as the Preferred Alternative based upon community preferences to have the interchange serve the Village of Ridgeway and adjacent development more directly than would occur with Alternative 3A. The combination of Alternative 2B and 3B was nearly unanimously preferred by the Village, nearby towns and Iowa County. County H, which currently runs south-north under US 18/151 into the Village of Ridgeway, would be relocated to connect to the interchange at County HHH.

Two options were considered for removing the existing intersection of County K with US 18/151 east of the Village of Barneveld. Alternate 3A included a grade-separated crossing at the existing intersection location. Alternative 3B would relocate County K to connect to the existing County ID interchange at the west end of the village. The relocation option was preferred by the Village of Barneveld to have County K traffic connect more directly to the interchange.

County K could be connected to the interchange by moving County K onto existing local roads, East Industrial Drive and South Jones Street. A second option would be to relocate County K to head in the northwesterly direction to the County ID interchange. The second option was selected because it would serve future development planned just south of the interchange and is more direct. Additionally, the South Jones Road alignment was not viewed as optimal for a county road.

Alternative 3B includes a continuous local road connection between the County HHH interchange in Ridgeway and the Village of Barneveld. The Iowa County Transportation Committee requested that it be designed as a county highway because the county currently lacks a continuous west-east facility; the existing county road network consists of many shorter sections of county highway that run predominantly south-north. Alternative 3A, had it been selected, likely would have included a similar facility.

Alternatives 3A and 3B would have similar effects to the MRST, but in different locations. Alternative 3B would require shifting a portion of the MRST near the County HHH/Hi-Point Road interchange. It would also require shifting the trail

to accommodate the extension of County ID west of Ridgeway. Alternative 3A would require shifting the trail near the Pikes Peak Road interchange.

Section 4: Mounds View Road to WIS 78

The alternatives for this section considered the placement of an interchange to serve the Village and Town of Blue Mounds in the vicinity of existing County F.

- **Alternative 4A (Preferred Alternative):** Interchange would be constructed at County F.

Alternatives for locating the interchange either east or west of the existing County F intersection were also analyzed. These alternatives would result in significantly greater impacts to existing and planned business development (west of County F) or to existing residences (east of County F). Both would relocate a considerable length of County F, requiring significantly more real estate than Alternative 4A. Alternative 4A was selected for these reasons and because it is believed by the Village of Blue Mounds to best serve existing development. There are no effects to the MRST in the area of the interchange.

Section 5: WIS 78 to County PD

No changes are proposed for this section.

Section 6: County PD to County G

The analysis for this section considered the need for an interchange at County J.

- **Alternative 6A:** Diamond interchange at County J
- **Alternative 6B (Preferred Alternative):** No Interchange at County J

Alternative 6B was selected as it was determined that adequate access would be provided for this area by the combination of existing interchanges at County P/PD and County G and new local roads.

Both alternatives include a new continuous frontage road on the south side of 18/151 to ensure adequate response time for emergency services and avoid unreasonable additions to local trip lengths. Both alternatives also include auxiliary lanes on both sides of US 18/151 from the County G interchange to the West Verona Avenue interchange. Construction of the auxiliary lanes would require lengthening the box culvert that carries the MRST under US 18/151 in this area and expansion of the bridge over the Sugar River. No portions of the MRST would be relocated in Section 6.

3. Description of Proposed Action

The Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative) would add a total of four new interchanges, seven grade-separated crossings (two underpasses and five overpasses), 21 miles of new and altered local roads and one pair auxiliary lanes approximately ½ mile in length. Approximately 70 at-grade crossings would be eliminated along the corridor, including 34 at-grade intersections, one commercial driveway, 19 residential driveways, and 16 field entrances.

The changes/additions to county and town roads would be constructed in accordance with the volume and classification-based standards in WisDOT's Facilities Development Manual (FDM) for new construction or reconstruction. The two-lane county roads would have a traveled way width of 20 to 24 feet and shoulder width of two to six feet. Town roads would have a traveled way width of 20 to 22 feet and a shoulder width of three to six feet.

The total amount of real estate required to construct the Proposed Action is estimated to be 479.8 acres. See Factor Sheet A-3 for more details.

The Preferred Alternative will have an access control element for all interchanges. In general, no new access will be allowed between ramps and the nearest side road intersection. Access control will be extended along all legs of that same side road intersection. This distance will generally be the larger of the functional area of the intersection or county minimum distance from intersection to nearest access point. These controls will be added at existing interchanges to the extent they do not already exist. Existing access points within the access control limits will be evaluated as to their affect on safety and capacity on a section by section basis as part of the final design.

All sections of the Preferred Alternative can be designed and constructed independently of the others or constructed as a package of any two or more. As each section is funded, WisDOT must determine whether the subsequent reduction of expressway mileage and/or change in the length of abutting sections of freeway and expressway could reduce drivers vigilance for traffic crossing and entering from side roads and result in an increase in crashes. In addition, WisDOT would evaluate if and when the EA would need to be updated or reevaluated prior to the final design/construction of each section(s).

The Proposed Action for each section is described in more detail below.

Section 1: US 18 to East of County Y/YZ

Alternative 1B (Preferred Alternative) – Alternative 1B includes a diamond interchange at County Y in the Town of Dodgeville.

Local road changes associated with this alternative would include the following:

- Rural two-lane dead-end frontage road on the north side of US 18/151 connecting County Z to properties to the east
- Private driveway from Section Line Road extending about ¼ mile north to provide access for one property in agricultural use which currently has access onto US 18/151.
- Rural two-lane dead-end frontage road on the north side of US 18/151 connecting County Y to properties to the east
- Rural two-lane dead-end frontage road on the south side of US 18/151 connecting County Y to properties to the east
- Construction of three cul de sacs

This alternative includes relocation of 0.61 miles of the MRST north of US 18/151 to run adjacent to the new interchange and County YZ to the west.

This alternative includes acquisition of one property that includes a residence and outbuildings, and one building on another property used as a workshop. Twelve driveway access points onto US 18/151 and two direct local road connections would be removed (County Y/YZ). An estimated total of 73.7 acres of land would be acquired for Alternative 1B.

Section 2: County BB to west of County H

Alternative 2B (Preferred Alternative) – Alternative 2B includes a diamond interchange between County BB and Reed Road in the Town of Ridgeway.

Local road changes associated with this alternative would include the following:

- Closure of existing Ridgevue Road connection to US 18/151; Ridgevue Road would be extended to connect to the interchange
- Extension of County BB easterly to the new interchange
- Closure of the existing County HHH connection to US 18/151 on the west side of Ridgeway; County HHH would be routed over US 18/151 via an overpass and extended westerly to connect to the new interchange.
- Relocation of Prairie Road/Moon Road intersection so that Prairie Road is a continuous connection to the interchange and Moon Road become a T intersection with Prairie Road
- Closure of the existing Prairie Road connection to US 18/151, constructing a cul de sac on the east end and a T intersection with the County HHH extension
- Possible closure of the section of Prairie Road between Moon Road and the new County HHH extension; this decision would be made the Town of Ridgeway at the time of final design.
- Removal of Cemetery Road (County BB and Prairie Road extensions would provide access to properties which currently have access off Cemetery Road)
- Construction of an intersection of Aschliman Road and the County BB extension.

This alternative includes relocation of 0.62 miles the MRST west of Ridgevue Road to run adjacent to the new connection to the interchange, crossing this connection at the westbound on and off ramps at the interchange.

One residence and two outbuildings would be acquired. Two private driveways would be removed and five direct local road connections to US 18/151 would be closed. An estimated total of 87.7 acres of land would be acquired for Alternative 2B.

Section 3: East of County H to west of Mounds View Road

Alternative 3B (Preferred Alternative) – A partial cloverleaf (parclo) interchange would be constructed at County HHH/Hi-Point Road.

Local road connections associated with this alternative would include the following:

- County H, which currently runs south-north under US 18/151 into the Village of Ridgeway, would be relocated to connect to the interchange at County HHH. A short section of County H between US 18/151 and the relocated portion of County H would be jurisdictionally transferred from Iowa County to the Town of Ridgeway and the Village of Ridgeway.
- Easterly extension of an existing rural two-lane dead-end frontage road on the north side of the interchange connecting properties east of the interchange to County HHH and the interchange.
- Removal of the Hi-Point Road connection to US 18/151 and construction of a cul de sac or field driveway on the north.
- A continuous county road from the County HHH interchange to the Village of Barneveld, in effect an extension of the existing County ID. Existing County ID currently connects to an interchange in the Village of Barneveld. The County ID extension would run south of US 18/151 from the County HHH interchange and pass over US 18/151 near County T, and from that point run on the north side of US 18/151. The new section of county road would be connected to the existing County ID and the interchange via a roundabout.
- Realignment of Pikes Peak Road to the east and under US 18/151 to a tee intersection with the County ID extension
- Realignment of West Brigham Road to the west to connect to a tee intersection with the County ID extension
- Closure of the existing County T connection to US 18/151 and realignment of County T to connect it to the County ID extension just south of the new County ID overpass
- Removal of the driveway accessing US 18/151 for a property adjacent to US 18/151 and County T. A new driveway would be constructed on the west side of County T
- Dead-end frontage road extending west from the County ID extension on the north side of US 18/151 in the vicinity of County T to allow for the removal of the Ihm-Harris Road connection to US 18/151 and a private driveway connection to US 81/51
- Construction of a roundabout in Barneveld to connect the County ID extension to existing County ID and the existing County ID interchange in Barneveld.
- Relocation of County K near its existing intersection with South Jones Street to run in a northwesterly direction to connect to the County ID interchange
- Reconstruction of the existing County K crossing of the East Branch of the Pecatonica River including replacing the existing culvert.
- Reconstruction of the driveway entrance to the parcel south of the junction of the existing County K and the relocated County K with a culvert for the crossing of the East Branch of the Pecatonica River
- Construction of cul de sacs at the existing north and south intersections of County K with US 18/151

This alternative requires a slight relocation of 0.8 miles of the MRST to accommodate the interchange at County HHH/High Point Road and the relocation of 1.57 miles of the MRST on the north side of US 18/151 to accommodate the County ID extension. The trail would run adjacent to and along the north side of the County ID extension.

Two residences, each with one outbuilding would be acquired on two separate parcels. Twelve driveways and eight direct local road connections to US 18/151 would be removed. An estimated total of 183.1 acres of land would be acquired for Alternative 3B.

Section 4: West of Mounds View Road to WIS 78

Alternative 4A (Preferred Alternative) – Alternative 4A includes construction of a partial cloverleaf (parclo) interchange at County F. A parclo was preferred at this location as it best accommodated existing and planned development in the area and required the least amount of new right of way.

Local road changes associated with this alternative would include the following:

- Overpass at Mounds View Road

- Overpass at East Brigham Road
- Overpass at Cave of the Mounds Road and construction of a cul de sac on the south end
- Underpass at Erbe Road and reconstruction of the Erbe Road/County ID intersection
- Agricultural driveway connection from County E to provide access to a parcel that has existing driveway access from US 18/151. WisDOT would purchase the lands needed and deed the driveway to the property owner after driveway construction is completed.

This alternative includes replacing the existing at-grade crossing of the MRST of Erbe Road with a grade-separated crossing on the new bridge carrying westbound US 18/151 over Erbe Road.

One residence and two outbuildings on one property would be acquired and one commercial building and one mobile home unit on a second parcel would be acquired. Four driveways and ten direct local road connections to US 18/151 would be removed. An estimated total of 21.6 acres of land would be acquired for Alternative 4A.

In 2015, WisDOT is removing the existing County E intersection with US 18/151 and relocating County E to connect to WIS 78 just south of US 18/151. This change has been adopted into the freeway conversion plan but the investigation and development of the alignment was completely independent of the conversion study. Note that these improvements to County E were developed and approved in a separate environmental document.

Section 5: WIS 78 to County PD

No changes are proposed.

Section 6: County PD to County G

Alternative 6B (Preferred Alternative) – No interchange would be constructed at County J.

Alternative 6B would construct one auxiliary lane on the either side of the highway between the County G interchange and the West Verona Road interchange in order to reduce the weaving movements between these two interchanges. The existing steel girder bridge over the Sugar River would be expanded to accommodate the auxiliary lanes. The existing box culvert which carries the Military Ridge State Trail under US 18/151 would be lengthened to accommodate the auxiliary lane additions.

No interchanges or over/underpasses are proposed for this section.

Local road changes associated with this alternative would include the following:

- Extension of Springdale Center Road to the County PD interchange
- A two-lane local road connecting Springdale Center Road to County G south of US 18/151
- Extension of Prairie Ridge Road to allow for the removal of the Despins Lane connection to US 18/151 and another private driveway
- Closure of the County J jug-handle connection to US 18/151 on the north side of US 18/151
- Rural dead-end two-lane local road extending west from County J on the north side of US 18/151 to allow for the removal of the County J connection and a private driveway with existing access to US 18/151
- Rural dead-end two-lane road from Dairy Ridge Road to two parcels with existing driveway access onto US 18/151
- Cul de sacs for Spring Rose Road on the north side of US 18/151 and Erb Road on the south side of US 18/151

In this section, one residence on one parcel, and three outbuildings on two other properties and one commercial building and mobile home on another property would be acquired. Approximately four driveways and nine direct local road connections to US 18/151 would be removed. An estimated total of 95.5 acres of land would be acquired for Alternative 6B.

Park and Ride Facilities

WisDOT would consider adding Park and Ride facilities at one or more locations throughout the corridor as construction project are funded based on a determination of need in cooperation with local governments. (See also 11b.).

4. In general terms, briefly discuss the construction and operational energy requirements and conservation potential of the various alternatives under consideration. Indicate whether the savings in operational energy are greater than the energy required to construct the facility:

Energy requirements for the construction of the Preferred Alternative would be greater than those required for the No Build Alternative. However, the Preferred Alternative would result in a more efficient transportation system, with less wait time at existing intersections for drivers attempting to enter US 18/151 and thus a lower consumption of energy. There would also likely be fewer crashes, which would reduce energy usage related to vehicle delay and redirection. Over the design life of the facility, savings in operational energy would be greater than the energy required to construct the facility and thus in the long-term would result in net savings in energy usage.

5. Describe existing land use (attach land use maps, if available):

a. Land use of properties that adjoin the project:

Commercial/Industrial

Commercial and industrial uses are concentrated in the incorporated areas along the corridor with some scattered uses in the rural areas along the project corridor, including: a vehicle repair facility, a landscaping business, a meat processing facility and two quarries.

Residential

Scattered residential uses are located adjacent to the project corridor while high-density residential developments are concentrated in the incorporated communities along the US 18/151 corridor in the Villages of Mount Horeb, Ridgeway, Blue Mounds, and Barneveld.

Agricultural

A substantial amount of agricultural land is located within the project corridor. These agricultural lands produce crops, support agricultural forests (forested lands contiguous with agricultural land), and support livestock.

Parks and recreation

The Military Ridge State Trail (MRST) runs from the City of Fitchburg in Dane County to the City of Dodgeville in Iowa County, and is used for hiking, biking, and snowmobile use. Portions of the trail are immediately adjacent to the US 18/151 corridor. The WDNR also owns approximately 30 acres of woodland that is connected to the MRST on the north side of US 18/151 near County BB.

Uplands

There are uplands associated with rural properties now used primarily for residential use and a significant amount of former agricultural fields which have been allowed to go fallow. The Southwest Wisconsin Grassland and Stream Conservation Area (SWGSCA) is a 50,000+ acre grassland landscape in Dane and Iowa Counties which lies within the project area south of US 18/151 for the most part. The SWGSCA includes working farms and remnants of pre-settlement prairie with rare plants, herptiles and birds. The agency/organizational partners involved with preservation of the SWGSCA work with private landowners to preserve these remnants by purchasing easements so that the lands are not developed, or assisting the landowners to apply easements to their own property.

Wetlands

The Sugar River Wetlands Natural Area is a 110-acre site on both sides of US 18/151, east of County G. This is a diverse wetland complex including sedge meadow, calcareous fen, emergent aquatic, shrub-carr, and wet-mesic prairie. Located within the Upper Sugar River Watershed, this extensive wetland harbors numerous rare plant and animal species and contains the most diverse fishery in southern Wisconsin. Sugar River Wetlands is owned by the DNR and was designated a State Natural Area in 1996.

b. Land use surrounding project area:

The land uses surrounding the project area are similar to that of the immediate area and include agriculture, residential, commercial and recreational land uses. Residential uses include homes as well as widely dispersed farmsteads. Commercial/industrial land uses are mostly located in and near incorporated communities.

The SWGSCA discussed above includes two State Natural Areas: the Barneveld Prairie located in the Town of Brigham, Iowa County, and the Thomson Memorial Prairie located in the Town of Blue Mounds, Dane County. Agricultural and conservation easements have been applied to some parcels in the vicinity to ensure that the lands remain undeveloped.

Two large state parks, Blue Mounds State Park and Governor Dodge State Park are near US 18/151. Other recreational or cultural resources include Folklore Village, Brigham Park, Little Norway, Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark and private campgrounds.

6. **Briefly identify adopted local or regional plans for the project area and zoning regulations. Discuss whether the proposed action is compatible with the plan or zoning:**

Statewide Plans

WisDOT Connections 2030 Plan

Connections 2030 is WisDOT's long-range transportation plan for the state. The plan includes the Corridors 2030 plan which identifies high priority highway routes in the state. US 18/151 is identified as a Backbone Route in the Corridors 2030 plan. Backbone Routes are those highway systems that connect major economic/population centers and carry long-distance, statewide traffic and are the highest priority routes for investment because of their importance in the overall highway network. The Proposed Action supports the goals of this statewide plan.

The Proposed Action is consistent with various local and regional plans in Dane and Iowa counties as a transportation improvement necessary to maintain a safe and efficient transportation facility. These plans are briefly described below.

Iowa County Plans

Iowa County Comprehensive Plan (2005)

The Proposed Action is consistent with the Iowa County Comprehensive Plan which calls for improving the safety of US 18/151. It also calls for intersection improvements along US 18/151, including upgrading intersections to interchanges.

Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2009-2014 (Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 2009): This plan is intended to promote economic development within southwestern Wisconsin, which includes Iowa County. The Proposed Action is consistent with the plan's transportation goals of upgrading the area's transportation system.

Iowa County Municipal Comprehensive Plans

Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission produced a number of Comprehensive Plans for communities in Iowa County located along the project corridor. The transportation sections of these plans are all similar and describe the need to improve the safety of US 18/151 by making improvements to at-grade intersections throughout the corridor. Specific land use elements of these are described below.

City of Dodgeville Comprehensive Plan (2005): Future land use plans call for commercial/retail developments along the US 18 corridor and future residential development along US 151, west of the US 18/151 interchange on the east side of Dodgeville.

Town of Dodgeville Comprehensive Plan (2005): Lands around the County Y/YZ intersection are designated for general "rural" development which could include residential and/or commercial developments.

Town of Ridgeway Comprehensive Plan (2005): The town's land use plans call for moderate development that is compatible with the current character of the town.

Village of Barneveld Comprehensive Plan (2003): The village anticipates more development at the existing County ID interchange. This development would likely be consistent with the Proposed Action to reroute County K northwesterly to directly connect with a new local road south of the village that connects with the existing County ID interchange.

Village of Ridgeway Comprehensive Plan (2005): The Proposed Action is consistent with the village's land use plans, which call for moderate development that is compatible to the existing character of the village and would be efficiently served by the Preferred Alternative.

Town of Brigham Comprehensive Plan (2008): Town of Brigham future land use plan calls for commercial development to be concentrated at access points on US 18/151. After the freeway conversion is complete, there would be no points of direct access to US 18/151 in the Town of Brigham. The Town of Brigham did not express any concerns regarding this loss of access.

Dane County Plans

Dane County Comprehensive Plan (Adopted in 2007)

The Proposed Action is consistent with this Comprehensive Plan which identifies US 18/151 as an important highway transportation system within Dane County and notes current planning to eliminate at-grade crossings along the highway.

Transportation Improvement Program for Madison Metropolitan Area and Dane County 2011-2015

The Proposed Action is consistent with the TIP, which, among many other plans and projects, describes ongoing planning efforts to improve access and safety along US 18/151 in Dane County.

Town of Blue Mounds Comprehensive Plan (2010): The Proposed Action is consistent with this plan which calls for supporting safe and efficient transportation systems throughout the town. The Proposed Action is also consistent with land use plans, which call for developed uses near the County F/US 18/151 intersection. One of the goals of the plan is to concentrate industrial/commercial development into a business/industrial park, similar to the one in the Village of Blue Mounds located in the southwest quadrant of the County F/US 18/151 intersection.

Town of Springdale Land Use Plan (Update 2009): The Proposed Action would not construct any interchanges in the town but would close at-grade access to the US 18/151. Proposed driveway and access closures, including Spring Rose Road would limit some highway dependent developments at that intersection. Such development is not specifically planned for and thus the Proposed Action is consistent with the plan. In general, the plan calls for limited, controlled development of commercial and residential developments.

Town of Verona Comprehensive Plan (2006): The Proposed Action is consistent with this plan which calls for creating a safe and efficient transportation system. The plan calls for working with the City of Verona to review development that may occur in the eastern portion of the town near existing interchanges.

Village of Mount Horeb Comprehensive Plan (2005): The Proposed Action does not recommend any new interchanges in the Village of Mount Horeb, which is consistent with the Plan. The Plan does recognize that highway-dependent development may continue to occur at the US 18/151 interchange west of the Village. In this area, the Plan calls for office and businesses uses.

Village of Blue Mounds Comprehensive Plan (2008): The Proposed Action would include the construction of an interchange at County F in the southern portion of the Village of Blue Mounds. The Proposed Action is consistent with local plans. The area is designated for highway business use, which could include hotels/motels, restaurants and drive-in establishments, gas stations, and other high-intensity uses. Furthermore, the Village indicates that areas to the north of US/151 would be serviced by municipal sanitary sewer and water systems.

7. Describe how the project development process complied with Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice. If populations of any group covered by EO 12898 are present in the project area, complete Factor Sheet B-4, Environmental Justice:

How was information obtained about the presence of populations covered by EO 12898?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Windshield Survey	<input type="checkbox"/> Official Plan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US Census Data (2010)	<input type="checkbox"/> Survey Questionnaire
<input type="checkbox"/> Real Estate Company	<input type="checkbox"/> WisDOT Real Estate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Information Meeting	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Government
<input type="checkbox"/> Human Resources Agency Identify agency Identify plan, approval authority and date of approval	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Identify)	

- a. No - Populations covered by EO 12898 are not present in project area.
- b. Yes - Populations covered by EO 12898 are present. Factor Sheet B-4 must be completed.

8. Indicate whether individuals covered by Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Age Discrimination Act were identified: Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or

country of origin.

- a. No - Individuals covered by the above laws were not identified.
- b. Yes - Individuals covered by the above laws were identified.
 - Civil Rights issues were not identified.
 - Civil Rights issues were identified. Explain:

9. Briefly summarize public involvement methods:

a. Meetings.

The public involvement effort included public information meetings and local official meetings. In addition to meeting notifications mailed to property owners along the corridor, information pertaining to meetings was also released to area newspapers. A total of seven public information meetings were held for the project. The first meeting was with residents from the Town and Village of Ridgeway to discuss proposals that would most directly affect these municipalities. This was followed by two public information meetings (one in Dane County and one in Iowa County) to gather public input on the range of alternatives developed for the whole corridor. There was another round of two public meetings to gather public input on the alternatives that WisDOT was recommending. The third round of two public meetings was to present the Preferred Alternatives.

Meetings with local officials and agencies were held prior to the first and third rounds of the public meetings. The proposed changes were also discussed at local town and village board meetings. A list of all meetings sponsored by WisDOT, or at which a WisDOT representative was present is provided below:

Date	Meeting Sponsor (WisDOT, RPC, MPO, etc.)	Type of Meeting (PIM, Public Hearings, etc.)	Location	Approx. # Attendees
8/16/07	WisDOT	Local Official Meeting	Ridgeway Elementary School	15
8/23/07	WisDOT	Local Official Meeting	Town of Springdale – Town Hall	17
10/9/07	WisDOT	Iowa County Coordination Meeting	Iowa County Highway Dept.	9
10/17/07	WisDOT	Ridgeway Local Official Workshop	Ridgeway Town Hall	15
11/1/07	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Ridgeway Town Hall	15
11/28/07	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Ridgeway Elementary School	32
11/29/07	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Town of Springdale – Town Hall	27
12/3/07	WisDOT	Agency Coordination Meeting	WisDOT – Southwest Region	12
2/28/08	Village of Blue Mounds	Village Board Meeting	Blue Mounds Village Hall	16
4/4/08	WisDOT	Coordination/Dane County Highways	2302 Fish Hatchery Road, Madison WI	5
12/22/08	WisDOT	Towns of Springdale and Verona Coordination Meetings	WisDOT-Southwest Region	6
1/21/09	WisDOT	Town and Village of Ridgeway Coordination Meeting	Village of Ridgeway	35
Date	Meeting Sponsor (WisDOT, RPC, MPO, etc.)	Type of Meeting (PIM, Public Hearings, etc.)	Location	Approx. # Attendees
2/3/09	Town of Dodgeville	Town of Dodgeville Board Meeting	Town of Dodgeville	20
3/19/09	WisDOT	Dodgeville/Ridgeway Coordination Meeting	WisDOT-Southwest Region	20
6/23/09	WisDOT	Iowa County Coordination Meeting	WisDOT-Southwest Region	6
11/10/09	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Ridgeway Elementary School	50
11/12/09	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Springdale Town Hall	43
9/17/09	WisDOT	Agency Coordination Meeting	WisDOT – Southwest Region	14
2/4/10	WisDOT	Town of Brigham Coordination Meeting	WisDOT – Southwest Region	6
10/18/10	Town of Springdale	Town of Springdale Board Meeting	Town of Springdale	12
11/30/10	Iowa County	Iowa County Transportation Committee	Iowa County Highway Dept.	20
	Dane County	Dane County Highway Meeting		
1/4/12	Town of Ridgeway	Town Board	Town Hall	10
1/9/12	Town of Springdale	Town Board	Town Hall	10
7/17/12	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Mount Horeb Community Center	5
7/17/12	WisDOT	Local Officials Meeting	Mount Horeb Community Center	23
7/26/12	WisDOT	Public Information Meeting	Dodgeville Middle School	35
7/26/12	WisDOT	Local Officials Meeting	Dodgeville Middle School	9

b. Other methods, describe:

Three meetings were held on site with private property owners to discuss specific issues related to their properties.

Several mailings were sent to small groups of property owners that would be affected by proposed localized changes to give those property owners the opportunity to give input.

WisDOT also provided large maps of proposed changes to local municipal boards upon their request to aid board discussion of particular issues.

c. Identify groups that participated in the public involvement process. Include any organizations and special interest groups:

Public involvement, local official, and coordination meetings included a wide range of representatives from the affected communities, as mentioned above in 9(a).

Participation from special interest groups during the public involvement process included members from utility companies with resources located in the project area. In some cases, these companies provided written feedback regarding the Proposed Action. See Appendix C1 for a copy of letters from utility providers.

Several representatives from snowmobile clubs participated in the public involvement process as there are groomed trails in the project area that currently cross US 18/151.

The Driftless Area Land Conservancy (DALC) participated in discussions regarding possible effects on lands which are protected from development by agricultural easements. See Appendix C-2 for correspondence the DALC.

d. Indicate plans for additional public involvement, if applicable:

Additional public involvement meetings would occur prior to the final design/construction of each section.

10. Briefly summarize the results of public involvement:

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

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

Residents from the affected communities offered a variety of feedback related to the Proposed Action, described below by county with the issue resolution. WisDOT had hundreds of contacts with property owners in the course of this study. Below are brief summaries of the concerns and how they were addressed.

Iowa County

Several residents suggested that WIS 191 be relocated onto County Y to remove highway traffic from the in-town WIS 191 route.

Resolution: WisDOT is willing to consider this option when Section 1 is funded for design and construction following completion of the freeway conversion study.

Local road connections in the vicinity of interchanges are proposed to be ¼ miles from interchange ramps, per WisDOT Facilities Design Manual (FDM) desirable standards. Local officials and residents expressed concern about the amount of land acquisition that achieving these standards requires.

Resolution: WisDOT explained to local officials and property owners that the current design standards are intended to prevent safety and operational problems that arise when lands surrounding interchanges develop and local road intersections are too close to the interchange ramps.

Community members in Dodgeville and Ridgeway had strong concerns about safety issues related to school busses crossing US 18/151 at existing at-grade intersections, particularly in foggy weather. There was support for an interchange west of the Village of Ridgeway. Public comments indicated an interchange in this area would improve safety on the highway.

Resolution: WisDOT has selected the alternative for Ridgeway that was preferred by most residents and the Town of Ridgeway and secured funding to advance construction of the interchange to 2017.

A large farm operator affected by the proposed interchanges at County BB and at High Point Road/ County HHH was concerned with initial plans to use Rock Road as a connection to County HHH/Hi-Point Road interchange, and the configuration of the local road connections to the County BB interchange.

Resolution: The local road connections at High Point Road/ County HHH were revised so as to not impact the farm operations in the vicinity of Rock Road. WisDOT worked closely with this individual and with the Iowa County Highway Department on the County BB interchange placement so as to minimize negative effects.

Local snowmobile clubs had concerns about the removal of their existing trail crossings of US 18/151 at the Ridgevue Road and County BB intersections.

Resolution: Representatives of the snowmobile club have reviewed the plans and are satisfied that there would be adequate grade-separated crossings in this area.

The Driftless Area Land Conservancy, one partner in the conservancy group with an interest in property adjacent to US 18/151 and County T on the south side of the highway and another parcel under the same ownership on the north side of the highway, expressed concern about potential impacts on the properties and the impact that the driveway removal could have on the agricultural operations of the farm.

Resolution: The final plan for the property is to remove the existing driveway onto US 18/151 and to upgrade an old driveway off County T (or construct a new driveway at another location preferred by the property owner). An overpass would be constructed at County T to connect the area to Barneveld via a new east-west county road on the north side of US 18/151. This frontage road would also provide access to the property on the north side of US 18/151.

Residents on Venden Road expressed concern about the need to acquire a residence and outbuildings and the need to move Venden Road and the MRST closer to a home on the north side of Venden Road in order to accommodate the interchange at County Y.

Resolution: Due to the limited amount of space between US 18/151 and Venden Road, it is not possible to avoid impacts to buildings and the need to shift Venden Road and the MRST. A vegetative barrier would be considered between the residences and the trail at locations where the trail is moved closer.

The property owner of lands on the west side of Thompson Road adjacent to US 18/151 was concerned about the proposal to acquire the residence and barn located on his property.

Resolution: WisDOT was willing to consider a road location that would avoid the house and barn. Because this new location would take farmland, the property owner did not request this change but did request that at the time of final design the placement of the frontage road be reviewed. Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment to review the placement of the frontage road at the time of final design and consult with the property owner at that time.

Dane County

Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark currently directs visitors to use Cave of the Mounds Road to access the site. The owners believe it would be very important to have the site's sign moved to direct visitors to the County F interchange when Cave of the Mounds Road access is removed.

Resolution: Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment that WisDOT would place a sign near the County F interchange to direct visitors to use that roadway for access to the Natural Landmark. Cave of the Mounds representatives indicated that even though the access would be less direct, it would be safer for visitors and employees who access the Natural Landmark. The owners were also provided contact information for Dane County to ask about adding a directional sign at the County F/County ID intersection.

Operator of Kelly Quarry adjacent to County J and US 18/151 expressed concern about loss of access at the County J jug-handle connection to US 18/151.

Resolution: WisDOT did extensive analysis of the interchange option (Alternative 6A) and determined that the cost of constructing an interchange cannot be justified to accommodate the quarry operator's preference for direct access onto US 18/151. This is particularly true in light of the fact that it is not known how many years of quarry operation will remain after the direct access to County J is closed. WisDOT committed to a review of the area and quarry conditions when Section 6 is funded, in case changes have occurred that would significantly increase the need for an interchange at County J.

Owner of the quarry in the vicinity of Ringgenberg Road preferred that the frontage road go on the north side of the quarry instead of on the south side.

Resolution: WisDOT determined that there is not sufficient right of way between the quarry edge and US 18/151 to

place the frontage road on the north side.

There were concerns from residents about traffic, including truck traffic, on Dairy Ridge Road after the County J jug-handle access to US 18/151 is closed.

Resolution: The Towns of Springdale and Verona have the option of posting Dairy Ridge Road so that heavy trucks do not use it. The frontage road on the south side of US 18/151 would provide good east-west access and is an alternative to Dairy Ridge Road.

Residents on Spring Rose Road expressed concerns about traffic from landscape business that would travel on Spring Rose Road to get to the frontage road proposed south of US 18/151. They are also concerned about the glare from headlights making the turn onto Spring Rose Road from the frontage road.

Resolution: The landscape business in question would have direct access to the frontage road from its parking lot. WisDOT conducted a headlight glare analysis and determined that the problem of headlights glare shining into homes would be minimal due to elevation differences between the homes in question and the roadway. Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment to re-visit this issue at the time of final design.

A property owner located on Spring Rose Circle adjacent to US 18/151 expressed concern about the proximity of the frontage road to his home.

Resolution: WisDOT shifted the road 35 feet closer to US 18/151 to provide greater distance between the home and the frontage road.

A property owner located on the east end of the south frontage road in the Town of Verona was concerned about the road location, which would split his parcel farm field such that one or both remnants would be economically unavailable for cropping.

Resolution: WisDOT agreed to shift the road slightly to locate the portion of the road in question on the property owner's south property line.

The Natural Path Sanctuary located on Spring Rose Road notified WisDOT that the property is used as a cemetery and should be avoided.

Resolution: WisDOT's archeological consultant incorporated information into their project report and prepared an archaeological (burial) site record for the cemetery and submitted it to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to ensure that the site is avoided.

A property owner affected by the Prairie Ridge Road extension was concerned about the amount of right of way needed from his property.

Resolution: Amount of right of way was adjusted slightly to decrease amount of land needed.

A property owner affected by the local road connection on the north side of the County BB interchange was concerned about headlight glare into his residence.

Resolution: Local road design was revised to ensure that headlight glare would not be an issue.

11. Local/regional government coordination:

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

Unit of Government	Coordination Attached Y/N	Coordination Initiation Date	Coordination Completion Date	Comments
MPO, RPC, City, County, Village, Town, etc.	Correspondence Attached Y/N			
Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC)	N	October 10, 2007	On going	SWWRPC participated in the US 18/151 Corridor Study completed in 2006, providing assistance in coordinating participation by local governments in the corridor. SWWRPC was invited to all the Local Officials meetings and the Agency Coordination meeting held December 3, 2007. SWWRPC was extended the opportunity to provide comments and attend all meetings throughout all phases of the project. See Appendix A2 Scoping Letter.
Iowa County Highway Department, Planning Department, UW Extension, Sheriff, Airport	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	The Iowa County agencies were invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. WisDOT coordinated closely with the Iowa County Highway Department throughout the planning process. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.
Dane County Executive, Emergency Management, Transportation, UW Extension, Planning Department, Sheriff, Historical Society,	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	The Dane County agencies were invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. WisDOT coordinated closely with the Dane County Transportation Department. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter
City of Dodgeville Public Works	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	The City of Dodgeville Public Works was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.
City of Verona	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	The City of Verona was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.
Village of Ridgeway	Y	October 10, 2007	v	The Village of Ridgeway was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C3 for correspondence from the Village of Ridgeway.
Village of Barneveld	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	The Village of Barneveld was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.

Village of Blue Mounds	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Village of Blue Mounds was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C4 for correspondence from the Village of Blue Mounds.</p>
Village of Mount Horeb	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Town of Dodgeville was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.</p>
Town of Dodgeville	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Town of Dodgeville was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C3 for correspondence from the Town of Dodgeville.</p>
Town of Ridgway	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Town of Ridgway was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C3 for correspondence from the Town of Ridgway.</p>
Town of Brigham	N	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Town of Brigham was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C3 for correspondence from the Town of Brigham.</p>
Town of Blue Mounds	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Town of Blue Mounds was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C4 for correspondence from the Town of Blue Mounds.</p>
Town of Springdale	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	<p>The Town of Springdale was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings.</p> <p>See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C4 for correspondence from the Town of Springdale.</p>

Town of Verona	Y	October 10, 2007	On going	The Town of Verona was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C4 for correspondence from the Town of Verona.
----------------	---	------------------	----------	---

b. Describe the issues, if any, identified by units of government during the public involvement process and c. Briefly describe how the issues identified above were addressed:

Comments and concerns from units of government and their resolution are described below by county.

Iowa County

The Iowa County Transportation Committee requested that the plan include a continuous county road between the Villages of Ridgeway and Barneveld, as there are few continuous roads in Iowa County at this time. Due to the rolling topography of the area, there are many shorter routes and the county lacks a well-connected network of roads. The committee also commented on interchange locations and designs.

Resolution: WisDOT determined that construction of a continuous route would provide an effective means for the removal of access points currently on US 18/151. This is referred to herein as the County ID extension from between Ridgeway and Barneveld.

Town of Dodgeville – Would like WIS 191 to be jurisdictionally transferred onto County Y and vice-versa.

Resolution: WisDOT is willing to consider this option at a future date after completion of the freeway conversion study.

The WDNR would likely object to a continuous north side frontage road between County Y and Ridgeway that would go through WDNR-owned property. This was not proposed by WisDOT but there was of some interest by the general public.

Resolution: WisDOT determined that it is possible to remove access points onto US 18/151 without constructing a frontage road through the WDNR-owned property.

Town of and Village of Ridgeway expressed a preference that the west interchange at County BB be constructed as soon as possible due to the absence of a highway interchange in the area.

Resolution: WisDOT agrees that construction of this interchange is a high priority due to safety issues and has obtained funding to advance construction.

The Dodgeville School District expressed strong concerns about safety issues related to school busses accessing US 18/151 and lack of grade-separated route into Ridgeway from US 18/151. Currently, Dodgeville School District does not permit school busses to cross US 18/151 for safety reasons so school busses are re-routed around the village. The District would like to see an interchange built at the west end of Ridgeway as soon as possible to address the safety issues.

Resolution: WisDOT agrees that construction of this interchange is a high priority due to safety issues and has obtained funding to construct the County BB interchange and all other Section 2 improvements in 2017.

Iowa County Highway Department requested exploring the possibility of adding Park and Ride facilities near the proposed County BB interchange and County ID interchange in Barneveld.

Resolution: WisDOT SW Region will be conducting a Park and Ride Study for the entire Region, which includes Iowa County. The study will identify potential Park and Ride facility locations based on need and feasibility. If a site in Iowa County is identified, WisDOT would contribute funding to the construction of Park and Ride facility if there is a maintenance agreement with local communities that would be responsible for mowing, plowing, trash pick-up, etc.

WDNR has expressed interest and concerns regarding the impact of the proposed driveway removal and access changes at County T on the Thomas property, site of a stone barn listed on the National Register of Historic Places and possible need to acquire small amounts of agricultural conservation land from the Thomas property.

Resolution: Land would not be acquired from the Thomas farm. The driveway that accesses US 18/151 would be closed and a new driveway off of County T would be constructed at a location that is acceptable to the property owner. SHPO would also be consulted closer to the time of final design/construction if the proposed driveway

alignment would be altered in any way to determine if a new alignment would have effects on the barn.

WDNR expressed a concern about impacts to the MRST for alternatives that would require relocation of portions of the trail or add at-grade crossing locations or increase crossing volumes.

Resolution: WisDOT coordinated extensively with WDNR on proposed trail relocations. WDNR preferences were followed in the design choices made and proposed designs were reviewed and approved by WDNR prior to finalization. Overall, there would be a net decrease of one at-grade trail crossing. In addition, the overall traffic volumes at crossing would decrease.

WDNR noted that all alternatives for an interchange at County Y/YZ would impact *Gentiana Alba* (yellow gentian) and has requested that WisDOT coordinate closer to the time of construction for relocation of plants to be affected.

Resolution: Basic Sheet 8 includes a Commitment to coordinate with WDNR on the relocation of the yellow gentian plants prior to the start of construction.

WDNR expressed concern regarding crossings of two cold water streams in the vicinity of County Z in Iowa County that were proposed at one point in the planning process.

Resolution: These crossings were eliminated during in the planning process.

WDNR expressed concern about an early version of Alternative 2A (this area now incorporated into Map 3) that would have flattened the 90 degree turn on West Brigham Road in Section 19 of the Town of Brigham to make a gentle curve. This proposal would have impacted property with some high quality prairie in the northwest quarter of Section 19.

Resolution: This proposal was dropped early in the planning process.

WDNR expressed concern for possible frontage road designs, with and without a grade-separated crossing at Pikes Peak/West Brigham Road. WDNR supported the grade-separation option to minimize the amount of frontage road that would be needed on the north side, where prairie plantings are located.

Resolution: WisDOT selected an underpass at this location, which would avoid the need for a full frontage road on the north side of US 18/151.

WDNR expressed concern about the options being considered for County K near Barneveld which could impact the East Branch of the Pecatonica River and the possible impact of the rerouting of County K onto new alignment which could potentially affect some rare plant species.

Resolution: The rerouting of County K would require the reconstruction of two existing crossings of the East Branch of the Pecatonica River. It would also result in less traffic on the section of County K that now connects to US 18/151 and would become a cul de sac under the Preferred Alternative. The reduction of traffic on County K may have beneficial impacts on the river which runs adjacent to the existing alignment. WisDOT has determined that the proposed relocation of County K would avoid identified rare plant species.

WDNR expressed concern about the infestation of crown vetch and wild parsnip throughout the corridor and the potential for construction activities to exacerbate the problem. The development of an Invasive Species Control Plan is requested.

Resolution: Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment for WisDOT to coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of controlling invasive crown vetch and wild parsnip to prevent further spread of these species during construction and to plan for long-term control of these species.

WDNR noted that the Preferred Alternative is located in a habitat conservation area known as the "Southwest Wisconsin Grassland and Stream Conservation area. WDNR wishes to partner with WisDOT to avoid negative impacts to the grasslands through the use of native seeding, especially in prairie restoration areas.

Resolution: Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment for WisDOT to coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of using native seeding in areas of construction where prairie restoration efforts have occurred or are underway.

Dane County

Dane County Highway Department raised the issue of whether a complete frontage road system is needed on the south side of US 18/151 between County G and Count P/PD.

Resolution: WisDOT has determined that significant portions of frontage road are needed in order to provide access to all properties. Dane County agreed that the additional sections needed to provide a continuous route are justified

by the need to provide a suitable level of emergency services.

The Town of Springdale objects to the proposed local road connection from Dairy Ridge Road to two properties which currently have access onto US 18/151 that would be removed, and to the proposed connection from County J to the property west of County J. Town standards require that a minimum of three properties be served by any new town road.

Resolution: WisDOT cannot force property owners to accept joint ownership of a private access road serving more than one property. At the time of final design, WisDOT will further discuss with the two affected property owners the options of either a town road or a private shared driveway to connect to Dairy Ridge Road. WisDOT believes that a town road is justified to connect the property to County J in order to ensure that there is an open connection in the winter to keep access for emergency services to the property, but will review conditions when Section 6 is funded to explore changing this access to a private drive or extending it westerly to the Prairie Ridge Road dead-end, creating a continuous frontage road.

The Town of Springdale was concerned about the amount of land needed to connect Springdale Center Road to the interchange at County PD.

Resolution: The proposed design reduces impacts to the extent possible while still meeting WisDOT design standards.

At the end of the planning process, the Town of Verona questioned the need for the frontage road proposed to run between Spring Rose Road and County G.

Resolution: WisDOT determined that most portions of frontage road are needed in order to provide access to all properties. The additional sections needed to provide a continuous route are justified by the need to provide a suitable level of emergency services. WisDOT commits to reviewing this decision at the time of final design and if significant changes to land use have occurred, determine if another option would better meet the needs for access.

WDNR expressed concern about a possible frontage road that would run between East Brigham Road and County F, south of US 18/151, and connect Blackhawk Drive in the Village of Blue Mounds. A road in this location would impact known prairie remnants, thus WDNR preferred an overpass at East Brigham Road.

Resolution: An overpass has been selected for East Brigham Road, based on cost and impact comparisons and input from local residents and the town board.

WDNR expressed concern about a possible frontage road that would run between County F and Cave of the Mounds Road that would impact known prairie plantings on property adjacent to US 18/151 and Cave of the Mounds Road. WDNR preferred an overpass at Cave of the Mounds Road.

Resolution: An overpass has been selected for Cave of the Mounds Road, based on cost and impact comparisons and input from local residents and the town board.

WDNR expressed concern about a possible interchange at County J that could promote growth in the sensitive Upper Sugar River Watershed.

Resolution: No interchange is proposed at County J.

WDNR expressed concern about the proposed auxiliary lanes between County G and the West Verona Road Avenue interchange and their possible impact on the Sugar River Wetland Natural Area which is adjacent to US 18/151 in this area. WDNR requested wetland delineation.

Resolution: The proposed auxiliary lanes would not require additional lands outside of the existing WisDOT right of way. WisDOT would carry out delineation closer to the time of construction and would minimize wetland takings by maximizing the steepness of the road embankment.

WDNR expressed concern about the infestation of crown vetch and wild parsnip throughout the corridor and the potential for construction activities to exacerbate the problem. The development of an Invasive Species Control Plan is requested.

Resolution: Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment for WisDOT to coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of controlling invasive crown vetch and wild parsnip to prevent further spread of these species during construction and to plan for long-term control of these species.

WDNR noted that the Preferred Alternative is located in a habitat conservation area known as the "Southwest Wisconsin Grassland and Stream Conservation area. WDNR wishes to partner with WisDOT to avoid negative impacts to the grasslands through the use of native seeding, especially in prairie restoration areas.

Resolution: Basic Sheet 8 includes a commitment for WisDOT to coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of using native seeding in areas of construction where prairie restoration efforts have occurred or are underway.

d. Indicate any unresolved issues or ongoing discussion:

- WisDOT, Iowa County and Town of Dodgeville are delaying discussion regarding the jurisdictional transfer of WIS 191 onto County Y until Section 1 is funded for design and construction.
- At the time of final design, WisDOT would review the need for a continuous frontage road on the south side of US 18/151 between Spring Rose Road and County G, and consult with the Town of Verona on this issue.
- At the time of final design, WisDOT would consult with the Town of Springdale regarding the need for new town roads that serve fewer than three landowners to determine if there are any options to the new connections proposed in this plan, such as construction of share private driveways.
- At the time of final design, further discussion would occur with affected property owners if WisDOT would purchase access for the parcel that is proposed to be served by a new road off Section Line Road instead of building this new road.

**Basic Sheet 3
Coordination**

INTERNAL WisDOT	Coordination Required?	Correspondence Attached? Y = Yes N = No	Comments Explain or give results. If no correspondence is attached to this document, indicate when coordination with the agency was initiated and, if available, when coordination was completed. If coordination is not required, state why.
Bureau of Aeronautics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	N	Coordination is not required. Project is not located within 2 miles (3.22 km) of a public or military use airport nor would the project change the horizontal or vertical alignment of a transportation facility located within 4 miles (6.44 km) of a public use or military airport.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		Coordination has been completed and project effects have been addressed. Explain:
Bureau of Rails & Harbors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	N	Coordination is not required because no railways or harbors are in or planned in the project area.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		Coordination has been completed and project effects have been addressed. Explain:
Regional Real Estate Section	<input type="checkbox"/> No		Coordination is not required because no inhabited houses or active businesses will be acquired.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	N	Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan attached as Appendix G.
STATE AGENCY	Coordination Required? Y = Yes N = No	Correspondence Attached? Y = Yes N = No	
Agriculture (DATCP)	Y	Y	Opportunity for review and comment was extended to DATCP as part of the formal scoping process. DATCP completed an Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS). The AIS covers impacts for Section 2, the first section scheduled for construction. An amended AIS would be completed for the remaining sections prior to final design/construction. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C5 for DATCP Correspondence. See Appendix D Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS).
Natural Resources (WDNR)	Y	Y	WDNR was consulted throughout the project planning stage. Coordination with WDNR included issues of the Military Ridge State Trail, Threatened and Endangered Species, and prairie conservation areas. See also question 11 on Basic Sheet 2 for full description of WDNR's issues and their resolution. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix C5 for WDNR Correspondence.
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	Y	Y	SHPO has been coordinated with as part of the project Section 106 process. The Section 106 document has been submitted. The final Section 106 will be included in the FONSI. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix E, Section 106 Form
Others:	Y	N	The Wisconsin State Patrol was invited to provide initial comments as well as attend all local official and public meetings. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.

FEDERAL AGENCY	Coordination Required? Y = Yes N = No	Correspondence Attached? Y = Yes N = No	
Advisory Council on Hist.Pres. (ACHP)	N	N	Coordination is not required. The effects of the project are predominantly the acquisition of agricultural/undeveloped lands for interchanges and local road connections. Impacts on other resources are relatively minor.
Corps of Engineers (COE)	Y	Y	The USACOE has been given the opportunity to comment throughout all phases of the project. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter and C6 for a letter from USACE.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	N	N	Coordination is not required.
National Park Service (NPS)	Y	N	Coordination with the NPS regarding the MRST occurred through WDNR.
Nat. Resource Cons. Service (NRCS)	Y	Y	The NRCS was invited to the agency scoping meeting. Agency officials were invited to provide comments throughout all phases of the project. See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter. See Appendix F, NRCS Form AD-1006 and Appendix C6 for the response.
US Coast Guard (USCG)	N	N	Coordination is not required.
Fish & Wildlife Serv. (FWS)	Y	N	See Appendix A2, Scoping Letter.
Other(Identify)	N	N	N/A
AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBES	Y	Y	Tribes and the GLITC were notified, and requested further coordination in the event that discoveries are made prior to, and during construction. See Appendix C7, Tribal Correspondence.

**Basic Sheet 4
Environmental Factors Matrix**

FACTORS	EFFECTS				Comments
	Adverse	Benefit	None Identified	Factor Sheet Attached	
<p>Note: Comments should be of a summary nature and should not extensively duplicate information contained in an attached factor sheet. If an "adverse" effect is permanent, a factor sheet must be attached. If an "adverse" effect is temporary, it must be explained on this sheet under "comments". If "None Identified" is indicated, explain why.</p>					
A. ECONOMIC FACTORS					
A-1 General Economics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Proposed Action would:</p> <p>Support the economic viability of the region by promoting safe and efficient travel on the US highway system.</p> <p>Promote the efficient movement of raw materials, goods, and services between markets.</p> <p>Provide safe and efficient access to the communities along the corridor.</p> <p>Accommodate the current and planned economic growth/development for the area.</p> <p>Assist in ensuring safe and efficient access of police, fire, and emergency services to the area.</p> <p>Provide safer access to and across US 18/151 for agricultural equipment and other slow moving vehicles.</p> <p>Provide safer access to businesses and commercial operations along US 18/151</p> <p>Require relocation of some current private and agricultural access to US 18/151 resulting in the potential for slight redirection for vehicles access some properties along the corridor.</p> <p>Increased travel time to/from some locations along the US 18/151 corridor.</p> <p>Require a major capital investment by WisDOT that could not be expended elsewhere.</p> <p>Reduce useable agricultural land by 437.1 acres.</p> <p>Cause temporary disruptions during construction.</p> <p>See General Economics Factor Sheet A-1.</p>
A-2 Business	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Proposed Action would:</p> <p>Support the economic viability of the region by promoting safe and efficient travel on the US highway system.</p> <p>Promote the efficient movement of raw materials, goods, and services between markets.</p> <p>Provide safe and efficient access to the communities along the corridor.</p> <p>Better accommodate the current and planned economic growth/development for the area.</p> <p>Provide safer access to businesses and commercial operations</p>

					<p>along US 18/151</p> <p>Require relocation of one business and a nonprofit service club.</p> <p>Cause slight indirection for vehicle access to businesses along the corridor.</p> <p>Require acquisitions to accommodate local connections, interchange and grade separation footprints in some locations.</p> <p>Increased travel time to/from some locations along the US 18/151 corridor, including travel time for employees, customers, and deliveries/shipments to businesses.</p> <p>Cause temporary disruptions and access to businesses during construction.</p> <p>See Business Impacts Factor Sheet A-2 and the Conceptual stage Relocation Plan in Appendix G.</p>
A-3 Agriculture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Proposed Action would:</p> <p>Assist in ensuring safer and efficient access to farm operations currently bisected by US 18/151. Access for operations with parcels on both sides of US 18/151 would be via grade-separated crossings rather than the current at-grade crossings.</p> <p>Require acquisition of 437.1 acres of agricultural land from 98 farm operations.</p> <p>Increase travel time to and from fields for approximately four farm operations with land on both sides of US 18/151.</p> <p>DATCP has prepared an Agricultural Impact Statement for Section 2. An updated AIS would be prepared for the remaining sections closer to the time of final design/construction.</p> <p>See Agricultural Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet A-3. See Appendix C5 for DATCP Correspondence.</p>
B. SOCIAL/CULTURAL FACTORS					
B-1 Community or Residential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Proposed Action would:</p> <p>Support local land use plans of communities along US 18/151.</p> <p>Have a minor effect on the character and traffic patterns of some county and local roadways. Some local roads may see increased traffic.</p> <p>Balance indirection from access changes with additional safe crossings of US 18/151 for the provision of emergency response services.</p> <p>Cause minor changes for other transportation modes such as bicycle and snowmobile by eliminating six locations at which US 18/151 or public roads would be crossed by MRST users and creating five new at-grade trail crossings.</p> <p>Require closing of driveways with direct access to US 18/151</p> <p>Require the acquisition of seven residential structures.</p> <p>Require the acquisition and relocation of one community facility (VFW facility).</p> <p>See Community/Residential Factor Sheet B-1. And the Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan in Appendix G.</p>
B-2 Indirect Effects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Proposed Action would not have the likelihood to result in indirect effects. This conclusion was based on the evaluation for 10</p>

					<p>pre-screening factors including: project design concepts and scope; project purpose and need; project type; facility function (current and planned); project location; improved travel times to an area; local land use and planning considerations; population and demographic considerations; rate of urbanization; and public/agency concerns.</p> <p>See Appendix H, Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis</p>
B-3 Cumulative Effects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Proposed Action would have a cumulative effect, when combined with many other factors that are shaping growth patterns in the area. These factors include transportation improvements that have occurred over decades, community development plans, the extension of utilities, and the presence of schools that would attract new residents. These factors could affect the same resources that are potentially affected by the Proposed Action, including uplands, agricultural lands, wetlands, and threatened and endangered species.</p> <p>See Appendix H, Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis.</p>
B-4 Environmental Justice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>This document is in compliance with U.S. DOT and FHWA policies to determine whether a proposed project would have induced socioeconomic impacts or any adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations; and it meets the requirements of Executive Order on Environmental Justice 12898 - "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice on Minority and Low-Income Populations". Neither minority nor low-income populations would receive disproportionately high or adverse impacts as a result of the Proposed Action. The majority of the community and residential population are supportive of the Proposed Action.</p>
B-5 Historic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Research and survey indicated that there are three National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed or eligible properties in the project area. Through the Section 106 process, it was determined that there would be no affect to these properties. Factor sheets were included for these three properties.</p> <p>Determination of Eligibility (DOE) forms were process for three additional properties in the project area. It was determined that these three properties did not meet NRHP criteria/eligibility.</p> <p>SHPO has concurred and signed the Section 106 document .</p> <p>See Appendix E – Section 106</p>
B-6 Archaeological Sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Several sites were identified during the Phase I archaeological review. None of the sites would be affected. However, further consultation with SHPO would be needed at the time of final design/construction to ensure no impacts would occur.</p> <p>See Appendix E – Section 106</p>
B-7 Tribal Issues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Tribal Historic Preservation Officers were notified of the planned improvements to US 18/151. None of the tribes objected or had any concerns regarding the proposed improvements. Additional coordination would occur if any Tribal resources are found during final design or construction.</p>
B-8 Section 4(f) and 6(f) or Other Unique Areas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Several portions of the Military Ridge State Trail (MRST) would be re-located to accommodate the proposed improvements to US 18/151. WDNR concurred with the potential effects to the MRST and planned mitigation efforts. WisDOT will consult with WDNR prior to the final design and construction of sections that would affect the MRST.</p> <p>See Appendix C5 - State Agency Correspondence.</p> <p>See Appendix I - Section 4f) De Minimis Document</p>

B-9 Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Proposed Action would have a minimal effect overall on the existing landscape. Changes to the landscape would be concentrated in the areas where interchanges, overpasses and local road connections would be constructed. The changes are consistent with locations on the corridor where these conditions already exist.
C. NATURAL SYSTEM FACTORS					
C-1 Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>There is one wetland area within the entire project area near Sugar River in the Town of Verona. Auxiliary lanes would be constructed on the north and south side of US 18/151 in this area. Approximately 1.5 acres of wetland could be affected in existing WisDOT right of way.</p> <p>Wetlands will be delineated by WisDOT closer to design/construction to determine the exact amount and location of wetlands impacted by the Proposed Action. Following that determination, a wetland mitigation plan will be developed to document the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimization efforts (steep in-slopes and barrier) • The impacted wetland acreage by wetland type • The plan for on-site restoration and anticipated compensation acreage. • The proposal for debiting the remaining compensation acreage to a WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Bank. <p>See Wetlands Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet C-1.</p>
C-2 Rivers, Streams and Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Two existing crossings of the East Branch of the Pecatonica River near County K with culverts would be reconstructed. The existing steel girder bridge over the Sugar River would be expanded for the proposed auxiliary lanes. The relocation of County K onto new alignment would remove most of the traffic from existing County K, which runs parallel to the Pecatonica River, thereby potentially resulting in a lower level of road contaminants into the stream. See Streams & Floodplains Factor Sheet. C-2.
C-3 Lakes or Other Open Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None identified.
C-4 Groundwater, Wells, and Springs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No monitoring wells were observed during the hazardous materials review performed in the field. An inventory of private wells will be conducted closer to the time of final design to determine if any wells would be affected by the proposed improvements. If private wells are identified on properties that are proposed for acquisition they would be abandoned per State code.
C-5 Upland Wildlife and Habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Wildlife associated with the project corridors land types include a variety of game and non-game species of birds, mammals, fish, reptiles and amphibians that typically live in Iowa and Dane County. The Southwest Wisconsin Grassland and Stream Conservancy Area is located within the project area. Some invasive species are known to exist throughout the project area. WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR during construction to further control of invasive species in the area. The Proposed Action would degrade small areas of habitat throughout the study area. The overall effect of the eventual implementation of the Proposed Action is expected to be minor.</p> <p>See the Upland Wildlife and Habitat Factor Sheet C-5.</p>
C-6 Coastal Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A.
C-7 Threatened and Endangered Species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Threatened and Endangered Species are known to exist in the vicinity of the proposed interchange at County Y. Any species found within grading limits would be relocated prior to construction.</p> <p>See Threatened and Endangered Species Factor Sheet C-7.</p>

D. PHYSICAL FACTORS					
D-1 Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project is exempt from permit requirements under Wisconsin Administrative Code - Chapter NR 411. No substantial impacts to air quality are expected.
D-2 Construction Stage Sound Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	To reduce the potential impact of construction noise, the special provisions for this project would require that motorized equipment shall be operated in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations relating to noise levels. See Construction Stage Sound Factor Sheet D-2.
D-3 Traffic Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A traffic impact analysis was performed per Wisconsin Administrative Code - Chapter TRANS 405. The Traffic Noise Model (TNM) predicted that residential receptors within the project corridor would exceed Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) levels in one location, near the proposed auxiliary lanes in Section 6. See Exhibit 5, Preferred Alternative With Noise Receptors See Traffic Noise Factor Sheet D-3.
D-4 Hazardous Substances or Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No known hazardous material sites were identified on the route.
D-5 Stormwater	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A Stormwater Management Plan will be developed with coordination from WDNR to reduce or minimize runoff effects to surrounding waters of the State from construction of the Proposed Action. Construction site erosion and sediment control would be part of the project's design and construction as set forth in TRANS 401 Wis. Adm. Code and the WisDOT/WDNR Cooperative Agreement. WisDOT will make every effort to design the interchanges so that any runoff from the interchange would be contained within the interchange area through runoff basins and directed ditching. If feasible WisDOT could make design decisions which would allow the interchange to serve as a drainage, retention and filter area for runoff from adjacent agricultural lands and may improve the overall water quality. The final determination of the stormwater measures to be taken would be made during final design and implemented in construction. See Storm Water Management Factor Sheet D-5.
D-6 Erosion Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Standard WisDOT erosion control methods will be used during construction as per WisDOT Standards Specifications for highway and structure construction. Temporary and permanent erosion control methods would include minimizing the amount of land exposed at one time, erosion bales, temporary seeding, silt fencing, erosion mats, rip-rap (side channel and backwater complex), seeding and mulching, temporary sediment traps, dust abatement, and grass-line conveyance (parallel to flow). Additionally, WDNR would be coordinated with in order to ensure adequate vegetative cover is maintained on approach slopes. A Stormwater Management Plan will be developed and incorporated into the project's design to reduce or minimize runoff effects to surrounding waters of the State from construction of the Proposed Action. Construction site erosion and sediment control would be part of the project's design and construction as set forth in TRANS 401 Wis. Adm. Code and the WisDOT/WDNR Cooperative Agreement. An Erosion Control Implementation Plan (ECIP) will be

					<p>prepared by the contractor and approved by WisDOT prior to construction. WDNR will be given an opportunity to review the ECIP and provide comments.</p> <p>See Erosion Control Factor Sheet.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

E. OTHER FACTORS					
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

E-1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
E-2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

**Basic Sheet 5
Alternatives Comparison Matrix**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	UNIT MEASURE	ALTERNATIVES/SECTIONS					
		No Build	Alt 1A	Alt 1B (Preferred)	Alt 1C	Alt 2A	Alt 2B* (Preferred)
Project Length	Miles	28.8					
Preliminary Cost Estimate							
Construction	Million \$	0	15.24	15.25	15.58	42.39	51.55*
Real Estate	Million \$	0	1.34	1.34	1.34	0.98	0.98
Total	Million \$	0	16.58	16.59	16.92	43.37	52.53
Land Conversions							
Wetland Area Converted to ROW	Acres	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upland Habitat Area Converted to ROW	Acres	0	0	0	0	10.8	1.5
Other Area Converted to ROW	Acres	0	0.6	1.7	0.3	0	0
Total Area Converted to ROW	Acres	0	71.7	73.7	75.4	62.8	87.7
Real Estate							
Number of Farms Affected	Number	0	22	22	22	10	10
Total Area Required From Farm Operations	Acres	0	71.1	72	75.1	52	86.2
AIS Required	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Farmland Rating	Score	N/A	126	131	125	131	140
Total Buildings Required	Number	0	1	4	0	1	3
Housing Units Required	Number	0	0	1	0	0	1
Commercial Units Required	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Buildings or Structures Required	Number (Type)	0	1	3	0	0	2
Environmental Issues							
Indirect Effects	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Cumulative Effects	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Environmental Justice Populations	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Historic Properties	Number	0	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected
Archeological Sites	Number	0	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected
106 MOA Required	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
4(f) Evaluation Required	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Flood Plain	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Total Wetlands Filled	Acres	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stream Crossings	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0
Endangered Species	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Air Quality Permit Required	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Design Year Noise Sensitive Receptors							
	No Impact	0	NA	7	NA	NA	8
	Impacted			0			0
Contaminated Sites	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Alt 2B includes costs associated with the construction of the entire County ID extension into the Village of Barneveld, which is anticipated to be constructed as one project.

Basic Sheet 5 (continued)
Alternatives Comparison Matrix

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE	UNIT MEASURE	ALTERNATIVES/SECTIONS					Total Preferred Alternative
		Alt 3A	Alt 3B* (Preferred)	Alt 4A (Preferred)	Alt 6A	Alt 6B (Preferred)	
Project Length	Miles						28.8
Preliminary Cost Estimate							
Construction	Million \$	9.92	10.77	8.68	23.16	15.19	101.44
Real Estate	Million \$	2.47	2.47	1.33	2.04	2.04	8.16
Total	Million \$	12.39	13.24	10.01	25.20	17.23	109.60
Land Conversions							
Wetland Area Converted to ROW	Acres	0	0	0	1.5	1.5	1.5
Upland Habitat Area Converted to ROW	Acres	14.3	24.1	0.5	3.9	6	32.1
Other Area Converted to ROW	Acres	0	1	3	4.4	4.9	10.6
Total Area Converted to ROW	Acres	175.4	183.1	21.6	94	95.5	479.8
Real Estate							
Number of Farms Affected	Number	24	24	21	19	19	96
Total Area Required From Farm Operations	Acres	161.1	158	36.3	85.7	84.6	437.1
AIS Required	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Farmland Rating	Score	125	125	N/A	N/A	N/A	NA
Total Buildings Required	Number	4	4	6	4	5	22
Housing Units Required	Number	2	2	2	1	1	7
Commercial Units Required	Number	0	0	1	1	1	2
Other Buildings or Structures Required	Number (Type)	2	2	3	3	3	13
Environmental Issues							
Indirect Effects	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Cumulative Effects	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Environmental Justice Populations	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Historic Properties	Number	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected
Archeological Sites	Number	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected	None Affected
106 MOA Required	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
4(f) Evaluation Required	Yes/No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Flood Plain	Yes/No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Wetlands Filled	Acres	0	0	0	1.5	1.5	1.5
Stream Crossings	Number	2	2	0	1	1	3
Endangered Species	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Air Quality Permit Required	Yes/No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Design Year Noise Sensitive Receptors							
	No Impact	NA	20	2	3	3	40
	Impacted		0	0	4	4	4
Contaminated Sites	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0

*The costs associated with the County ID extension are included in Alt 2B.

Basic Sheet 6
Traffic Summary Matrix (*see notes below)

	ALTERNATIVES/SECTIONS					
	No Build	Alt. 1 – A, B & C	Alt. 2 – A & B	Alt. 3 – A & B	Alt. 4A	Alt. 6A
TRAFFIC VOLUMES - US 18/151 Mainline. Traffic volumes vary within segments and are shown as ranges.						
Existing ADT Yr. 2009/2010	14,500- 20,400	16,900	14,900- 16,700	16,700- 17,100	14,500- 17,300	18,900- 20,4000
Const. Yr. ADT Yr. 2017	16,100- 23,800	18,900	16,200- 20,700	18,600- 19,100	16,700- 19,800	22,200- 23,900
Const. Plus 10 Yr. ADT Yr. 2027	17,600- 28,700	21,300	17,700- 20,700	20,700- 21,500	18,800- 23,000	26,400- 28,800
Design Yr. ADT Yr. 2037	19,100 33,600	23,700	19,200- 23,100	23,100- 24,000	21,000- 26,200	30,600- 33,700
DHV Yr. 2037	1,890-3,326	2,346	1,900-2,286	2,286-2,376	2,079-2,593	3,029-3,336
TRAFFIC FACTORS						
K [30/100/200] (%)	10.8/9.9/9.5	10.8/9.9/9.5	10.8/9.9/9.5	10.8/9.9/9.5	10.8/9.9/9.5	10.8/9.9/9.5
D (%)	60/40	60/40	60/40	60/40	60/40	60/40
Design Year T (% of ADT)	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %
T (% of DHV)	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %	6.6 %
Level of Service*	A-B	A	A	A	B	B
SPEEDS						
Existing Posted	65	65	65	65	65	65
Future Posted	65	65	65	65	65	65
Design Year Project Design Speed	70	70	70	70	70	70
OTHER (Specify)						
P (% of ADT)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
K (% OF ADT)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ADT = Average Daily Traffic DHV = Design Hourly Volume K [30/100/200] : K₃₀ = Interstate, K₁₀₀ = Rural, K₂₀₀ = Urban,
% = ADT in DHV D = % DHV in predominate direction of travel T = Trucks P = % ADT in peak hour K₈ = % ADT occurring
in the average of the 8 highest consecutive hours of traffic on an average day. (Only required when a carbon monoxide analysis
must be performed per Wisconsin Administrative Code - Chapter NR 411.) * Notes: The LOS of the existing four-lane
US 18/151 was analyzed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Additional
operational/LOS analysis was conducted for several intersections/interchanges that do not meet desired spacing requirements
from ramp termini (see Exhibit 6). Traffic counts/forecasts and design assumptions/standards for the local road system
is in Exhibit 7.

**Basic Sheet 7
EIS Significance Criteria**

When the significance of impact of a transportation project proposal is uncertain, an environmental assessment (ES) is prepared to assist in this determination. If it is found that significant impact(s) would result, the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) should be initiated immediately. Indicate whether the issue listed below is a concern for the proposed action or alternative. If the issue is a concern, explain how it is addressed or where it is addressed in this environmental document.

1) Will the proposed action stimulate substantial indirect environmental effects?

- No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.

2) Will the proposed action contribute to cumulative effects of repeated actions?

- No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.
The Proposed Action is one of many actions and influences that have and will continue to shape the project area. The Proposed Action are not expected to be a significant influence.
See Appendix G for the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis.

3) Will the creation of a new environmental effect result from this proposed action?

- X 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, or national policies, including conflicts potential effects of transportation on land use and land use on transportation demand?

- No
 Yes – Explain or indicate where addressed.

Basic Sheet 8
Environmental Commitments

Identify and describe any commitments made to protect the environment. Indicate when the commitment should be implemented and who in WisDOT would have jurisdiction to assure fulfillment for each commitment. Note if the commitment will be recorded in the plans, "special provisions", "notes to construction" or some other written format. Note if the commitment is mandated by law, and therefore legally binding.

Commitments on Basic Sheet 8 supplement environmental commitments incorporated in WisDOT's Standard Specifications for Highway and Bridge Construction.

ATTACH A COPY OF THIS PAGE TO THE DESIGN STUDY REPORT AND THE PS&E SUBMITTAL PACKAGE

Factors	Commitments
A-1 General Economics	No commitments needed.
A-2 Business	<p>Commitments made: An informational/directional sign for the Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark will be moved to County F, which will become the closest interchange access point. Note that the signage will be subject to the signing rules at the time of final design/construction.</p> <p>Access in Section 6 near the Yahara and Ringenberg quarries will be reevaluated when construction is funded to ensure that if conditions change, access as proposed will be sufficient.</p>
A-3 Agriculture	<p>Commitments made: An AIS was completed for Section 2. DATCP will amend the AIS when construction is imminent for Sections 1, 3, 4, and 6 to include descriptions of impacts on the individual farmland owners affected by these sections.</p> <p>WisDOT will consult with the county conservationist prior to construction to ensure that construction proceeds in a manner that minimizes crop damage, soil compaction, and soil erosion on adjacent farmland.</p>
B-1 Community or Residential	<p>Commitments made: WisDOT will review the headlight glare analysis carried out for the homes near the intersection of Spring Rose Road and the south frontage road at the time of final design to confirm that headlight glare problems will be minimal for residences located across from the intersection of the new frontage road and Spring Rose Road.</p> <p>WisDOT will consider adding one or more new park and ride lot(s) along the corridor, dependent up on recommendations in WisDOT Southwest Region's Park and Ride Plan and local support.</p> <p>WisDOT will propose the joint use, private drive option to current owners of two Town of Springdale rural residential properties whose access is to be relocated to Dairy Ridge Road. If not accepted, WisDOT will also commit to investigating the buyout options, subject to the cost and owner preference issues noted above.</p> <p>If requested by the owner of parcel 008-0269.B, WisDOT will explore the possibility of relocating the building to be acquired on parcel 008-0269.B to the remnant of parcel 008-0271 (both parcels on Venden Road).</p>
B-2 Indirect Effects	No commitments needed.
B-3 Cumulative Effects	No commitments needed.
B-4 Environmental Justice	No commitments needed.
B-5 Historic Resources	<p>Commitments made: If the location of the proposed driveway for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Thomas Barn property is altered during final design/construction, WisDOT will consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to ensure that any deviation from the proposed alignment will not adversely affect the historic property.</p>

<p>B-6 Archaeological Sites</p>	<p>Commitments made: Additional Section 106 obligations and consultation will be required if and when final design for the relocation of County K (Section 3) onto new alignment proceeds and fill will be placed over site 471A0505. (Construction of this part of the project may require some local cost-share funding, which the municipality is not able to guarantee at this time.) WisDOT will compare the final design to the Section 106 completed for this EA and will request survey of outstanding areas at that time.</p> <p>Given the recovery of cultural artifacts from shovel tests and the possibility for sub-surface features associated with mounds, an archeological monitor will be present during construction activities in the vicinity of the Springdale Mound Group (47DA0237/BDA0455).</p>
<p>B-7 Tribal Issues</p>	<p>No commitments needed.</p>
<p>B-8 Section 4(f) and 6(f) or Other Unique Areas</p>	<p>Commitments made: WisDOT will follow the mitigation measures, as agreed upon with WDNR, for impacts to the MRST in Section 2. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The trail will be constructed to meet or exceed the Wisconsin Bicycle Facility Design Manual (FDM). • The newly developed surface materials will be the same as the segment it is replacing. • All trail intersections will be paved with bituminous asphalt 15 feet back from the road surface. This will help avoid erosion from occurring on the trail surface. • All signage will be placed according to FDM and WDNR Snowmobile Signing Handbook. • Berms and native vegetated landscaping as a visual buffer in selected locations will be implemented. These will be especially important in areas where the trail will be adjacent to a new frontage road. <p>The MRST will remain open during construction, using temporary paths as needed to insure connectivity is maintained.</p> <p>WisDOT will consult with WDNR prior to the final design and construction of the remaining sections that will impact the MRST. At that time, specific mitigation measures will be developed for each impacted section of MRST.</p>
<p>B-9 Aesthetics</p>	<p>Commitments made: WisDOT will consider aesthetic treatment to bridges that provides a consistent look, subject to funding policies at time of final design/construction of each section.</p>
<p>C-1 Wetlands</p>	<p>Commitments made: Closer to the time of final design, WisDOT will delineate and mitigate effects on the wetlands located near the proposed auxiliary lanes.</p>
<p>C-2 Rivers, Streams & Floodplains</p>	<p>Commitments made: Closer to the detailed design stage, WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR regarding the two crossings of the East Branch of the Pecatonica River that will be reconstructed as part of the County K realignment and the extension of the Sugar River Bridge. No in-stream work will be done between March 1st and June 15th.</p>
<p>C-3 Lakes or other Open Water</p>	<p>No commitments needed.</p>
<p>C-4 Groundwater, Wells and springs</p>	<p>Commitments made: An inventory of private wells will be conducted during the time of final design to determine if any wells will be affected by the proposed improvements. If private wells are identified on properties that are proposed for acquisition they will be abandoned per State code.</p>
<p>C-5 Upland Wildlife and Habitat</p>	<p>Commitments made: WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of controlling invasive crown vetch and wild parsnip to prevent further spread of these species during construction and to plan for long-term control of these species. WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of using native seeding in areas of construction where prairie restoration efforts have occurred or are underway, or where prairie remnants exist.</p>
<p>C-6 Coastal Zones</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>C-7 Threatened and Endangered Species</p>	<p>Commitments made: During final design for the proposed interchange at County Y, WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR to find a suitable replacement site for <i>Gentiana alba</i> (yellow gentian), a state threatened plant species located in the area affected by the construction.</p>

D-1 Air Quality	No commitments needed.
D-2 Construction Stage Sound Quality	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <p>X (box) WisDOT Standard Specification 107.8(6) and 108.7.1 will apply.</p> <p>_ (box) Special construction stage noise abatement measures will be required.</p> <p>Describe: To reduce the potential impact of Construction Noise, the special provisions for this project will require that motorized equipment shall be operated in compliance with all applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations relating to noise levels permissible within and adjacent to the project construction site. At a minimum, the special provisions will require that motorized construction equipment shall not be operated between 10 PM and 6 AM without prior written approval of the project engineer. All motorized construction equipment will be required to have mufflers constructed in accordance with the equipment manufacturer's specifications or a system of equivalent noise reducing capacity. It will also be required that mufflers and exhaust systems be maintained in good working order, free from leaks or holes. See Construction Stage Sound Quality Factor Sheet.</p>
D-3 Traffic Noise	No commitments needed.
D-4 Hazardous Substances or Contamination	Commitments made: WisDOT will review the WDNR register of contaminated sites during final design for each section.
D-5 Stormwater	No commitments needed.
D-6 Erosion Control	Commitments made: Construction site erosion and sediment control will be part of the project's design and construction as set forth in TRANS 401 Wis. Adm. Code and the WisDOT/WDNR Cooperative Agreement. An Erosion Control Implementation Plan (ECIP) will be prepared by the contractor and approved by WisDOT prior to construction.

E Other

Commitments made:

Due to the long expected time frame for construction of some of the elements of the freeway conversion plan, WisDOT has committed to review the proposed design and revise if appropriate due to changed conditions which exist at the time of final design in the following locations:

Section 1:

Review proposed alignment of frontage road in consultation with property owner at southwest quadrant of County Y/YZ.

Section 3:

Review location for proposed driveway construction off of County T in consultation with property owner for parcel 004-0529.

Review proposed location of County ID extension and resulting acquisition of residence and outbuilding in consultation with property owners for parcels 004-0523 and 004-0501.C (in the vicinity of County T).

Section 4:

Review locating access off of County E instead of Erbe Road in consultation with the Town of Blue Mounds and affected property owners for parcels 6061528007 and 60615295304

Section 6:

Review proposed frontage road between Spring Rose Road and County G in the Town of Verona in consultation with the Town of Verona.

Review proposed local road connection from Dairy Ridge Road to two properties that currently have access to US 18/151 in the Town of Springdale in consultation with the Town of Springdale (parcels 060713396902 and 060713399016).

Review proposed frontage road alignments with owners along both the Yahara Quarry west of County J and north of US 18/151 and the Ringgenberg Quarry next to Ringenberg Drive and south of US 18/151.

Other Commitments:

WisDOT will investigate use of polymer overlay on bridge decks and some wider unpaved shoulder or flat area next to shoulder for underpass crossing in consultation with snowmobile club representatives in the area.

WisDOT will re-examine the intersection type at all locations during final design, including locations where a roundabout was proposed/analyzed.

All permitted signage for private and public entities that exists on US 18/151 and affected side roads at the time of final design/construction will be moved as appropriate to properly direct people to the correct interchanges.

See also Exhibit 7 – Roadway Characteristics and Design Notes for additional commitments.

GENERAL ECONOMICS EVALUATION

Factor Sheet A-1

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8 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:

The Proposed Action is located in Dane and Iowa Counties in south central and southwest Wisconsin.

Economic Activity	Description
a. Agriculture	Agriculture is an important industry for both Dane and Iowa Counties. From 2002 to 2007 the number of farms in Dane County increased from 1,686 to 1,813 (8.0 percent). For the same period, the number of farms in Iowa increased from 2,887 to 3,331 (15 percent). The number of acres of land in farms decreased slightly in Dane County from 2002 to 2007, from 367,373 acres to 364,970 acres (-1.0 percent). During the same period, the number of acres of land in farms increased moderately in Iowa County, from 515,475 acres to 535,756 acres (4.0 percent).
b. Retail business	Retail businesses are located throughout the corridor, mostly concentrated in or near the incorporated municipalities located along or near the corridor, including Villages of Ridgeway, Barneveld, Mount Horeb and the City of Dodgeville.
c. Wholesale business	Dane and Iowa Counties have a number of wholesale business operators. No known wholesale operations are located in the project area.
d. Heavy industry	Dane County, and to a limited extent, Iowa County, has a number of heavy industrial business operators. No known heavy industries are found in the project area.
e. Light industry/services	Light industry in the project area includes the headquarters for Lands' End, a retail clothing business located in the City of Dodgeville, Iowa County, Epic Systems, a medical software company located on the western edge of the City of Verona, meat processing, implement sales and repairs, animal reproductive services, parts machining, truck and auto repair and sales, and landscaping services.
f. Tourism	Dane and Iowa Counties are both home to popular tourist destinations. In the project area, these include state parks, private campgrounds, Little Norway, Cave of the Mounds Natural National Landmark, Folklore Village, Botham Winery, and specialty shopping stores
g. Recreation	Both Iowa and Dane County offer a wide range of recreation activities and facilities for residents and visitors alike. Military Ridge State Trail is located adjacent to the corridor. It serves as a biking, hiking, and snowmobiling trail that crosses woods, wetlands, prairies and farmland. Other recreation areas near the corridor include Blue Mounds State Park and Governor Dodge State Park in Iowa County.
h. Forestry	N/A

Source: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture; U.S. Census Bureau; WI Dept. of Tourism

As Table 1, Economic Characteristics of the Project Area shows, the top three employers by industry are quite similar between counties. The top three employers by industry for Dane County are educational services, retail trade, and

manufacturing. Iowa County's top three employers by industry are retail trade, educational services, and manufacturing. Median Household Incomes range from \$54,298 in Iowa County to \$57,546 in Dane County. Dane County has 74.2 percent of the population over the age of 16 in the labor force while Iowa County has 74.0 percent.

Table 1, Economic Characteristics of the Project Area

2005-2009	Dane County	Iowa County
Percent of Individuals in Labor Force (age 16 and over)	74.2 %	74 %
Top 3 Employers by Industry	1 Educational services	Retail trade
	2 Retail trade	Educational services
	3 Manufacturing	Manufacturing
Median Household Income	\$ 57,546	\$54,298

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2005-2009

The Proposed Action is not likely to have an effect on the overall economic character of the area.

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 Proposed Action would provide numerous economic advantages including:

- Improving the economic viability of the area by providing safer and more efficient transportation, both on US 18/151 and the local and county roadway system
- Compatibility with the current and planned economic growth/development of the area
- Elimination of dangerous cross, merge, and diverge traffic to/from US 18/151 and local roads
- Ensuring safe and efficient access of police, fire, and emergency services to the area
- Encouragement and promotion of collaborative planning for land use and transportation systems
- Convenient and safe access to US 18/151 – a major commercial arterial for import and export of goods
- Safer access to opposite sides of US 18/151 for agricultural equipment and other slow moving vehicles

The Proposed Action's disadvantages include:

- Major capital investment by WisDOT
- Temporary travel disruptions during construction
- Increased travel time to/from certain locations of the project study area (access to and across US 18/151 would be limited)
- Reduced acreage of private land for farming activities and development

The Proposed Action would increase safety for agricultural operators, business owners, customers, and employees, tourists and tourism operators, and recreational users of US 18/151 in the area.

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 Action would likely have no effect on the potential for economic development in the area. The existing expressway provides excellent regional mobility at this time and is not a barrier to development.

The proposed project will have an effect on economic development.

Increase, describe:

Decrease, describe:

Factor Sheet A-2

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

1. Is a Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan attached to this document?

- Yes – See Appendix G – Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan (CSRP)
- No - (Explain) _____

2. Describe the economic development or existing business areas affected by the proposed action:

Two businesses would be directly affected by being acquired to accommodate the proposed construction. One business is a truck/auto repair business. The second entity is classified as a business for evaluation purposes is VFW Post 9511 located in the Town of Blue Mounds. Both of these businesses are not dependent upon their specific locations to serve their customers.

Most businesses in the project area are located in or near incorporated communities and will not be affected by the proposed freeway conversion as they will continue to have access to US 18/151 at existing or proposed highway interchanges. The following businesses currently have fairly direct access to the highway via local roads that would have their access to US 18/151 closed:

- Landscaping business: businesses vehicles would access US 18/151 via a new local road to interchanges to the east and west.
- Two quarries: quarry trucks would access US 18/151 via a new local road to interchanges to the east and west.
- Meat processing facility: access would be via County ID to interchanges east or west.

In all these cases, the amount of indirection is minimal.

The Proposed Action would have no overall effect on economic development in the area. Access to areas likely to develop would continue to be very good. There currently is not a significant amount of business/commercial development activity occurring outside of the incorporated communities.

3. Identify and discuss existing modes of transportation and their traffic within the economic development or existing business area:

Customers and employees who wish to access businesses in the project area do so primarily by automobile. These businesses send and receive goods by truck. Automobile and truck traffic can be found on US 18/151, county roads, and local roads within the project area.

Bike and pedestrian traffic is also present in the area via the Military Ridge State Trail and county and town roads. The large majority of bike and pedestrian traffic is recreational in nature. In the winter months, several snowmobile trails are located within the project area including the Military Ridge State Recreational Trail.

Airports with controlled airspace near the study area include Dane County Regional Airport (Madison), Middleton Municipal Airport (Morey Field, Middleton), Gonstead Airport (Mount Horeb), Kittleson Krest Landing Strip (Blue Mounds), Dodgeville Municipal Airport (Dodgeville), and Iowa County Airport (1.5 miles northwest of Mineral Point). Dane County Airport serves more than 100 flights daily and serves over 1.6 million passengers yearly. Iowa County Airport operates an average of 34 flights per day mostly for general aviation. Middleton Municipal Airport operates approximately 11 flights per day.

Local intercity bus service is provided by Lamers Bus Lines which offers daily route service to/from Dubuque/Madison with stops in Platteville, Dodgeville, Mount Horeb, and Verona. Additional intercity bus service is available in Madison with service to Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and other cities throughout Wisconsin.

Iowa County and Dane County offer several low-cost taxi and rideshare programs for persons with disabilities and seniors. Several private taxi providers service the Dane County area and, to a limited extent, the Iowa County area.

In Iowa County, the Aging and Disability Resource Center Southwest Wisconsin-Iowa County (ADRC) offers two options to meet the differing transportation needs of elderly and persons with disabilities: a 15-passenger Care-A-Van mini bus that runs on a fixed schedule, and a volunteer Driver Escort Service that provides individualized door-to-door medical transportation.

In Dane County, the Department of Human Services provides several services for individual and group transportation for persons with disabilities, low-income families, and persons with unusual medical transportation expenses. The Rural Senior Group Transportation Program offers transportation services outside of the Madison area. Services include scheduled group trips which include destinations such as congregate meal sites (nutrition sites), community/senior centers, and grocery and general shopping. The service is a door-to-door, and is provided in accessible vehicles.

The Wisconsin Department of Administration offers vanpool/ridesharing programs to assist commuters in their ride to work. The State vanpool provides alternate transportation for state and non-state employees commuting to Madison from outside communities.

There is one a park and ride lot directly in the project area. It is located on WIS 78 south of US 18/151, just west of Mount Horeb. There is also park and ride lot is located to the east of the project area in the City of Verona, just off of US 18/151 on Old PB.

Rail and transit services do not currently service the project area.

4. Identify and discuss effects on the economic development potential and existing businesses that are dependent upon the transportation facility for continued economic viability:

- The proposed project will have no effect on a transportation-dependent business or industry.
- The proposed action may change the conditions for a business that is dependent upon the transportation facility. Identify effects, including effects which may occur during construction.

Changes in access due to the removal of all at-grade crossings (driveways and local road intersections) would affect how customers and employees access some places of business. In general, indirection is anticipated to be minor and would likely not discourage potential customers from traveling to the commercial business destinations in the area. Overall, the proposed improvements would make travel in the corridor safer for business customers and employees.

During construction, access to some locations along the corridor would likely be somewhat inconvenient.

5. Describe both beneficial and adverse effects on:

- A. The existing business area affected by the proposed action. Include any factors identified by business people that they feel are important or controversial.

Overall, there were few concerns expressed by business owners about the Proposed Action. This is likely due to the fact that relatively few businesses along the corridor currently have direct access to the highway. In addition, the existing and proposed network of local roads combined with existing and proposed interchanges would provide convenient and safer access. There currently are no highway-dependent businesses along the corridor that would be affected by the loss of direct access to US 18/151.

One quarry operator near the corridor expressed concerns about the indirection that would result from closure of an existing access point used by the operation. A complete analysis was done on the amount of indirection that would result and it was determined that the effects are within an acceptable range. WisDOT committed to a review of the area and quarry conditions when Section 6 is funded, in case changes have occurred that would significantly increase the need for an interchange at County J.

- B. The existing employees in businesses affected by the proposal. Include, as appropriate, a discussion of effects on minority populations or low-income populations.

The Proposed Action would benefit employees in the area by providing a safer transportation system for travel to/from their place of employment in the corridor, as well as other commercial establishments in the area.

Some employees of businesses in the area may experience minimal indirection due to removal of at-grade intersection and access changes to driveways. Additionally, some employees of those businesses that are proposed for relocation may experience temporary job loss or hour reduction due to the business relocation and transition process.

No minority or low income populations have been identified which would be affected.

6. Estimated number of businesses and jobs that would be created or displaced because of the project:

Business/Job Type	Businesses			Jobs	
	Created	Displaced	Value	Created	Displaced
Retail	0	0	0	0	0
Service	0	2	0	0	5 - 9
Wholesale	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	0	0	0
Other (List)	0	0	0	0	0

7. Are any owners or employees of created or displaced businesses elderly, disabled, low-income or members of a minority group?

- No
 Yes – If yes, complete Factor Sheet B-4, Environmental Justice Evaluation.

8. Is Special Relocation Assistance Needed?

- No
 Yes – Describe special relocation needs.

9. Identify all sources of information used to obtain data in item 8:

- WisDOT Real Estate Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan Multiple Listing Service (MLS)
 Newspaper listing(s) Other - Identify: Property Owner Interview; Public Information Meetings

10. Describe the business relocation potential in the community:

- A. Total number of available business buildings in the community. 6 (see Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan for additional information)
- B. Number of available and comparable business buildings by type and price (Include business buildings in price ranges comparable to those being dislocated, if any).
 4 Number of available and comparable type business buildings in the price range of \$100,000-\$199,000
 1 Number of available and comparable type business buildings in the price range of \$ 200,000-\$299,000
 1 Number of available and comparable type business buildings in the price range of \$ 300,000 +

11. Describe how relocation assistance will be provided in compliance with the WisDOT Relocation Manual or FHWA regulation 49 CFR Part 24. Check all that apply:

- Business 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 forced to relocate from their business. Some available benefits include relocation advisory services, reimbursement of moving expenses, replacement of business payments. In compliance with State law, no person would be displaced unless a comparable replacement business would be provided.

Compensation is available to all displaced persons without discrimination. Before initiating property acquisition activities, property owners will 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 will be inspected by one or more professional appraisers. The property owner will 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. Reasonable cost of an owner’s appraisal will be reimbursed to the owner if received within 60

days of initiation of negotiations. Based on the appraisal(s) made, the value of the property will be determined, and that amount offered to the owner.

Describe other relocation assistance requirements, not identified above.

12. Identify any difficulties relocating a business displaced by the proposed action and describe any special services needed to remedy identified unusual conditions:

There is a mobile home unit that sits on the same parcel as the VFW. The VFW indicated that the tenant in the mobile receives reduced rent in exchange for some maintenance to the property. Options for relocating the tenant to a residence on or near the business relocation should be considered. This is discussed further in Appendix G - Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan.

13. Describe any additional measures that will be used to minimize adverse effects or provide benefits to those relocated. Also discuss accommodations made to minimize adverse effects to businesses that may be affected by the project, but not relocated:

WisDOT would follow the acquisition and relocation procedures established by the Uniform Relocation Act of 1972 for the two relocated businesses (truck/auto repair and VFW),. These statutes are in place to ensure landowners and tenants are treated fairly when the public interest requires the purchase and relocation of homes and businesses. See Appendix G – CSRP for additional relocation assistance information.

As discussed in question 2, three businesses that currently have fairly direct access to the highway via local roads would have their access to US 18/151 closed. The landscaping business would have access to US 18/151 via a new local road and the meat processing facility would access US 18/151 via County ID interchanges on east or west.

This EA includes a commitment to reevaluate access near the the Yahara and Ringenberg quarries in Section 6 to reevaluated access when construction is funded to ensure that if conditions change, access as proposed would be sufficient.

AGRICULTURE EVALUATION

Factor Sheet A-3

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway: 28.8 Length of This Alternative: 28.8
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	444.6	0	444.6
Woodland	32.1	0	32.1
Land of undetermined or other use (e.g., wetlands, yards, roads, etc.)	10.6	0	10.6
Totals	479.8	0	479.8

Note: The identification of easements on agricultural lands, if needed, would occur during the time of final design.

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

Acreage to be Acquired	Number of Farm Operations
Less than 1 acre	21
1 acre to 5 acres	75
More than 5 acres	20

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.
- 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. 7/21/09

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

The Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) has completed an AIS for this project. Note that the focus of the AIS is on Section 2, the first section that would be constructed. When construction for the remaining sections is imminent, the AIS would need to be amended to include descriptions of impacts on the individual farmers and farmland owners affected by those sections. See Appendix C5, DATCP Correspondence and Appendix D, Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS).

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 Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8
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:

The Proposed Action includes the following communities:

- Town of Dodgeville
- Town of Ridgeway
- Village of Ridgeway
- Town of Brigham
- Village of Barneveld
- Village of Blue Mounds
- Town of Blue Mounds
- Town of Springdale
- Town of Verona

Name of Community/Neighborhood: Town of Dodgeville																			
Incorporated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																			
Total Population 1,708 (Census 2010)																			
Demographic Characteristics																			
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Census 2010</th> <th style="text-align: left;">% of Population</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>White</i></td> <td>97.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Black/African American</i></td> <td>0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i></td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Asian</i></td> <td>1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i></td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Some other race</i></td> <td>0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Two or more races</i></td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i></td> <td>1.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Census 2010	% of Population	<i>White</i>	97.4	<i>Black/African American</i>	0.3	<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.1	<i>Asian</i>	1.2	<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0	<i>Some other race</i>	0.4	<i>Two or more races</i>	0.6	<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	1.1	
Census 2010	% of Population																		
<i>White</i>	97.4																		
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.3																		
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.1																		
<i>Asian</i>	1.2																		
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0																		
<i>Some other race</i>	0.4																		
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.6																		
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	1.1																		
The Town of Dodgeville is located in central Iowa County. In 2000, the total population was 1,407. In 2010, the Town had a total population of 1,708. The town can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 98.3 percent White. Of the total population in 2005-2009, 11.7 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income was \$75,341 with retail trade as the leading industry. Land use in the Town of Dodgeville is predominantly agricultural with small pockets of residential development.																			

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Town of Ridgeway**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
568 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	97.5
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.7
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.4
<i>Asian</i>	0.0
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.5
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.9
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	1.1

The Town of Ridgeway is located in east-central Iowa County. In 2000, the total population was 581. In 2010, the Town had a total population of 568. The Town can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 97.5 percent White. Of the total population in 2005-2009, 15 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income was \$57,143 with retail trade as the leading industry. Land use in the Town of Ridgeway is predominantly agricultural with small pockets of residential development.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Village of Ridgeway**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
653 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	98.8
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.0
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.0
<i>Asian</i>	0.0
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.9
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.3
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	5.1

The Village of Ridgeway is located in east central Iowa County. The population of the Village has decreased slightly in recent years. In 2000, the total population was 689. In 2010, the Village had a total population of 653. The Village can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 98 percent White. Of the total population in 2010, 10.7 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income in 2010 was \$44,286 with retail trade as the leading industry. Land use in the Village is predominantly residential with small pockets of commercial and agricultural uses.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Town of Brigham**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
1,034 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	97.6
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.2
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.1
<i>Asian</i>	0.6
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.8
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.8
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	2.1

The Town of Brigham is located in eastern Iowa County. In 2000, the total population was 908. In 2010, the Town had a total population of 1,034. The Town can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 97.6 percent White. Of the total population in 2005-2009, 12.9 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income in 2005-2009 was \$75,833 with social services and agriculture tying as the leading industry. Land use in the Town of Brigham is predominantly agricultural with small pockets of residential development.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Village of Barneveld**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
1,231 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	98.2
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.7
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.1
<i>Asian</i>	0.2
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.0
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.7
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	0.2

The Village of Barneveld is located in eastern Iowa County. In 2000, the total population was 1,088. In 2010, the Village had a total population of 1,231. The Village can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 98 percent White. Of the total population in 2000-2009, 7.6 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income was \$75,417 with educational services, health care, and social services as the leading industry. Land use in the Village of Barneveld is predominantly residential with commercial development near the interchange location at County ID. Several areas of public/institutional development are also present in the Village of Barneveld north of US 18/151.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Village of Blue Mounds**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
855 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	97.8
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.1
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.4
<i>Asian</i>	0.5
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.5
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.8
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	1.3

The Village of Blue Mounds is located in western Dane County. In 2000, the total population was 708. In 2010, the Village had a total population of 855. The Village can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 97 percent White. Of the total population in 2000-2009, 10.2 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income was \$54,643 with social services listed as the leading industry. Land use in the Village of Blue Mounds is mostly residential with some small pockets of commercial development.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Town of Blue Mounds**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
968 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	96.8
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.8
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.4
<i>Asian</i>	0.7
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.6
<i>Two or more races</i>	0
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	2.4

The Town of Blue Mounds is located in western Dane County. In 2000, the total population was 842. In 2010, the Town had a total population of 968. The Town can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 96.8 percent White. Of the total population in 2005-2009, 8.5 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income was \$69,712 with social services as the leading industry. Land use in the Town of Blue Mounds is predominantly agricultural with small pockets of residential development.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Town of Springdale**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
1,904 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	97.4
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.5
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.2
<i>Asian</i>	0.4
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.7
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.7
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	1.5

The Town of Springdale is located in southwestern Dane County southwest of the City of Madison between the City of Verona and the Village of Mount Horeb. In 2000, the total population was 1,530. In 2010, the Town had a total population of 1,904. The Town can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 97 percent White. Of the total population in 2005-2009, 11.5 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income in 2000 was \$87,500 with educational services, health care, and social services as the leading industries. Land use in the Town of Springdale is predominantly agricultural with small pockets of residential development.

Name of Community/Neighborhood: **Town of Verona**

Incorporated

Yes No

Total Population
1,948 (Census 2010)

Demographic Characteristics

Census 2010	% of Population
<i>White</i>	96.3
<i>Black/African American</i>	0.8
<i>Amer. Indian/Alaska Native</i>	0.2
<i>Asian</i>	0.9
<i>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</i>	0.0
<i>Some other race</i>	0.9
<i>Two or more races</i>	0.8
<i>Hispanic/Latino (of any race)</i>	1.5

The Town of Verona is located in south central Dane County approximately 8 miles southwest of the City of Madison. In recent years, the Town of Verona's population has decreased, due to annexation. In 2000, the total population was 2,153. In 2010, the town had a total population of 1,948. The Town can be characterized as a predominantly rural community that is 96.3 percent White. Of the total population in 2000-2009, 9.3 percent were aged 65 or older. The median household income was \$102,708 with educational services, healthcare and social services as the leading industries. Land use in the Town of Verona is predominantly agricultural with small pockets of residential development.

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

Nearly all transportation in the corridor is by automobile and truck. US 18/151, county highways, and local roads all serve these modes of transportation. In 2009 and 2010, traffic volumes along this section of US 18/151 ranged from 14,500 vehicles per day (vpd) to 20,400 vpd. Future traffic volumes are anticipated to increase to 19,100 to 33,600 by the year 2037. See Traffic Forecast Reports in Appendix B.

The Military Ridge State Trail, located in the corridor, is maintained and managed by the WDNR and connects the City of Fitchburg to the City of Dodgeville. The trail runs north of US 18/151 and roughly parallel to the corridor. The 40 mile trail follows the former Chicago and Northwestern Railroad corridor and is seasonally opened to bikers, hikers, and in the winter is opened to snowmobiles and cross-country skiers. Other bike facilities include several county and local routes that are used for biking.

In the winter months, several snowmobile trails maintained by local snowmobile clubs are located within the project area. Snowmobiles are permitted to use the Military Ridge State Recreational Trail.

Bicycle use is currently allowed on US 18/151 within the project area except in areas that have already been converted to a freeway. In Dane County, areas where bicycle use is prohibited include WIS 78 to County P/PD, and County G/Dairy Ridge Road past the east end of the study corridor. In Iowa County, bicycle use is prohibited from beyond the west project limits to County Y/YZ, and from County ID to County K in the Village of Barneveld. In the remaining areas where bicycle use is not prohibited, the 2010 Wisconsin State Bicycle Map and related county bike maps indicate the facility is of "high volume" and "undesirable" for bicycle use. The maps classify state and county roads throughout the state in terms of bicycling conditions, using, in part, 2009 traffic and roadway data.

Airports with controlled airspace near the study area include Dane County Regional Airport (Madison), Middleton Municipal Airport (Morey Field, Middleton), Gonstead Airport (Mount Horeb), Kittleson Krest Landing Strip (Blue Mounds), Dodgeville Municipal Airport (Dodgeville), and Iowa County Airport (1.5 miles northwest of Mineral Point). Dane County Airport serves more than 100 flights daily and serves over 1.6 million passengers yearly. Iowa County Airport operates an average of 34 flights per day mostly for general aviation. Middleton Municipal Airport operates approximately 11 flights per day.

Local intercity bus service is provided by Lamers Bus Lines which offers daily route service to/from Dubuque/Madison with stops in Platteville, Dodgeville, Mount Horeb, and Verona. Additional intercity bus service is available in Madison with service to Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and other cities throughout Wisconsin.

Iowa County and Dane County offer several low-cost taxi and rideshare programs for persons with disabilities and seniors. Several private taxi providers service the Dane County area and, to a limited extent, the Iowa County area.

In Iowa County, the Aging and Disability Resource Center Southwest Wisconsin-Iowa County (ADRC) offers two options to meet the differing transportation needs of elderly and persons with disabilities: a 15-passenger Care-A-Van mini bus that runs on a fixed schedule, and a volunteer Driver Escort Service that provides individualized door-to-door medical transportation.

In Dane County, the Department of Human Services provides several services for individual and group transportation for persons with disabilities, low-income families, and persons with unusual medical transportation expenses. The Rural Senior Group Transportation Program offers transportation services outside of the Madison area. Services include scheduled group trips which include destinations such as congregate meal sites (nutrition sites), community/senior centers, and grocery and general shopping. The service is a door-to-door, and is provided in accessible vehicles.

The Wisconsin Department of Administration offers vanpool/ridesharing programs to assist commuters in their ride to work. The State vanpool provides alternate transportation for state and non-state employees commuting to Madison from outside communities.

There is one a park and ride lot directly in the project area. It is located on WIS 78 south of US 18/151, just west of Mount Horeb. There is also park and ride lot is located to the east of the project area in the City of Verona, just off of US 18/151 on Old PB.

Rail services do not currently service the project area.

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:

It is anticipated that there would be no substantial changes to transportation modes and functions in the corridor communities. Overall, automobile and truck transportation would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Action. There are currently numerous points of direct access for roads and driveways on to US 18/151 that would be eliminated. The removal of direct access points along the highway and the construction of interchanges, over/underpasses and frontage roads would result a safer facility for those traveling along the corridor. Individuals who currently have direct access to US 18/151 may experience slight increases in travel times as they would access US 18/151 via local and frontage roads that lead to highway interchanges. Conversely, for some, travel time may be reduced as wait times to enter the highway would be nearly eliminated.

In general, areas where new interchanges would be constructed would see increased traffic on local roads due to traffic funneling to these locations in order to access US 18/151. These areas may experience additional increased traffic as interchange zones may become more attractive to commercial and highway dependent developments such as fast food restaurants and gas stations. However, traffic on these local roads is not expected to be enough to change the function of the roads.

The Proposed Action would convert US 18/151 to a freeway. WisDOT standards indicate that freeways are not suitable for bicycle use. Therefore, as a result of converting US 18/151 to a freeway, bicycle use would be prohibited. The Proposed Action includes other parallel routes that may be used. Bicyclists in the area would be able to use other facilities and resources in the area for transportation and recreation, including the MRST, and county and town roads, both existing and proposed, as described by each section below. (See also Exhibit 3 – Preferred Alternative Detail)

- Section 1: Bicycle use is currently prohibited west of County Y/YZ. East of County Y/YZ bicyclists would continue to be able to use the MRST, which parallels US 18/151 on the north side between County Y/YZ and County HHH. The proposed interchange between County BB and County HHH (west) would provide a safer crossing of US 18/151.
- Section 2: Local roads added or altered in this section would be suitable for bicycle use. The proposed interchange near County BB and the County HHH overpass would both provide safer crossings of US 18/151. Bicyclists would continue to be able to use the MRST in this area, which parallels US 18/151 on the north side.
- Section 3: No change between County HHH (west) and County HHH (east), where biking on US 18/151 is prohibited. The proposed extension of County ID from Barneveld to Ridgeway and parallel to US 18/151 would include six foot shoulders for bicycle accommodations. The proposed County HHH interchange, Pikes Peak Road underpass, and County T overpass would all provide safe crossings of US 18/151. The proposed County K alignment would provide an additional north/south connection for bicycle users. Bicyclists would continue to be able to use the MRST in this area, which parallels US 18/151 on the north side.
- Section 4: No change between County ID and County K, where biking on US 18/151 is prohibited. Existing County ID parallels US 18/151 between Barneveld and Mt Horeb in this section and is suitable for bicycle use. The 2010 Wisconsin State Bicycle Map and related county bike maps indicate the facility is a “best/moderate” condition for bicycle use. Bicyclists would continue to be able to use the MRST in this area, which parallels US 18/151 on the north side..
- Section 5: No improvements proposed for this section. Bicycle use is already prohibited in this area.
- Section 6: A frontage road system proposed just south of US 18/151 from county PD to County G and would replace US 18/151 as an east-west route for bicycle use.

Below is a description of the proposed changes in each of the communities in the project study area.

Town of Dodgeville

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 1):

- Construction of an interchange at County Y
- Relocation of the Military Ridge State Trail near the County Y interchange
- Construction of a local roadway on the north and south sides US 18/151 near County Y, terminating in cul-du-sacs
- Construction of local roadway on the north side of US 18/151 near County Z, terminating in a cul-du-sac.

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Town of Dodgeville would be closed and all access would be through an interchange at County Y/YZ. The Proposed Action would allow for safe crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Dodgeville.

Town of Ridgeway

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Maps 1 & 2):

- Construction of a new diamond interchange near the existing intersection of US 12/18 and Cemetery Road.
- Closure of existing Ridgevue Road connection to US 18/151; Ridgevue Road would be extended to connect to the new interchange
- Extension of County BB easterly to the new interchange
- Closure of the existing County HHH connection to US 18/151 on the west side of Ridgeway; County HHH would be extended westerly and routed over US 18/151 via an overpass to connect to the new interchange.
- Relocation of Prairie Rd/Moon Road intersection so that Prairie Road is a continuous connection to the interchange and Moon Road become a T intersection with Prairie Road
- Closure of the existing Prairie Road connection to US 18/151, constructing a cul de sac on the east end and a T intersection with the County HHH extension
- Possible closure of the section of Prairie Road between Moon Road and the new County HHH extension; this decision will be made the Town of Ridgeway at the time of final design.
- Removal of Cemetery Road (County BB and Prairie Road extensions would provide access to properties which currently have access off Cemetery Road)
- Construction of an intersection of Aschliman Road and the County BB extension
- County H, which currently runs south-north under US 18/151 into the Village of Ridgeway, would be relocated to connect to the interchange at County HHH. A short section of County H between US 18/151 and the relocated portion of County H would be jurisdictionally transferred from Iowa County to The Town of Ridgeway and the Village of Ridgeway.
- Rural two-lane dead-end frontage road on the north side of the interchange connecting properties east of the interchange to County HHH and the interchange.
- Removal of the Hi-Point Road connection to US 18/151 and construction of a cul de sac on the north end
- A continuous county road from the County HHH interchange to the Village of Barneveld, in effect an extension of the existing County ID. Existing County ID currently connects to an interchange in the Village of Barneveld. The County ID extension would run south of US 18/151 from the County HHH interchange and pass over US 18/151 near County T, and from that point run on the north side of US 18/151. The new section of county road will be connected to the existing County ID and the interchange via a roundabout.

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Town of Ridgeway would be closed and all access would be redirected to the nearby interchanges at County BB and County HHH/High Point Road. The Proposed Action would allow for safer crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Ridgeway.

Village of Ridgeway (See also Town of Ridgeway)

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Maps 2 and 3):

- Construction of an interchange at County HHH/High Point Road
- Construction of an overpass at County HHH and an extension of County HHH to the southwest after it crosses US 18/151 to the new interchange near Cemetery Road
- Reroute of County H to County HHH interchange

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Village of Ridgeway would be closed and all access would be redirected to the interchanges at County BB and County HHH/High Point Road. The Proposed Action would allow for safer crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Ridgeway.

Town of Brigham

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 3):

- Construction of an extension of County ID from Barneveld to the west side of Ridgeway, through the Town of Brigham. This would include construction of an overpass for the County ID extension, near current location of the County T and US 18/151 intersection.
- Closure of the County T intersection with US 18/151. Construction of a County T intersection with to the County ID extension.
- Relocation of the Military Ridge State Trail to the north of the proposed County ID extension on the north side of US 18/151 from just west of proposed County ID overpass to the proposed County ID roundabout on west side of Barneveld.
- Construction of an underpass at Pikes Peak Road and realignment of West Brigham Road to connect to the County ID extension.
- Construction of overpasses at Mounds View Road and East Brigham Road.

- Closure of the County K intersection with US 18/151 on the north and south sides of the highway and construction of cul-de-sacs in these locations.
- Relocation of County K on new alignment in a northwesterly direction to connect to the County ID interchange on the south side of US 18/151.

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Town of Brigham would be closed and all access would be redirected to the interchanges in Ridgeway and Barneveld. The Proposed Action would allow for safer crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Brigham.

Village of Barneveld

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 3):

- Closure of the County K and US 18/151 intersection on both sides of highway and construction of cul-du-sacs at these locations (in the Town of Brigham)
- Relocation of County K on a new alignment in a northwesterly direction to connect to the County ID interchange on the south side of US 18/151
- Construction of County ID extension from Barneveld to the west side of Ridgeway, including construction of a roundabout in Barneveld
- The Military Ridge State Trail would be shifted north of the proposed County ID extension from just west of the proposed County ID overpass to the proposed County ID roundabout on west side of Barneveld.

All direct access to US 18/151 in and near the Village of Barneveld would be closed and all access would be redirected to the interchange at County ID. The Proposed Action would allow for safe crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Barneveld.

Village of Blue Mounds

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 4):

- Construction of an interchange at County F
- Construction of a roundabout at the intersection of County F and County ID (when conditions require it)

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Village of Blue Mounds would be closed and all access would be redirected to the interchange at County F. The Proposed Action would allow for safe crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Blue Mounds.

Town of Blue Mounds

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 4):

- Construction of an interchange at County F
- Construction of an underpass at Erbe Road
- Construction of an overpass at Cave of the Mounds Road
- Relocation of the Military Ridge Crossing of Erbe Road to the bridge on US 18/151 to be constructed over Erbe Road

All direct access to US 185/151 in the Town of Blue Mounds would be removed and all access would be redirected to the interchange at County F. The Proposed Action would allow for safer crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in the Town of Blue Mounds.

Town of Springdale

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 6):

- Closure of the Spring Rose Road and US 18/151 intersection on the north and south sides of the highway and construction of cul-du-sacs in these locations
- Closure of the Spring Rose Circle and the US 18/151 intersection
- Construction of a local road on the south side of the highway from County PD to County G
- Construction of an extension of Prairie Ridge Road to east of Despina Drive, terminating in a cul-du-sac
- Construction of a local road from County J to the west, terminating in a cul-du-sac. Trucks servicing the quarries near County J traveling east or west would experience indirection and would have to access the highway using the new local road on the south side of the highway to connect to the County G interchange to the east or the County P/PD interchange to the west or take County J south to County G. Traffic on Dairy Ridge Road, including truck traffic, could increase as a result of the Proposed Action as it would be used to connect to the existing interchange at County G.
- Construction of a local road to provide alternate access to Dairy ridge Road for two properties that currently have access to US 18/151.

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Town of Springdale would be closed and all access would be redirected to the interchanges at County G and County P/PD. The Proposed Action would allow for safer crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Springdale.

Town of Verona

The Proposed Action includes (Exhibit 3, Map 6):

- Construction of a new local road that would be an east-west parallel route of US 18/151 connecting Spring Rose Road to County G
- Removal of direct access from Spring Rose Road to US 18/151
- Construction of an auxiliary lane on either side of the highway from County G to the interchange at West Verona Road to address the close proximity of these two interchanges which leads to unsafe weaving of vehicles entering and exiting the interchanges

All direct access to US 18/151 in the Town of Verona would be closed and all access would be redirected to the nearby interchanges at County G and West Verona Avenue. The Proposed Action would allow for safer crossing and access to/from US 18/151 in Verona.

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

In general, land uses within the project area would not change substantially. The overall agricultural character in the rural areas of the corridor would not be affected. Likewise, the existing pattern of scattered residential rural development and residential developments in the communities located throughout the corridor is not expected to change as a result of the Proposed Action.

Closures of direct access to US 18/151 could result in some land use changes throughout the corridor. Auto-dependent businesses such as service stations and fast food restaurants may choose to develop closer to the proposed interchanges due to increased accessibility and visibility. New developments near interchanges could result in the conversion of some farmland.

The closure of the existing at-grade intersections would result in areas near these intersections becoming less attractive to commercial and auto-dependent development. Instead, future development would likely occur near the interchanges. However, it should be noted that little of this type of development has occurred in areas that have direct access to the highway along the corridor today.

Potential land use changes are discussed in more detail in Appendix H, Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis.

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

The Proposed Action would improve safety for emergency response services as the proposed interchanges would provide safe and efficient access to/from US 18/151 without having to cross high speed traffic lanes. Construction of interchanges allows for operational safety in merging instead of the crossing the highways and eliminates delays associated with at-grade intersections.

Emergency response services may experience some indirection when responding to calls for service. With the removal of all at-grade crossings of the highway, emergency responders would have to travel on existing or newly constructed local roads to reach interchanges in order to access the highway. In some cases, this could result in longer response times. Conversely, response time for some areas may be reduced due to the ability to enter the highway at interchanges instead of waiting for gaps to enter or cross US 18/151. In addition, coordination among emergency service responders would likely be necessary as emergency service areas may need to be altered due to changes in highway access.

Coordination between local emergency service providers would be required to limit the effect of construction on emergency service provision in the project area during construction and after construction is completed.

The need for emergency services may be reduced as the freeway conversion is expected to result in fewer highway crashes.

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.:

All at-grade access points to US 18/151 would be removed as a result of the Proposed Action, including private driveways. Access to the highway system would be through interchanges. Over/underpasses would be constructed to safely cross US 18/151 and local road connections would be constructed to allow access for all residents via highway interchanges. In most cases, private driveways would be shifted or realigned to connect with new local roads. Interchange, local road, and over/underpass construction would require the acquisition of some right of way from residential and business property owners. The proposed construction of local roads, interchanges, and over/underpasses would result in road facilities located closer to some residential, agricultural and business properties. The Proposed Action would require the acquisition, removal, and relocation of five residential properties and two business properties. In some cases, it may be possible to locate new residences on the existing property. (See Appendix G, CSRP).

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:

Several community facilities would be affected by the Proposed Action, including the Military Ridge State Trail, Folklore Village, and the VFW.

Military Ridge State Trail

The 40-mile Military Ridge State Trail, in Iowa and Dane counties, connects Dodgeville and Madison, Wisconsin, by way of the communities of Ridgeway, Barneveld, Blue Mounds, Mount Horeb, Riley, Klevenville, and Verona. The trail follows an 1855 military road between Verona and Dodgeville. The trail runs along the southern borders of Governor Dodge and Blue Mound state parks. The land around the trail is primarily agricultural, but also includes woods, wetlands, prairies, villages, and small cities.

The limestone-surfaced trail is open to walkers, bicyclists, and wheelchair users in late spring, summer, and fall and snowmobilers and cross-country skiers in the winter. The segment between Verona and Madison is blacktopped and also usable by in-line skaters.

Most of the trail follows the former Chicago and North Western Railroad corridor, which has a gentle grade of only 2 to 5 percent. Between Dodgeville and Mount Horeb it runs along the top of the Military Ridge, the divide between the Wisconsin River watershed to the north and the Pecatonica and Rock River watershed to the south. Between Mount Horeb and Fitchburg, the trail goes through the Sugar River Valley where it intersects with the Ice Age National Scenic Trail.

The relocation of portions of the Military Ridge State Trail would not result in substantial effects to trail users.

Blue Mounds State Park

Blue Mound State Park is located about 25 miles west of Madison. It is named for two large hills which have long been Wisconsin landmark features. The West Mound, at 1716 feet, is the highest point in Southern Wisconsin and is within the state park; the East Mound reaches 1489 feet and is privately owned. . The 1,153-acre park is a popular place for swimming, hiking, camping, cross-country skiing and mountain biking (both double and single track). The park is accessed by way of County F, at the Village of Blue Mounds.

The construction of an interchange at County F would provide a more efficient and safer route for employees and park users to access the state park via US 18/151.

Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark (CTMNNL)

This unique geological feature lies just off U.S. Highways 18/151 in Blue Mounds, WI, located just 20 miles west of Madison, off U.S. Highways 18/151. The United States Department of the Interior and the National Park Service designated CTMNNL because the site possesses "exceptional value as an illustration of the nation's natural heritage and contributes to a better understanding of man's environment". CTMNNL is recognized by the Chicago Academy of Sciences as "the significant cave of the upper Midwest". Guided tours of Cave of the Mounds are available year 'round. Picnic areas, walking trails, rock gardens, gift shops and a visitor center have all been developed on the site.

The site is accessed off US 18/151 via Cave of the Mounds Road. An informational sign on US 18/151 directs visitors to the turn-off point, and is considered very important by the facility's staff in helping visitors find the site. With the removal of direct access from Cave of the Mounds Road, visitors will reach CTMNNL by exiting US 18/151 at County F. The informational sign would be moved and changed to reflect the change in access.

Snowmobile Trails

The study area is interspersed with numerous snowmobile trails maintained by several snowmobile clubs. Important crossings of US 18/151 are located within the study area. The Proposed Action would include new crossings which would be safer for snowmobiles. The trail crossing of the Mineral Point T-Riders Snowmobile Club on US 18/151 just west of County BB would be moved to the new interchange at County BB and riders would use the shoulder from ramp intersection to ramp intersection. The Ridgeway Riders Snowmobile Club trail crossing of US 18/151 at the Ridgeway Road intersection would be moved to the new, safer grade-separated crossing at County BB interchange.

Folklore Village

Folklore Village is located on County BB, approximately ¼ mile from the intersection of County BB and US 18/151. It is a nationally recognized folk arts and culture center offering a broad range of cultural and recreational programs, including country dancing, concerts, classes and workshops about traditional country arts and special activities and events for children and families.

The 94 acre site includes:

- Farwell Hall, a 5,500 square foot facility with dance floors, exhibits, classroom spaces and a kitchen.
- Wakefield School, an 1893 one-room school house.
- Plum Grove Church, built in 1882, listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Numerous programs, weddings and other special celebrations are held in this historic building.
- Rustic Bunkhouses provides overnight housing for events and rentals
- Preservation of the 1848 Wisconsin home of Norwegian immigrant Aslak Olsen Lie, a renowned craftsman and community leader, is currently in progress on site.
- Tall Grass Prairie Restoration Project includes over 30 relic species of remnant prairie and many grassland bird species.

Folklore Village is accessed by way of County BB, a stop-controlled intersection at US 18/151. Visitors to the site are often not familiar with the area and some are traveling at night. Thus, the existing at-grade intersection is of some concern. The Folklore Village would benefit from a safer access to its facilities via the proposed interchange at County BB.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 9511

The Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) is an organization that offers community programs, service and support for veterans. Post 9511 is located at 2787 Erbe Road, in the Town of Blue Mounds. The VFW regularly hosts events for members of the community. An underpass is proposed for Erbe Road, south of the VFW. In order to provide sufficient right of way for the improved Erbe Road, the VFW facility would need to be relocated.

Little Norway

Little Norway is a tourist and educational destination located near the Village of Blue Mounds on County JG. Little Norway consists of a collection of historic buildings and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The buildings and the property are open for public tours. School and other educational tours of the property are also offered.

Visitors access Little Norway by exiting US 18/151 at Cave of the Mounds Road and follow County ID to County JG to enter the facility. An informational sign on US 18/151 directs visitors to the turn-off point. With the removal of direct access from Cave of the Mounds Road, visitors will reach Little Norway by exiting US 18/151 at County F. The informational sign would be moved and changed to reflect the change in access.

No minority populations are anticipated to be affected as a result of the Proposed Action in any of the communities. Low-income and other minority groups would not be directly affected.

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

A range of comments and feedback was offered by community members regarding the Proposed Action and are listed below as well as in Basic Sheet 2 – Question 10.

Overall, the communities affected by the Proposed Action expressed concern about the current safety risks associated with crossing US 18/151 and, in general, were supportive of measures to improve safety along the

corridor. Some property owners were concerned about the proximity of new proposed local road connections to their homes, businesses, and/or farms, the need to acquire land from them and the effects of farm field severance.

Map 1 (Exhibit 3)

- Two residents whose properties would be directly affected by the proposed County Y interchange had concerns about these impacts to the value of their property.
- Several residents suggested that WIS 191 be relocated onto County Y to remove highway traffic from the in-town WIS 191 route.

Map 2 (Exhibit 3)

- The Mineral Point T-Riders Snowmobile Club has a trail crossing of US 18/151 just west of County BB.
- Local road connections at WisDOT Facilities Design Manual (FDM) desirable standards of ¼ mile from interchange ramps was a cause of concern due to increased acquisition of farmland needed to meet this standard.
- Community members had strong concerns about safety issues related to school busses accessing US 18/151, particularly in foggy weather. There was support for an interchange west of the Village of Ridgeway. Public comments indicated an interchange in this area would improve safety on the highway.

Map 3 (Exhibit 3)

- A large farm operator was concerned with initial plans to use Rock Road as a connection to High Point Road/ County HHH interchange. The Ridgeway Riders snowmobile had concerns about their trail crossing US 18/151 at the Ridgevue Road intersection.
- Driftless Area Land Conservancy, one partner in the conservancy group with an interest in the Thomas property, expressed concern about potential impacts on the Thomas property and the impact that the driveway removal could have on the agricultural operations of the farm.
- A farm owner had a concern about the increase in travel distance from their property on the south side of US 18/151 to their fields on the north side of US 18/151 due to the closure of the crossing at County K.

Map 4 (Exhibit 3)

- Cave of the Mounds National Natural Landmark currently directs visitors to use Cave of the Mounds Road to access the site. They believe it will be very important to have the site's sign moved to direct visitors to the County F interchange when Cave of the Mounds Road access is removed.

Map 5 (Exhibit 3)

No improvements are proposed for this section.

Map 6 (Exhibit 3)

- A property owner had objections to the alternate access via new extended Dairy Ridge Road to the east.
- Operator of Kelly Quarry expressed concern about loss of access at County J, and the Ringgenberg Quarry expressed concern over right-of-way needed on their property for a new frontage road.
- There were concerns from residents about the potential for increased traffic, including truck traffic, on Dairy Ridge Road; many residents preferred the road be constructed as a dead-end.
- Residents on Spring Rose Road expressed concerns about traffic from a nearby landscape business that would be on the new east-west local road.
- Some property owners expressed concern over the potential for vehicle headlight glare.
- Some property owners were concerned regarding farm field severances near County G.

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

Community Sensitive Design elements would be considered as more detailed highway design plans are developed.

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.

See Table 1, below for a list of residential relocations. See also Appendix G - CSRP, for more details regarding relocations.

Table 1, Preferred Alternative – Summary of Residential Relocations				
	Relocations	Alternative	Relocation Property Description	Estimated # of Bedrooms
Section 1				
	1	Alt. 1B (Preferred)	Residence, garage, outbuilding	2-3
Section 2				
	1	Alt. 2B (Preferred)	Residence, outbuildings	2-3
				2-3
Section 3				
	2	Alt 3B (Preferred)	Residence, barn	3-4
			Residence, barn	2
Section 4				
	2	Alt. 4A (Preferred)	Residence, barn, outbuildings	2-3
		Alt. 4A (Preferred)	Mobile home (part of VFW property)	2
Section 5				
	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Section 6				
	1	Alt. 6B (Preferred)	Residence, barn, silo, outbuildings	2-3
TOTAL	7			

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: 7

(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 4
---	---

b. Number of households to be relocated that have.

1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom 5 (estimated 2 or 3 bedrooms, based on property photographs and property searches)	3 Bedroom 2	4 or More Bedrooms
-----------	---	----------------	--------------------

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

Number of Single Family Dwellings: 6	Price Range: \$200,000 - \$350,000
Number of Multi-Family Dwellings: 0	Price Range: N/A
Number of Apartments: 0	Price Range: N/A

12. Describe the relocation potential in the community:

a. Number of Available Dwellings

1 Bedroom N/A	2 Bedrooms 62	3 Bedrooms 62	4 or More Bedrooms N/A
------------------	------------------	------------------	---------------------------

b. Number of Available and Comparable Dwellings by Location:

95 within: 5 miles	123 within: 20 miles
106 within: 10 miles	

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
25	\$0-\$150,000
73	\$150,000 – \$300,000
26	\$300,00+
Multi-Family Dwellings: N/A	
Apartments:	
28 under \$400/month	
50 over \$400/month	
Source: Information gathered from local realtor and rental websites as of 6/20/2011	

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 Local realtor websites:

 www.realtor.com; www.coldwellbankeronline.com

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.

Assistance to tenants (renters) will also be provided. This would include, but not limited to, replacement housing, interest and closing, and moving expenses.

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

There is a mobile home unit that sits on the same parcel one of the business units that is proposed for relocation. The business indicated that the tenant in the mobile receives reduced rent in exchange for some maintenance to the property. Options for relocating the tenant to a residence on or near the business relocation should be considered. This is discussed further in Appendix G - Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan.

18. 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

17. 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:

In addition to the acquisition price, additional costs for replacement housing, incidentals, and moving costs would be provided. Assistance to tenants (renters) will also be provided. This would include, but not limited to, replacement housing, interest and closing, and moving expenses. No person or household would be displaced unless a comparable dwelling is provided. All the available resources are provided without discrimination. Before the initiation of any property acquisition activities, WisDOT real estate staff would contact the property owner to explain the details of the acquisition process, the Uniform Relocation assistance and Real Estate Property Acquisition Policies of 1970, and Wisconsin's Eminent Domain Law under Section 32.05 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

HISTORIC RESOURCES EVALUATION

Factor Sheet B-5

Alternative Preferred Alternative	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.2 Length of This Alternative 28.2
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

Section 106 Form or other documentation, with all necessary approvals, must be attached to the Environmental Document for all projects.

1. Parties contacted:

Parties Contacted	Date Contacted	Comments Received		
		No	Yes	Check if Attached
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)	10/10/2007; 5/14/2008		X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Driftless Area Land Conservancy	10/26/2007		X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Property Owner	12/10/ 2007; 4/21/2008;1/13/2009		X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Iowa County Historical Society	10/10/2007; 5/14/2008	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
USDA	10/10/2007; 5/14/2008	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wisconsin State Historical Society	10/10/2007; 5/14/2008	X		<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Property Name: Thomas Property

3. Location: 7777 State Road 18/151, Brigham, WI 53507

4. Use: Agricultural facility (barn)

5. Property type:

- Bridge
- Building
- Historic District
- Other: _____

6. Property Designations:

- National Historic Landmark (NHL)
- National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
- State Register of Historic Places
- Local Registry
- Tribal Registry

7. A Determination of Eligibility (DOE) has been prepared:

- No - Property is already on NRHP or NHL.
- Yes - DOE prepared.
- Other: _____

8. Describe the significance of the structures and/or buildings:

The Thomas Stone Barn is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and is an example of a stone barn building type built in 1881.

The barn was designed to store hay and house cattle and horses and still continues to operate today. The barn's character-defining features include quarry stone walls, round-arched drive through doorways and interior composition and fixtures have remained almost completely unaltered since the buildings construction. The Thomas Stone Barn is 100 feet by 40.5 feet with walls that are 21 inches thick.

The barn stands at the northern end of a 165 acre parcel of land that is largely planted to crops and some pasture. It is accessed by a gravel drive from US 18/151. Due to its size, setting and excellent integrity, the barn is a highly visible landmark in its vicinity; its unique construction and design distinguish it from all other farm buildings in its region.

9. In compliance with the requirements of Section 106, of the National Historic Preservation Act, the proposed project's effects on the historic property, (e.g., structure or building) have been evaluated in the following report, a copy of which is:

- In the project file, or
- Attached to this document:
 - Documentation for determination of no historic properties affected (Reported on the Section 106 Review Form).
 - Documentation for determination of no adverse or conditional no adverse effect to historic properties.
 - Documentation for Consultation about adverse effect(s). A Memorandum of Agreement has been completed.
 - No. Consultation about effects is continuing.
 - Yes, a copy of the MOA is attached to this document. Summarize MOA stipulations below:

10. Do FHWA requirements for Section 4(f) apply to the project's use of the historic property?

- No
 - Project is not federally funded.
 - No right-of-way or Permanent Limited Easements will be acquired from the property and the project will not substantially impair the characteristics that qualify the property for the NRHP.
 - Right-of-way will be acquired from the NRHP property but a *de minimus* finding has been proposed.
 - Other – Explain:
- Yes – Complete Factor Sheet B-8, Section 4(f) and 6(f) or other Unique Areas.

HISTORIC RESOURCES EVALUATION

Factor Sheet B-5

Alternative Preferred Alternative	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.2 Length of This Alternative 28.2
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

Section 106 Form or other documentation, with all necessary approvals, must be attached to the Environmental Document for all projects.

1. Parties contacted:

Parties Contacted	Date Contacted	Comments Received		
		No	Yes	Check if Attached
Dane County Historical Society	10//10/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Wisconsin State Historical Society	5/14/2008	X		<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Property Name: William Beat House

3. Location: 7621 Marshview Road, Verona, WI 53593

4. Use: House and barn

5. Property type:

- Bridge
- Building
- Historic District
- Other: _____

6. Property Designations:

- National Historic Landmark (NHL)
- National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) - Determined eligible for NRHP
- State Register of Historic Places
- Local Registry
- Tribal Registry

7. A Determination of Eligibility (DOE) has been prepared:

- No - Property is already on NRHP or NHL.
- Yes - DOE prepared.
- Other: _____

8. Describe the significance of the structures and/or buildings:

The William Beat House was determined significant for its representation of an intact Greek Revival residence.

The house is a two-story, front gabled, brick, Greek Revival house resting on a stone foundation. The appearance of the house is unchanged since it was determined eligible in 1989. It is a gabled building with a stone rubble foundation. Over a period of several decades, a number of additions were made to and around the barn including a chicken coop, a milk house, silos, and outbuildings.

9. In compliance with the requirements of Section 106, of the National Historic Preservation Act, the proposed project's effects on the historic property, (e.g., structure or building) have been evaluated in the following report, a copy of which is:

- In the project file, or
- Attached to this document:
 - Documentation for determination of no historic properties affected (Reported on the Section 106 Review Form).
 - Documentation for determination of no adverse or conditional no adverse effect to historic properties.
 - Documentation for Consultation about adverse effect(s). A Memorandum of Agreement has been completed.
 - No. Consultation about effects is continuing.

Yes, a copy of the MOA is attached to this document. Summarize MOA stipulations below:

10. Do FHWA requirements for Section 4(f) apply to the project's use of the historic property?

- No
 - Project is not federally funded.
 - No right-of-way or Permanent Limited Easements will be acquired from the property and the project will not substantially impair the characteristics that qualify the property for the NRHP.
 - Right-of-way will be acquired from the NRHP property but a *de minimus* finding has been proposed.
 - Other – Explain:
- Yes – Complete Factor Sheet B-8, Section 4(f) and 6(f) or other Unique Areas.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet B-6

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 miles Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
--	---

Preferred
 Yes No None identified

If there are any effects to an archaeological site and any American Indian Tribes express interest in the project, Factor Sheet B-7, the Cultural Resources Tribal Issues Factor Sheet must also be completed. Section 106 Form or other documentation, with all necessary approvals, must be attached to the Environmental Document for all projects.

1. Parties Contacted:

Parties Contacted	Date Contacted	Comments Received		
		No	Yes	Check if Attached
Lac Vieux Desert Band Of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians - Ketegitigaaning Ojibwe Nation	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Sac And Fox Of The Mississippi In Iowa	10/27/2007		X	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Appendix C7)
Menominee Indian Tribe Of Wisconsin	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Forest County Potawatomi Community Of Wisconsin	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council, Inc.	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Ho-Chunk Nation	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Red Cliff Band Of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians Of Wisconsin	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Bad River Band Of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians Of Wisconsin	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Sac And Fox Nation Of Missouri In Kansas And Nebraska	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic Preservation Officer Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Iowa Tribe Of Oklahoma	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Sac And Fox Nation Of Oklahoma	10/27/2007	X		<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Property Designations:

Note - All sites would be avoided. Determination of eligibility/status has not been made.

- National Historic Landmark
- National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)
- State Register of Historic Places
- Local Registry
- Tribal Registry

3. Sites Identified by record search or Phase I survey. Attach map to appendices depicting site(s)' approximate location within alternative:

Site #	Site Name (Field Number)	County	Description & Site Information (e.g., historic, prehistoric, village, campsite, etc.)	Site Recommended for Phase II Evaluation? Y/N	Site Avoided? Y/N
47IA0061	W-0322-05-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American Mining Site	N	Y
47IA0504	W-0322-06-2011	Iowa	Prehistoric with Nominal Historic Euro-American components	N	Y
47IA0488	W-0322-04-2008	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0487	W-0322-03-2008	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0506	W-0322-08-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
BIA0032	W-0322-11-2011	Iowa	Cemetery/Burial Site	N	Y
47IA0502	W-0322-02-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0508	W-0322-12-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0509	W-0322-14-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0489	W-0322-05-2008	Iowa	Prehistoric Lithic Scatter	N	Y
47IA0490	W-0322-07-2008	Iowa	Prehistoric Isolated Finds	N	Y
47IA0503	W-0322-04-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0507	W-0322-09-2011	Iowa	Historic Euro-American	N	Y
47IA0505	W-0322-07-2011	Iowa	Prehistoric with Nominal Historic Euro-American components	N	N (see #6 below)
BDA0018	None	Dane	Cemetery/Burial Site	N	Y
47DA0237/BD A0455	None	Dane	Cemetery/Burial Site	N	N (see #6 below)
47DA1385	W-0322-06-2008	Dane	Prehistoric Isolated Finds	N	Y

4. Sites evaluated by Phase II survey:

No sites are recommended for Phase II survey.

5. Do any sites identified in Phase I or II investigations (Question 3 and 4) involve human burials?

No

Yes

American Indian Burial:

Complete Factor Sheet B-7, Tribal Issues.

Euro-American Burial:

Documentation Attached:

Cemetery Name(s): _____

Consultation with Wisconsin Historical Society (Burial Sites Office and SHPO):

Dates: _____

Burials will not be affected:

Identify: 47DA0237/BDA0455; BDA0018; BIA0032

Burials will be affected:

Identify _____

Documentation attached:

Unknown Affiliation:

6. List Environmental Commitments to avoid impacts to sites listed as "Avoided" in Phases I and II, above (Also list on Basic Sheet 8, Environmental Commitments):

Additional Section 106 obligations and consultation will be required if and when final design for the relocation of County K (Section 3) onto new alignment proceeds and fill will be placed over site 47IA0505. (Construction of this part of the project may require some local cost-share funding, which the municipality is not able to guarantee at this time.) WisDOT will

compare the final design to the Section 106 evaluation completed for this EA and will request survey of outstanding areas at that time.

Given the recovery of cultural artifacts from shovel tests and the possibility for sub-surface features associated with mounds, an archeological monitor will be present during construction activities in the vicinity of the Springdale Mound Group (47DA0237/BDA0455).

7. Identify effects on those sites not avoided in question #4: None/does not apply.

Site # _____ (Complete questions below for each site listed in Question 4, above.)

List any commitments to avoid having an adverse effect. (Also list on the Environmental Commitments Basic Sheet)

- Yes, the adverse effect is unavoidable. Describe the adverse effect:
 - Do FHWA requirements for Section 4(f) apply to the project's use of the historic property?
 - No
 - Project is not Federally funded.
 - Other – Explain: _____
 - Yes - Complete Factor Sheet B-8, Section 4(f) 6(f) or Other Unique Areas (Form DT2077).
 - Property is eligible for NRHP and project will have adverse effect.
 - Other, Explain: _____
- Has Documentation for Consultation been prepared?
 - No
 - Yes - Complete Question 8

8. Has a Memorandum of Agreement been signed? None/does not apply.

No – Pending:
Explain - _____

Yes, attached:
Signatories and dates of signature:

- ACHP _____
- FHWA _____
- WHS _____
- American Indian Tribes _____

- WisDOT _____
- Other _____

Commitments:

- Data Recovery:
 - Yes Date plan accepted: _____
Prepared by _____
 - No
- Monitoring.
- Other: _____

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

Factor Sheet B-8

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

1. Property Name: Military Ridge State Trail (MRST)

2. Location: Iowa and Dane Counties

3. Ownership or Administration: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)

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:

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: See #9 for benefits.

See Appendix I – Section 4(f) De Minimis

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:

7. Describe the significance of the property:

Description and Location

The approximately 40-mile Military Ridge State Trail is located in southwestern Wisconsin in Iowa and Dane counties. The route connects the City of Fitchburg and the City of Dodgeville. The trail serves the incorporated communities of Dodgeville, Ridgeway, Barneveld, Blue Mounds, Mount Horeb, Verona and Fitchburg, and the towns of Dodgeville, Ridgeway, Brigham, Blue Mounds, Springdale and Verona. Most of the trail follows the former Chicago and North Western Railroad corridor, which has a grade of two to five percent. Between the City of Dodgeville and the Village of Mount Horeb it runs along the top of the Military Ridge, the divide between the Wisconsin River watershed to the north and the Pecatonica and Rock River watershed to the south. Between the Village of the Village Mount Horeb and the City of Fitchburg, the trail goes through the Sugar River Valley.

The majority of the trail (37.2 miles) is made up of crushed stone. The remaining portion (2.5 miles) is paved asphalt. There are several observation platforms adjacent to the trail for viewing wildlife and other natural features. In Ridgeway, the trail passes by a historic railroad depot.

Activities and Use

The fairly level grade and smooth limestone and asphalt surfaces make the trail suitable for bicyclists, walkers and joggers. The 2.5-mile section between Fitchburg and Verona has been paved with asphalt suitable for in-line skating. In the winter months, the trail can be used by snowmobiles and cross country skiers.

Access and Adjacent Trails

Vehicle parking lots for trail access are located in or near the following communities: City of Verona; Riley (north of project area); Village of Mount Horeb; Village of Blue Mounds, Village of Barneveld, and City of Dodgeville.

The MRST is near the connection of the Capital City and Badger state trails in Fitchburg, to the east of the project area. There is also a 6-mile trail, the Shake Rag Trail, along US Highway 151 between Dodgeville and Mineral Point. An access trail extends to Governor Dodge State Park, located near County Z, north of the City of Dodgeville.

Ownership and Management

The MRST is owned and managed by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Friends of the Military Ridge State Trail, a volunteer-led group, assists in promoting trail usage.

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.)**

The Proposed Action would require the relocation of 4.15 miles of the Military Ridge State Trail in five separate locations in the Towns of Dodgeville, Ridgeway, Brigham and Blue Mounds and the Village of Barneveld. Pages 1 through 4 of Exhibit 3 shows the proposed relocations.

- b. Discuss the following alternatives and describe whether they are feasible and prudent and why:
 1. Do nothing alternative.

The No Action Alternative would include performing routine maintenance on US 18/151 and would avoid all impacts to the MRST. This alternative would not address safety and operational issues at intersections within the project area. At-grade access along expressway corridors can lead to increased safety issues as traffic volumes increase over time. As gaps in traffic for entering and crossing vehicles decrease, the incidence of high risk driver behavior can increase.

The No Action Alternative does not support the function of a Connections 2030 backbone route to provide safe and efficient regional mobility and economic vitality. For this reason, the No Action Alternative does not fulfill the project purpose and need.

2. Improvement without using the 4(f) lands.

This alternative would include locating the proposed improvements (interchange, over/underpass, and/or local road) in a new alignment or location which would avoid impacts to the MRST. In areas where the trail is affected it lies adjacent to US 18/151. Thus, it would be difficult to avoid impacts to the trail; alternatives that would avoid trail

impacts would not be prudent because the alternate location of the interchanges, over/underpasses, local roads and even the mainline of US 18/151 would have substantial effects on other resources and, in some cases, the trail users experience would still be impacted due to proximity of the existing trail to proposed improvements.

3. Alternatives on new location.

This alternative would be similar to #2 described above. Developing an alternative for US 18/151 interchanges and grade separated crossings on new alignment would not be prudent due to associated high cost and substantial effects on other resources in the area.

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:

In general, the following mitigation measures would be implemented:

- Use of berms or vegetation will provide screening between proposed local roads and the trail.
- Snowmobile users who currently cross US 18/151 at grade to access the MRST will benefit from having grade separated locations to cross.
- Trail users who wish to cross US 18/151 to access local routes south of US 18/151 will have options for grade separated crossings.
- The existing at-grade crossing at Erbe Road will be moved to the proposed bridge over Erbe Road, resulting in a safer crossing.
- The existing crossing of Pikes Peak Road will be relocated slightly to provide better sight distance for crossing movements.
- Net reduction of one less at-grade crossing of a road.

In addition, WisDOT would follow the mitigation measures, as agreed upon with WDNR, for impacts to the MRST in Section 2. These include:

- The trail would be constructed to meet or exceed the Wisconsin Bicycle Facility Design Manual (FDM).
- The newly developed surface materials would be the same as the segment it is replacing.
- All trail intersections would be paved with bituminous asphalt 15 feet back from the road surface. This would help avoid erosion from occurring on the trail surface.
- All signage would be placed according to FDM and WDNR Snowmobile Signing Handbook.
- Berms and native vegetated landscaping as a visual buffer in selected locations would be implemented. These would be especially important in areas where the trail would be adjacent to a new frontage road.

The MRST would remain open during construction, using temporary paths as needed to ensure connectivity is maintained.

WisDOT would consult with WDNR prior to the final design and construction of the remaining sections that would impact the MRST. At that time, specific mitigation measures would be developed for each impacted section of MRST.

- 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 and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have consulted with the WDNR to resolve any potential adverse effects of the Proposed Action on the MRST. WDNR reviewed and commented upon early design concepts and approved the proposed Preliminary Design plans.

In a letter dated June 3, 2008, WDNR stated initial concerns with the possible aesthetic and environmental effects of relocating the trail near County T in the Village of Barneveld. The letter further states that trees and other natural features along this section of the trail should remain unless otherwise agreed upon. (Appendix C5)

In a letter dated October 28, 2009, WDNR confirmed that Land and Water Conservation (LAWCON) monies were used related to the trail. They stated that the National Park Service (NPS), along with WDNR would need to approve any trail relocations. WDNR also stated there may be additional concerns such as property acquisition, construction constraints, and trail safety issues related to the proposed new frontage road construction. (Appendix C5)

In a letter dated March 20, 2013, WDNR approved and outlined mitigation measures for the MRST relocation for Section 2 only – the first section proposed for construction. WisDOT would coordinate with WDNR during the final design/construction process in regards to mitigation measures for all subsequent sections that affect the MRST. WDNR would coordinate with NPS for final approvals of the MRST relocation. (Appendix C5)

Note: The public has been afforded an opportunity to review and comment on the effects of the project on the protected activities, features, and attributes of the MRST. The proposed relocation of portions of the trail were presented as part of WisDOT's Freeway Conversion Preferred Alternative at Public Information Meetings on July 17, 2012 and July 26, 2012. The MRST was identified on exhibits shown at the PIMs. No objections to the proposal to relocate portions of the trail were received at those meetings or at earlier meetings.

WETLANDS EVALUATION

Factor Sheet C-1

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B) Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
---	---

1. Describe Wetlands:

	Wetland 1		Wetland 2		Wetland 3	
Name (If known)						
Location County	Dane		Dane		Dane	
Location (Section-Township-Range)	S20 T6N R8E		S20 T6N R8E		S20 T6N R8E	
Location Map	See Exhibit 3, Map 6		See Exhibit 3, Map 6		See Exhibit 3, Map 6	
Wetland Type(s)¹	E2K		E2Hg		E2Hw	
Total Wetland Loss	Acres 0.64		Acres 0.23		Acres 0.63	
Wetland is: (Check all that apply)²	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated from stream, lake or other surface water body 		x		x		x
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not contiguous (in contact with) a stream, lake, or other water body, but within 5-year floodplain 	x		x		x	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If adjacent or contiguous, identify stream, lake or water body by Section-Township-Range 	Sugar River, S20 T6N R8E		Sugar River, S20 T6N R8E		Sugar River, S20 T6N R8E	

¹Use wetland types as specified in the "WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guideline, Table 3-C"

²If 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.

All are Emergent/wet meadow wetlands:

- E2K (wet soil, palustrine)
- E2Hg (standing water, palustrine; grazed)
- E2Hw (standing water, floodplain complex)

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

- No
 Yes:
 - Advanced Identification Program (ADID) Wetlands
 - Other – Describe: _____

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

The Proposed Action would affect the wetlands listed above due to the construction of auxiliary lanes on both sides of the highway from approximately County G to the County MV interchange. Approximately 1.5 acres of wetland would be filled.

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

Expected wildlife and waterfowl in the wetland areas near the Proposed Action may include: various reptiles and amphibians, white-tailed deer; rabbits, pheasant, muskrat, beaver, mink, weasel, raccoon, skunk, fox, coyote, duck, and mallard. In addition, songbirds, badger and woodchuck may be present.

5. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Wetland Policy:

- Not Applicable - Explain

- Individual Wetland Finding Required - Summarize why there are no practicable alternatives to the use of the wetland.

The construction of auxiliary lanes in this location is needed to improve safety and operations rather than add traffic capacity. The auxiliary lanes would be constructed in order to reduce weaving between vehicles entering and exiting US 18/151 at the County G and West Verona Avenue exits, which are less than 1 mile apart. Many wetlands are present in this area on both sides of the highway. Shifting the roadway to the north or south to accommodate auxiliary lanes would not be feasible as it would also have effects on wetlands, to a greater extent than the Proposed Action.

- 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 Impact Evaluation.
- Factor Sheet D-5, Stormwater Impact 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 1.5

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:

- Non-Reporting GP
- Provisional GP
- Provisional LOP
- Programmatic GP

Expiration date of 404 Permit, if known _____

8. 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.

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

- Not applicable.
- Required: Submitted on: Will be submitted closer to the time of construction

Status of PCN

USACE has made the following determination on: (Date)

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

9. 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.:

The Proposed Action uses existing roadway alignments to determine improvements. Shifting the roadway in this area to the north or south to accommodate auxiliary lanes could affect a greater amount of wetlands (and other natural and cultural) resources. In this area, wetlands are present on both sides of the roadway.

2. Indicate the total area of wetlands avoided:
Acres: 0

B. Minimize the amount of wetlands affected:

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

Steepening of side slopes and use of beam guard.

2. Indicate the total area of wetlands saved through minimization:
Acres: 0.1 acres

10. Compensation for Unavoidable Wetland Loss:

According to Section 401 (b) (1), of the Clean Water Act, unavoidable wetland losses must be mitigated on-site, if possible. If no on-site opportunities exist, near/off-site wetland compensation sites must be considered. If neither exists, the losses may be debited to an existing wetland mitigation bank site.

The Proposed Action would only affect wetlands located in Section 6. The determination of wetland compensation would be made at the time of final design/construction of that section. Wetlands would be mitigated per the WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guideline.

11. If on-site compensation is proposed, describe how a search for a compensation site was conducted:

The determination of wetland compensation would be made at the time of final design/construction of Section 6.

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

Wetlands would be delineated by WisDOT/WDNR closer to final design/construction to determine the exact amount and location of wetlands affected by the Proposed Action. Following that determination, a wetland mitigation plan would be developed to document the following:

- The impacted wetland acreage by wetland type
- The plan for onsite restoration and anticipated compensation acreage
- The proposal for debiting any remaining compensation acreage to a WisDOT wetland mitigation bank site in accordance with provisions of the WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guidelines

RIVERS, STREAMS AND FLOODPLAINS EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet C-2

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

1. **Stream Name: East Branch of Pecatonica River** (Iowa County near County K, Exhibit 3, Map 3 of 6)

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

- Unknown
- Warm water
- Cold water

If trout stream, identify trout stream classification: Class II Trout Stream

- Wild and Scenic River

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

The Sugar-Pecatonica River basin drains approximately 1,860 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: Unknown

C. Vegetation in Stream

- Absent
- Present - If known describe: Unknown

D. Identify Aquatic Species Present:

According to WDNR resources, aquatic species include brown trout and walleye.

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

According to WDNR, Water quality in the Sugar-Pecatonica River basin is generally fair to good.

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

- No
- Yes - List: _____

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

- Not Applicable

Note: Presence of migratory bird nests would be determined closer to the time of construction.

- None identified
- Yes – Identify Bird Species present
Estimated number of nests is:

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

- Not Applicable
- Yes

No - Describe mitigation measures:

8. Describe land adjacent to stream:

Land use within the vicinity of the East Branch of the Pecatonica River is predominantly agricultural and open space with some scattered residential and commercial uses.

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

There are approximately five unnamed tributaries within 0.8 kilometers (1/2 mile) of the subject site.

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:

Work in this area would include installation of new culverts to accommodate the relocation of County K and a driveway that connects to County K. Work in this area could also include excavation to make changes to sub-grade, grade and drainage. Work would also include changes to base course, concrete/asphaltic pavements, and adjustment to utilities.

All in-water construction activity would be avoided from March 1 to June 15 to protect endemic fish populations during spawning activities. Construction activities would also allow for an unobstructed passageway through the area at this location to allow for continuous fish movements.

The Proposed Action is not within the 100-year floodplain and would be a longitudinal crossing of the stream.

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:

New construction would comply with the National Flood Insurance Program, NR 116 and Executive Order 73. New construction would be planned and constructed in such a way as to comply with local floodplain development plans. Culverts will be sized to prevent creation of new backwater.

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

Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM maps) were provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and were used in reference to the project area. In addition, local governments were coordinated with regarding the project.

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:

There are no foreseen effects to floodplains.

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:

Impacts to water quality could occur during construction in the form of temporary disturbance of the stream bed, and this could disrupt the habitat temporarily. Plants, fish and wildlife would be expected to become re-established relatively quickly after completion of the work.

16. Are measures proposed to enhance beneficial effects?

- No
- Yes. Describe: _____

Coordination with WDNR will occur at the time of final design to determine if there are any actions to be taken to enhance beneficial effects. The stream may benefit overall from the relocation of County K and the conversion of existing County K to a dead-end road. This will reduce the amount of traffic on the road with a subsequent reduction in the amount of pollutant runoff from vehicles.

WisDOT, through TRANS 401 and Cooperative Agreement, would comply with the substantive permit requirements of Chapter 147 Wis. Stats. Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Additionally, erosion control measures implemented during construction would conform to the standard specifications listed in WisDOT's Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction and the Wisconsin Storm Water Management Technical Standards.

Some of the construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) could include silt fence, bale checks, temporary sediment basins, rock construction driveways, inlet protection, and dust abatement. Grass swales, vegetated filter strips, buffer zones, and detention basins incorporating infiltration could be incorporated as BMP's into the design of the project to manage storm water runoff and maintain/improve water quality on a permanent basis.

Specific measures are also discussed in Erosion Control and Storm water Management Factor Sheets.

RIVERS, STREAMS AND FLOODPLAINS EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet C-2

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 miles Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

1. **Stream Name:** Sugar River (east of County G, Exhibit 3, Map 6 of 6)

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

- Unknown
- Warm water
- Cold water

If trout stream, identify trout stream classification: Class II Trout Stream

- Wild and Scenic River

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

The Sugar River is located in the Upper Sugar River (USR) Watershed. The USR is approximately 15,000 acres.

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: Unknown

C. Vegetation in Stream

- Absent
- Present - If known describe: Unknown

D. Identify Aquatic Species Present:

According to WDNR resources, aquatic species present include northern pike, walleye, and brown trout.

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

Water quality in the river is considered generally good. Urban and agriculture sources of polluted runoff are likely sources of water quality problems that do exist to some extent. Runoff from farm fields, streets and parking lots, construction sites, and barnyards, intense grazing adjacent to the stream are adding sediments and pollutants to the stream and contribute to degrading habitat and water quality.

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

- No (Note: Delisted in 2002)
- Yes

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

- Not Applicable
- None identified

Note: Presence of migratory bird nests would be determined closer to the time of construction.

- Yes – Identify Bird Species present
Estimated number of nests is:

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

- Not Applicable
 Yes
 No - Describe mitigation measures:

8. Describe land adjacent to stream:

The Sugar River in the vicinity of US 18/151 is within the 110-acre Sugar River Wetlands Natural Area (SRWNA). These land are owned by the Department of Natural Resources and are undeveloped. Land use adjacent to the SRWNA is predominantly agricultural and open space with some scattered rural residential uses.

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

Six unnamed tributaries are located within 0.8 kilometers of the project site. The Slapback Creek, Badger Mill Creek, and Henry Creek are tributaries to the USR but are not within 0.8 kilometers of the project site.

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:

The Proposed Action would add an auxiliary lane on both sides of the highway in this area. These additional lanes would cross the Sugar River in the same location where the highway currently crosses the river. See Exhibit 3, Map 6 of 6.

Work in this area would include expanding the existing steel girder bridge to accommodate the auxiliary lanes. The Proposed Action is within the 100-year floodplain and is a crossing of the stream. The bridge currently has heavy rip rap on the slopes and this would be extended to the expansion area.

All in-water construction activity would be avoided from March 1 to June 15 to protect endemic fish populations during spawning activities. Construction activities would also allow for an unobstructed passageway through the area at this location to allow for continuous fish movements.

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:

New construction would comply with the National Flood Insurance Program, NR 116 and Executive Order 73. New construction would be planned and constructed in such a way as to comply with local floodplain development plans. Culverts will be sized to prevent creation of new backwater.

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

Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM maps) were provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and were used in reference to the project area. In addition, local governments were coordinated with regarding the project.

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:

The Proposed Action would result in the construction of one auxiliary lane on each side of the highway, over the Sugar River. There are floodplains on both sides of the highway. The additional auxiliary lanes would result in an encroachment on the floodplains. The adjacent wetlands are within the Sugar River Wetland Natural Area and are undeveloped.

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:

Impacts to water quality could occur during construction in the form of temporary disturbance of the stream banks, and this could disrupt the habitat temporarily. Plants, fish and wildlife would be expected to become re-established relatively quickly after completion of the work.

After establishment of permanent vegetation, the primary impact to water quality would come from storm water runoff from the pavement surface. Deicing agents used on the pavement surface could have an effect on the vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the pavement surface.

16. Are measures proposed to enhance beneficial effects?

- No
- Yes.

WisDOT, through TRANS 401 and Cooperative Agreement, would comply with the substantive permit requirements of Chapter 147 Wis. Stats. Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Additionally, erosion control measures implemented during construction would conform to the standard specifications listed in WisDOT's Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction and the Wisconsin Storm Water Management Technical Standards.

Some of the construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) could include silt fence, bale checks, temporary sediment basins, and detention basins incorporating infiltration could be incorporated as BMP's into the design of the project to manage storm water runoff and maintain/improve water quality on a permanent basis.

Specific measures are also discussed in Erosion Control and Storm Water Management Factor Sheets.

UPLAND WILDLIFE AND HABITAT EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet C-5

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 miles Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified	

1. Proposed Work in Upland Areas:

A. Describe the nature of proposed work in the upland habitat area (e.g., grading, clearing, grubbing, etc.):

The Proposed Action would require a total of approximately 32 acres of uplands.

Effects from the Proposed Action on upland habitats would result from the construction of both local new road segments and the four proposed interchanges and seven overpasses/underpasses areas throughout the corridor. The work would include grubbing, clearing, and grading of the above-discussed upland habitats and would result in permanent conversion of these upland areas to road/highway facilities and right-of-way vegetation.

2. Vegetation/Habitat:

A. Give a brief description of the upland habitat area. Include prominent plant community(ies) at the project site (list vegetation with a brief description of each community type if more than one present).

Uplands are areas affected in the corridor which are not developed, cropped or used for pasture. They can include wooded areas, and parcels that were once cropped and later converted to residential uses or allowed to go fallow.

The Southwest Wisconsin Grassland and Stream Conservation Area (SWGSCA) is a 50,000+ acre grassland landscape in Dane and Iowa Counties which lies within the project area, south of US 18/151 for the most part. The SWGSCA includes working farms and remnants of pre-settlement prairie with rare plants, herptiles and birds. This inter-agency initiative includes the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Farm Service Agency and several local conservation groups. The agency/organizational partners involved work with private landowners to preserve these remnants by purchasing easements so that the lands are not developed, or assisting the landowners to apply easements to their own property.

Many prairie and grassland remnants located within the study area, are in various stages of protection from state and local groups. Some of these same habitat types exist on the north side of US 18/151 but to a lesser degree.

No prairie remnants have been identified as being affected by the Proposed Action.

B. Will the project result in changes in the vegetative cover of the roadside?

The Proposed Action would result in disturbances to existing vegetative cover in the areas where proposed interchanges, over/underpasses and new local road connections would be constructed. In areas proposed for construction where invasive species currently exist, these plants will be removed and replaced with non-invasive vegetative cover.

3. Wildlife:

A. Identify and describe any observed or expected wildlife associations with the plant community(ies) listed in question #1:

Wildlife associated with the project corridors land types include a variety of game and non-game species of birds, mammals, fish, reptiles and amphibians that typically live in Dane and Iowa Counties. Common types of wildlife include whitetail deer, wild turkeys, wolf, raccoon, squirrels, songbirds, waterfowl and raptors. In addition, migrating birds use habitat in the corridor for food, shelter, and resting stops during seasonal migration.

B. Identify and describe any known wildlife or bird use areas or movement corridors that will be severed or affected by the Proposed Action:

Most of the lands affected by the project are in agricultural use, either cropped or in pasture. To the degree possible, uplands were identified through viewing of aerial mapping. One possible upland area that will be severed is the lands in the vicinity of the relocated County K (Exhibit 3, page 3)

No significant wildlife movement corridors have been identified in the project area, which could be affected by the Proposed Action or that could benefit from wildlife protection design treatments. Wildlife movement takes place throughout the study corridor, and will likely continue to do so once the Proposed Action is implemented.

C. Discuss other direct impacts on wildlife and estimate significance:

Habitat loss would occur in those areas where new facilities such as local roadways, overpasses, or interchanges are proposed to be constructed. Most of the new facilities are proposed to be located as close to US 18/151 as possible, while adhering to WisDOT design standards. Direct impacts to wildlife in the form of habitat loss and/or fragmentation are expected to be minimal as most habitat areas in the US 18/151 corridor are already fragmented or converted to cropland. As can be seen in Exhibit 3, large areas of open land will remain. Sufficient upland areas will remain available for nesting and foraging habitat.

D. Identify and discuss any probable indirect impacts on wildlife in the area expected due to the project:

At this time there are numerous at-grade intersections on US 18/151 in the study area. At present, development could occur at these intersections if permitted under the land use authority granted to local governments in the area. The Proposed Action would reduce the number of at-grade intersections on US 18/151, in some cases removing an intersection altogether or by replacing it with either an interchange or over/underpass. Development which might have located at these intersections likely would not if the Proposed Action is approved. Any potential new commercial or industrial development is likely to locate near the locations where new interchanges are planned, at existing interchanges, or in the incorporated areas. It is possible that further habitat loss may occur if the construction of an interchange spurs commercial or residential development in the immediate vicinity, but there is no reason to believe that the freeway conversion project itself would attract new development other than that which might occur if the current intersections with US 18/151 remain as they are today.

The issue of indirect impacts is discussed in more detail in Appendix H.

E. Describe measures to avoid and/or minimize adverse effects or to enhance beneficial effects:

In western Dane County, the ability to connect properties south of US 18/151 to County ID via the use of overpasses reduces the upland impacts that would occur without them because additional frontage roads would be needed instead (see Exhibit 3, page 4). In Iowa County, which lacks any routes parallel to the highway, the proposed extension of County ID is located to run as close to US 18/151 as possible so as to minimize severing large parcels of open land. Immediately west of Verona, the proposed frontage road on the south side of the highway is also located as close to the highway as is feasible.

WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of controlling invasive crown vetch and wild parsnip to prevent further spread of these species during construction and to plan for long-term control of these species. In areas proposed for construction where these species exist, they will be removed and replaced with non-invasive vegetation types. WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR prior to construction on the issue of using native seeding in areas of construction where prairie restoration efforts have occurred or are underway, or where prairie remnants exist.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet C-7

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 miles Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
--	---

Preferred
 Yes No None identified

1. Are there any known threatened or endangered species in the vicinity of the project?

- None identified
 Yes - Identify the species and indicate its status on Federal or State lists: A search of the Natural Heritage Inventory (NHI) database for the project area was performed. The NHI database contains listings of 8 endangered species, 12 threatened species, and 20 species of special concern. It should be noted that WDNR stated that the only known species directly in the project area is the *Gentiana alba* (yellow gentian).

Scientific Name	Common Name	State Status
<i>Ammodramus Heslowii</i>	Henslow's Sparrow	Threatened
<i>Vireo Belli</i>	Bells' Vireo	Threatened
<i>Emydoidea Blandingii</i>	Blanding's Turtle	Threatened
<i>Agalinis Gattingeri</i>	Roundstem Foxglove	Threatened
<i>Asclepias Lanuginosa</i>	Woolly Milkweed	Threatened
<i>Cacalia Tuberosa</i>	Prairie Indian Plantain	Threatened
<i>Carex Prasina</i>	Drooping Sedge	Threatened
<i>Cirsium Hillii</i>	Hill's Thistle	Threatened
<i>Cypripedium Candidum</i>	Small White Lady's-Slipper	Threatened
<i>Gentiana Alba</i>	Yellow Gentain	Threatened
<i>Parthenium Integrifolium</i>	American Fever-Few	Threatened
<i>Polytaenia Nuttallii</i>	Prairie Parsley	Threatened
<i>Ammodramus Savannarum</i>	Grasshopper Sparrow	Special Concern (fully protected)
<i>Bartramia Longicauda</i>	Upland Sandpiper	Special Concern (fully protected)
<i>Melanerpes Erythrocephalus</i>	Red-Headed Woodpecker	Special Concern (fully protected)
<i>Sturnella Neglecta</i>	Western meadowlark	Special Concern (fully protected)
<i>Clinostomus Elongatus</i>	Redside Dace	Special Concern (fully protected)
<i>Pituophis Catenifer Sayi</i>	Bullsnake	Special Concern (fully protected)
<i>Archilestes Grandis</i>	Great Spreadwing	Special Concern (not protected)
<i>Hesperia Leonardus Leonardus</i>	Leonard's Skipper	Special Concern (not protected)
<i>Carex Richardsonii</i>	Richardson Sedge	Special Concern
<i>Clematis Occidentalis</i>	Purple Clematis	Special Concern
<i>Houstonia Caerulea</i>	Innocence	Special Concern
<i>Jeffersonia Diphylla</i>	Twinleaf	Special Concern
<i>Lespedeza Violacea</i>	Violet Bush-Clover	Special Concern
<i>Lithospermum Latifolium</i>	American Gromwell	Special Concern
<i>Napaea Dioica</i>	Glade Mallow	Special Concern
<i>Onosmodium Molle</i>	Marbleseed	Special Concern
<i>Orobanche Uniflora</i>	One-Flowered Broomrape	Special Concern
<i>Panicum Wilcoxianum</i>	Wilcox Panic Grass	Special Concern
<i>Pediomelum Esculentum</i>	Pomme-De-Prairie	Special Concern
<i>Phegopteris Hexagonoptera</i>	Broad Beech Fern	Special Concern
<i>Lanius Ludovicianus</i>	Loggerhead Shrike	Endangered
<i>Noturus Exilis</i>	Slender Madtom	Endangered
<i>Acris Creptans Blanchardi</i>	Blanchard's Cricket Frog	Endangered
<i>Aflexia Rubranura</i>	Red-Tailed Prairie Leafhopper	Endangered
<i>Asclepias Purpurascens</i>	Purple Milkweed	Endangered
<i>Carex Schweinitzii</i>	Schweinitz's Sedge	Endangered
<i>Lespedeza Leptostachya</i>	Prairie Bush-Clover	*Endangered

* Federal Listed Threatened

2. Explain How a Species Is or Is Not Affected by the Action:

Species Not Affected:

Species Affected:

WDNR noted in a letter dated October 28, 2009, that the state threatened plant species, *Gentiana alba* (yellow gentian), is located in Section 1 of the Proposed Action, near the proposed County Y interchange. Effects to this species are unavoidable. As such, WisDOT would coordinate with WDNR to find an appropriate relocation site for any yellow gentian plants that would be in the construction zone.

3. Describe Coordination:

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service:

Has Section 7 coordination been completed?

No. Further coordination with USFWS will occur closer to the time of construction.

Yes Describe mitigation required to protect the federally listed endangered species:

WDNR

Has coordination with DNR been completed?

No

Yes - Describe mitigation required to protect the state-listed species:

As mentioned in #2, above, WisDOT would coordinate with WDNR during the detailed design stage to locate an appropriate site to move affected yellow gentian plants.

CONSTRUCTION STAGE SOUND QUALITY EVALUATION

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Factor Sheet D-2

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway: 28.8 miles Length of This Alternative: 28.8
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:

The adjacent land use is primarily agricultural and open space. No schools or libraries are located on or directly adjacent to the project corridor. Some residential home and/or property owners located directly on or adjacent to the corridor may be affected by noise during construction. Those homes in close proximity to the proposed new or modified intersections could expect to be the most affected. The effect is anticipated to be localized, temporary and transient in nature.

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:

The noise generated by construction equipment will vary greatly, depending on equipment type/model/make, duration of operation and specific type of work effort. However, typical noise levels may occur in the 67 to 107 dBA range at a distance of 50 feet.

Figure 1 on the next page shows typical noise levels for a variety of construction equipment. 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 10 P.M. until 6 A.M.
- 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:

To reduce the potential impact of construction noise, the special provisions for this project will require that motorized equipment shall be operated in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations relating to noise levels permissible within and adjacent to the project construction site. All motorized construction equipment will be required to have mufflers constructed in accordance with the equipment manufacturer's specifications or a system of equivalent noise reducing capacity. It will also be required that mufflers and exhaust systems be maintained in good working condition, free from leaks and holes.

FIGURE 1, CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT SOUND LEVELS

The types of construction equipment that are likely to be used on the project along with the corresponding maximum level allowed by the USEPA in decibels (dBA) at 50 ft. (15.2 m) from specific machines are listed below. Data was estimated from Figure 2-36 of the Report to the President and Congress on Noise, prepared by USEPA, February, 1972.

<u>Earthmoving</u>	<u>Approx. Max. dBA Allowed</u>
Compactors (Rollers)	71 – 75
Front Loaders	74 – 86
Backhoes	72 – 94
Tractors	77 – 97
Scrapers, Graders	80 – 84
Pavers	86 – 89
Trucks	82 – 94
<u>Materials Handling</u>	<u>Approx. Max. dBA Allowed</u>
Concrete Mixers	75 – 88
Concrete Pumps	82 – 85
Cranes (Moveable)	75 – 88
Cranes (Derrick)	86 – 88
<u>Stationary</u>	<u>Approx. Max. dBA Allowed</u>
Pumps	68 – 72
Generators	72 – 83
Compressors	76 – 87
<u>Impact Equipment</u>	<u>Approx. Max. dBA Allowed</u>
Pneumatic Wrenches	82 – 88
Jack Hammers and Rock Drills	81 – 98
Impact Pile Drivers (Peaks)	93 – 106
<u>Other</u>	<u>Approx. Max. dBA Allowed</u>
Vibrator	68 – 82
Saws	72 – 83

TRAFFIC NOISE EVALUATION

Factor Sheet D-3

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8 miles
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None Identified	

1. Need for Noise Analysis:

- A. Is the proposed action considered a Type I project? (A Type I project is defined as a project that involves construction of a roadway on new location or the physical alteration of an existing highway which substantially changes either the horizontal or vertical alignment or increases the number of through-traffic lanes).
- No – Complete only Factor Sheet D-2, Construction Stage Sound Quality Impact Evaluation.
 Yes – Complete Factor Sheet D-2, Construction Stage Sound Quality Impact Evaluation, and the rest of this sheet.

2. Traffic Data:

- A. 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)	%

- B. Identify and describe the noise analysis technique or program used to identify existing and future sound levels: (See attached receptor location map as Exhibit 5). A receptor location map must be included with this document.

The Federal Highway Administration's Traffic Noise Model (TNM), version 2.5 was used to predict existing and future sound levels near interchanges and along select new local roadways included in the US 18/151 Freeway Conversion project. The interchanges and new local roadways are in the area from the County Y/YZ interchange in the west portion of the corridor, to the auxiliary lanes to the west of Verona, WI on the east portion of the corridor.

- C. Identify sensitive receptors, e.g., schools, libraries, hospitals, residences, etc. potentially affected by traffic sound: (See attached receptor location map – Exhibit 5).

The US 18/151 Freeway Conversion project is along a 28.8-mile, predominantly rural corridor. There are an estimated 155 buildings that can be described as individual rural residences. They are mostly located in low density rural subdivisions, are part of a farming operation or as part of a business along the corridor. Representative receptors where noise levels were predicted are included on Exhibit 5. The only area identified with receptors that would be impacted by noise is in the vicinity of the proposed auxiliary lanes area on the far east portion of the US 18/151 corridor.

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

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

- E. 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.

- 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:

As indicated in the table below, with the exception of the area near the proposed auxiliary lanes at the far east portion of the corridor, TNM model predicted noise levels at representative receptors along the US 18/151 corridor would not exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) as specified in TRANS 405, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Construction of noise barriers was investigated for all noise impacted receptors along the project. Receptors in the auxiliary lanes portion of the corridor, where noise impacts were noted, are single, isolated homes or businesses. Due to the low density of homes along the US 18/151 corridor in the auxiliary lanes portion of the US 18/151 corridor (represented by REC #16) and the high cost of effective abatement, implementation of noise abatement is not allowed because the cost of the abatement measure would not be reasonable per TRANS 405.04.

See Appendix J for the Noise Notification Letters.

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} ¹ (dBA)			Impact Evaluation		
			Noise Abatement Criteria ² (NAC)	Future Sound Level	Existing Sound Level	Difference in Future and Existing Sound Levels (Col. e minus Col. f)	Difference in Future Sound Levels and Noise Abatement Criteria (Col. e minus Col. d)	Impact ³ or No Impact
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
Iowa County Y/YZ Interchange Area								
REC 1	390	2 residences	67	60	59	1	-7	N
REC 2	410	5 residences	67	52	48	4	-15	N
Iowa County BB Interchange Area								
REC 3	260	2 residences 2 business	67 72	53	51	2	-14 -19	N N
REC 4	250	none	67	50	48	2	-17	N
REC 5	180	3 residences 1 business	67 72	58	56	2	-9 -14	N N
Iowa County HHH Interchange Area								
REC 6	75	4 residences 2 businesses	67 72	58	51	7	-9 -14	N N
REC 7	585	2 residences 2 businesses	67 72	53	46	7	-14 -19	N N
REC 8	385	1 residence 1 business	67 72	59	57	2	-8 -13	N N

TABLE CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

¹ Use whole numbers only.

² Insert the actual Noise Abatement Criteria from Wisconsin Administrative Code, Chapter Trans. 405.04, Table 1.

³ 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 Abatement Criteria ("approach" is defined as 1 dB less than the Noise Abatement Criteria, therefore an impact occurs when Column (h) is -1 db or greater). I = Impact, N = No Impact.

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}^4 (dBA)			Impact Evaluation		
			Noise Abatement Criteria ⁵ (NAC)	Future Sound Level	Existing Sound Level	Difference in Future and Existing Sound Levels (Col. e minus Col. f)	Difference in Future Sound Levels and Noise Abatement Criteria (Col. e minus Col. d)	Impact or No Impact
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)
Iowa County ID Extension								
REC 9	15	none	67	54	52	2	-7	N
Iowa County K Relocation								
REC 10	25	3 businesses	72	62	51	11	-10	N
REC 11	755	4 residences 1 businesses	67 72	44	42	2	-23 -28	N
Dane County F Interchange								
REC 12	15	2 businesses	72	68	68	0	-4	N
REC 13	430	none	67	55	53	2	-12	N
Springdale/Verona Frontage Road Area								
REC 14	380	1 business	72	58	56	2	-14	N
REC 15	240	1 residence 1 business	67 72	51	47	4	-16 -21	N N
US 18/151 Auxiliary Lanes								
REC 16	180	2 businesses 2 residences	72 67	71	69	2 2	-1 +4	I I

⁴ Use whole numbers only.

⁵ Insert the actual Noise Abatement Criteria from Wisconsin Administrative Code, Chapter Trans. 405.04, Table 1.

STORMWATER EVALUATION

Factor Sheet D-5

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8
--	---

Preferred
 Yes No None identified

1. **Indicate whether the affected area may cause a discharge or will discharge to the waters of the state (Trans 401.03).** Special consideration should be given to areas that are sensitive to water quality degradation. 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 _____

2. **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. _____
 - Areas of groundwater recharge
 - Overland flow/runoff
 - High velocity flows
 - Impaired waterway
 - Exceptional/outstanding resource waters

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

Guidelines and regulations for highway project stormwater management include the WisDOT Facilities Development Manual, Chapter 10, Erosion Control and Storm Water Quality; Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter TRANS 401, Construction Site Erosion Control and Storm Water Management Procedures for Department Actions; and the WisDOT/WDNR Cooperative Agreement-Memorandum of Understanding on Erosion Control and Storm Water Management. Coordination with WDNR would also occur closer to design/construction for compliance with TRANS 401 and the WisDOT/WDNR Cooperative Agreement.

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

Water quality certification from WDNR and applicable USACE permits would be applied for as required for discharge and fill into U.S. inland waters. An Erosion Control Implementation Plan (ECIP) would be prepared by the contractor and approved by WisDOT. Prior to construction, WDNR would be given the opportunity to review the ECIP and comment.

5. **Identify the stormwater management measures to be utilized.**

- Swale treatment (parallel to flow) Trans 401.106(10)
- Vegetated filter strips (perpendicular to flow)
- Constructed storm water wetlands
- Buffer areas – Trans 401.106(6)
Describe - _____
- In-line storm sewer treatment, such as catch basins, non-mechanical treatment systems.
- Detention/retention basins – Trans 401.106(6)(3)
- Distancing outfalls from waterway edge
- Infiltration – Trans 401.106(5)
- Other

6. 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 _____

Yes - Discuss results _____

7. 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.

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. (Village of Barneveld)

8. Has the effect on downstream properties been considered?

No

Yes - Coordination will occur during final design

9. Are there any property acquisitions required for storm water management purposes?

No

Yes - Complete the following:

Safety measures, such as fencing are not needed for potential conflicts with existing and expected surrounding land use.

Safety measures are needed for potential conflicts with existing and expected surrounding land use. Describe:

Standard stormwater practices such as special ditching and retention ponds increase the width of the right of way footprint beyond what standard ditches require. They are expected to be used routinely for this project. The cross sections developed for this document and used to estimate the new right of way needs did not include them.

However, a less than maximum slope steepness and greater than likely overburden to bedrock depth were used, both of which result in a wider footprint. Between the two, the total amount of new right of way acreage estimated for this EA is expected to be reasonably accurate

EROSION CONTROL EVALUATION

Factor Sheet D-6

Alternative Preferred Alternative (1B, 2B, 3B, 4A, 6B)	Total Length of Center Line of Existing Roadway 28.8 Length of This Alternative 28.8
Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> None identified	

1. Provide a brief description of existing and proposed slopes in the project area, both perpendicular and longitudinal to the project. Include both existing and proposed slope length, percent slope and soil types.

Existing side slopes within the existing roadway generally vary from 2.5:1 to 6:1. The existing road profile contains slopes varying from one percent to eight percent. The proposed side slopes and road profiles slopes would be similar to the existing, with some variations. Ramp slopes will be as high as four percent.

2. Indicate all natural resources to be affected by the proposal that are sensitive to erosion, sedimentation, or waters of the state quality degradation and provide specific recommendations on the level of protection needed.

- No - there are no sensitive resources affected by the proposal.
 Yes - Sensitive resources exist in or adjacent to the area affected by the project.

- River/stream
- Lake
- Wetland
- Endangered species habitat
- Other - Describe _____

3. Are there circumstances requiring additional or special consideration?

- No - Additional or special circumstances are not present.
 Yes - Additional or special circumstances exist. Indicate all that are present.
- Areas of groundwater discharge
 - Overland flow/runoff
 - Long or steep cut or fill slopes
 - Areas of groundwater recharge (fractured bedrock, wetlands, streams)
 - Other - Describe any unique or atypical erosion control measures to be used to manage additional or special circumstances _____

4. Describe overall erosion control strategy to minimize adverse effects and/or enhance beneficial effects.

As described in Factor Sheet D-5, Stormwater Evaluation, coordination with WDNR would occur closer to final design/construction for compliance with TRANS 401 and the WisDOT/WDNR Cooperative Agreement.

Temporary and permanent erosion control methods may include but are not limited to:

- Silt fence and/or silt screen at the toe of fill slopes to avoid accumulation in wetland or undisturbed areas.
- Erosion mat for sheet flow conditions on long fill slopes adjacent to wetland areas.
- Inlet protection measures at all crossing culvert and area drains as required.
- Temporary ditch checks, erosion mat and rip rap would be used as appropriate for reducing particle transmission and sedimentation along swale drainage and ditches.
- Permanent seed or sod would be used on fished topsoil surfaces
- WisDOT would make efforts to design interchanges so that any runoff from the interchanges would be contained within the interchange area via runoff basins and directed ditching.

Final determination of these measures would be made closer to final design/construction.

5. Erosion control measures reached consensus with the appropriate authorities as indicated below:

- WisDNR
- County Land Conservation Department
- American Indian Tribe
- US Army Corps of Engineers

Note: All erosion control measures (i.e., the Erosion Control Plan) shall be coordinated through the WisDOT-WisDNR liaison process and TRANS 401 except when Tribal lands of American Indian Tribes are involved. WisDNR's concurrence is not forthcoming without an Erosion Control Plan. In addition, TRANS 401 requires the contractor to prepare an Erosion Control Implementation Plan (ECIP), which identifies timing and staging of the project's erosion control measures. The ECIP should be submitted to the WisDNR and to WisDOT 14 days prior to the preconstruction conference (Trans401.08(1)) and must be approved by WisDOT before implementation. On Tribal lands, coordination for 402 (erosion) concerns are either to be coordinated with the tribe affected or with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA or the tribes have the 401 water quality responsibility on Trust lands. Describe how the Erosion Control/Storm Water Management Plan can be compatible.

The Erosion Control Plan that would be prepared with the contractor would be compatible and complementary to the Stormwater Management Plan. Both plans would reflect Trans 401 requirements and would be prepared in coordination with WisDOT and WDNR.

6. Identify the temporary and permanent erosion control measures to be utilized on the project. Consult the FDM, Chapter 10, and the Products Acceptability List (PAL).

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minimize the amount of land exposed at one time | <input type="checkbox"/> Detention basin |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temporary seeding | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetative swales |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Silt fence | <input type="checkbox"/> Pave haul roads |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ditch checks | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dust abatement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Erosion or turf reinforcement mat | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rip rap (Sugar River bridge) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ditch or slope sodding | <input type="checkbox"/> Buffer strips |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Soil stabilizer | <input type="checkbox"/> Dewatering – Describe method |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inlet protection | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Silt screen |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Turbidity barriers | <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary diversion channel |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary settling basin | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permanent seeding |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mulching | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other - Describe: run off basins and directed ditching | |