MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

November 5, 2008
Madison Water Utility
119 E Olin Ave, Room A-B
7 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of October 1, 2008 Meeting Minutes
3. Communications
4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)
5. Presentation of Verona Road/West Beltline Proposed Interim Improvements by WisDOT SW Region Staff.
9. Consideration of Letter of Comment to WisDOT Regarding Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents – Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology of US 51 (Terminal Drive to Token Creek Park Road) Corridor Study
10. Status Report by TPB Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:
   • Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force
   • USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) Corridor Study
   • USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton)
   • North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee
11. Discussion of Future Work Items:
    • 2009-2013 Transit Development Program (TDP)
    • 2009 Federal Certification Review of the MPO
12. Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings
13. Adjournment

Next MPO Meeting:

Wednesday, December 3 at 7 p.m.
Madison Water Utility, 119 E Olin Ave., Room A-B

If you need an interpreter, materials in alternate formats, or other accommodations to access this meeting, contact the Planning & Development Dept. at (608) 266-4635 or TTY/TEXTNET (866) 704-2318.

Please do so at least 48 hours prior to the meeting so that proper arrangements can be made.

Si Ud. necesita un intérprete, materiales en formatos alternos, o acomodaciones para poder venir a esta reunión, por favor haga contacto con el Department of Planning & Development (el departamento de planificación y desarrollo) al (608)-266-4635, o TTY/TEXTNET (886)-704-2318.

Por favor avisenos por lo menos 48 horas antes de esta reunión, así que se puedan hacer los arreglos necesarios.
1. Roll Call

*Members present:* Joe Clausius, Ken Harwood, Duane Hinz, Robin Schmidt, Jerry Mandli (arrived at Item #6), Al Matano, Robbie Webber, Mark Opitz, Satya Rhodes-Conway (arrived at Item #5), Paul Skidmore, John Vesperman, Tom Clauder (arrived at Item #5).

*Members absent:* Eileen Bruskewitz, Chuck Kamp

*Staff present:* Bob McDonald, Bill Schaefer

2. Approval of September 3, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Clausius moved, Hinz seconded, to approve the September meeting minutes. Motion carried.

3. Communications

McDonald reported there was a phone communication from the Deputy Director of the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) requesting that MPO staff make a presentation on the Long-Range Regional Transportation Plan at the commission’s October 23rd meeting. They are holding a hearing on the plan, which the commission wants to adopt without changes as part of the master plan for the region. Staff agreed to do so, assuming the Board concurs. McDonald said he advised CARPC staff that if any changes are suggested those should be put into a memo to the MPO Board. The MPO Board would then consider those comments along with any other proposed amendments when the minor update of the plan is done in 2010.

4. Public Comment (for items not on MPO Agenda)

None

5. Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 19 Regarding the 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the Dane County Area

Schaefer reviewed the revised addition/correction sheet, which was at members’ places. He pointed out that the additions in the revised sheet are shown in italics. Schaefer said most of the changes to the draft TIP are minor and many involve locally funded projects that are in the TIP for information and coordination purposes only. He highlighted some of the more significant changes. In the Parking section, MPO staff has included information from the City of Madison’s Parking Utility budget. This includes funding for a new parking ramp with a hotel on the site of the Madison Municipal Building, replacing the current surface parking lot. It is one of three different parking ramp options the City is considering. The others are replacement of the Government East ramp and a new ramp on the site of the Brayton lot. Both are envisioned to be constructed as part of mixed-use development projects. The listings for the Badger State Trail and Starkweather Creek (West Branch) Path projects are being changed to reflect they now have approved Federal funding. Two other projects—Ice Age Junction Path and Pheasant Branch Conservancy (Main Branch) Path—are being added back to the TIP because they won’t be constructed until next year. Also, in response to Mark Opitz’s request the Middleton segment of the Wisconsin River Rail Corridor Path (parallel to University Ave.) has been added a project without programmed funding for informational purposes.
Two new Dane County transit projects have been added—one is categorized as a capital project and the other as an operating project. The two projects are part of the same New Freedom grant application that the Dane County Department of Human Services has applied for to implement a mobility management program and mobility trainer program. Schaefer said the Madison area now receives an annual allocation of funding under this program and the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Program. The Dane County project, which involves hiring a mobility manager, would create a one-stop call center for authorizing rides, addressing coordination issues, reducing duplication between county, Metro, and private services, and other tasks. The mobility manager would contract out for mobility training services, helping train persons how to use available public transit services and assist with safety related issues. Another small New Freedom grant application was submitted by Independent Living Inc. to provide services for persons with disabilities in south central Dane County. There is sufficient funding for both projects. MPO staff serves on a WisDOT staff review team that will score and rank the projects. Schaefer said that if more applications had been submitted staff would have added an agenda item to review the projects in more detail with the Board and get input on the scoring and ranking of the projects. Schaefer added that MPO staff had just completed preparation of a coordinated public transit—human services transportation plan with assistance from the Dane County Specialized Transportation Manager. Having such a plan is a requirement for receiving funding under the New Freedom and JARC programs. He said MPO staff could review the plan with the Board at a future meeting if members were interested.

The changes to the street/roadway projects involved mostly minor cost changes or moving a project up or back a year. For example, WisDOT has moved back the project to replace and expand the S. High Point Road Bridge over the Beltline from 2012 to 2013. The STH 113 (Pennsylvania-Packers Ave.) resurfacing project has also been pushed back from 2012 to 2013. Vesperman said the change was for budgetary reasons. The City of Madison has added a project to reconstruct South Point Road, which will be an important north-south collector street. There are no proposed changes to the draft STP-Urban priority project listings. Schaefer said the technical coordinating committee and citizen advisory committee had both recommended approval of the draft TIP with the changes.

Opitz moved, Skidmore seconded, to approve Resolution TPB No. 19 Regarding the 2009-2013 Transportation Improvement Program. Motion carried.


McDonald said the draft work program was in the packet and had been sent out to local units of government and appropriate agencies and commissions for review and comment. He said MPO staff reviewed the draft work program with FHWA and WisDOT staff last week and had received some editorial comments from WisDOT central office staff. Staff also reviewed it with the technical and citizen advisory committees. Staff will review comments received with the Board and would be seeking approval of the work program at the November meeting following the comment period. McDonald then reviewed the planned activities by work element. He explained that surveillance includes gathering, reformatting, and analyzing data from the U.S. Census Bureau, neighborhood plans, building permits, and other sources. The data is used for general analysis purposes and for the MPO’s regional travel model. Plan reappraisal involves the actual traffic forecasting work as well as other work on the regional transportation plan and its elements. This includes adjustments to the land use assumptions based on neighborhood plans as they are developed. A special effort is planned next year to re-evaluate the zonal structure based on recent and planned developments. The Census Bureau provides data to the MPO using the traffic
analysis zone boundaries, which must be consistent with Census Block Groups. Webber asked about the impact of rising gas prices on traffic forecasts and whether the model accounts for this. McDonald replied that staff track trends in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and mode choice. If the price of gas remains high and a change is shown in VMT and mode use over time, staff would make an adjustment for that in the travel model. Webber asked how many years of data would be required to make such a change. McDonald said that staff would rely on national research and expertise of modeling consultants to make that decision. Webber asked if the availability of alternative modes was considered, and McDonald said the travel model does have a mode choice component that factors in the price of gas, parking cost, and the availability of transit. Schaefer added that as staff works on the minor update to the Regional Transportation Plan in 2010, a sensitivity analysis could be done with the model assuming higher gas prices if the current trend continues.

McDonald said the TSM category is becoming a larger work activity over time and includes coordinating ITS efforts and tracking ITS projects to make sure they are in accord with the national architecture. He provided some examples of these projects. It also includes TDM work, including the MPO’s Rideshare Program and TDM assistance to the City of Madison Parking Utility. A major work activity next year involves further developing the congestion management program and tracking the impact of projects over time. This was a recommendation of the previous Federal Certification Review. Assisting the FHWA and FTA with the next Certification Review is another work activity under this element, and McDonald explained that process. Transit planning is a work element under the TSM category and includes preparation of the Transit Development Program (TDP). Staff has started the TDP update, which will be completed next year. Another category is the specialized transportation planning and coordination work. Staff just completed a county coordination plan. The Transportation Improvement Program is prepared every year. The next category is Corridor and Area Studies and includes the various WisDOT and other studies that MPO staff assists with. These include the two USH 51 studies, the North Mendota Parkway study, and the Beltline studies. WisDOT will be initiating studies on USH 14 West and USH 14 South focusing on access management and safety issues. It also includes the neighborhood plans that MPO staff assists with and prepares transportation forecasts for. He mentioned some of the current plans being prepared. The Rail Corridor Studies and Air Transportation involve mostly monitoring activity. Other Transportation Planning and Special Studies is catch all for a number of different studies and things that come up through the course of the year.

7. **Review and Recommendation of Draft 2009 MPO Budget**

McDonald indicated this item is more for information purposes, since the budget has already been submitted. He explained that MPO staff are City of Madison staff and the MPO’s budget is part of the budget of the Planning Division of the Department of Planning & Community and Economic Development. He said the 2009 budget is shown in comparison to the 2008, and it represents essentially a no increase budget except for staff salary cost of living and step increases. McDonald reviewed the budget and explained each major item. The Other Services General item includes the contract for TDM work with the City of Madison. It went up because MPO staff will be doing more work next reviewing employer TDM plans. The revenue is in the Parking Utility’s budget and comes from advertising in the ramps. Staff costs are broken out by direct and indirect costs because billing is based upon direct hours and the indirect rate (which includes administrative staff) is assigned based on the direct billable hours. Revenues aren’t shown, but there is a total $712,000 that primarily comes from FHWA and WisDOT, leaving a net deficit of around $150,000 to be provided by the City of Madison. A few other local units of government
have agreed to provide their proportionate share of the needed local funding. These are the Cities of Monona and Fitchburg and the Village of McFarland. Dane County pays $13,000 annually for specialized transportation coordination services.

Schmidt asked about the percentage of the staff cost from benefits. McDonald explained that the 37.8% figure was for the staff and the 11.3% figure was for hourly employees if any are hired. Clauder asked if other local units of government could be encouraged to contribute to the necessary local funding for the MPO. McDonald replied that a letter was sent out when the MPO was created. When the MPO was reorganized, the agreement included a suggestion that local units of government in the MPO area all contribute. Clauder noted it appeared staff salaries in most cases were increasing 10%. McDonald said this included step increases as well as 3% cost of living increases. [Ed. note: The increase also includes a longevity increase, since most staff started with the City in January 2000 when the new MPO was created.]

Skidmore moved, Schmidt seconded, to recommend approval of the 2009 MPO budget. Motion carried.

8. Review of Charge of the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee and Interaction With the MPO Board

McDonald said that at the Board’s last meeting Rhodes-Conway indicated that she would like the Board to review the charge and purpose of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and see if there might be ways to improve the interaction between the CAC and the Board. The item was on the agenda of the last CAC meeting, but there wasn’t a quorum so it will be on the agenda of their next meeting in November. Staff included in the packet information on the general purpose of the CAC, committee authority, term of membership, and the list of current committee members. Also included was an outline prepared by CAC member Royce Williams that provides some ideas on CAC membership and the process. McDonald suggested deferring action on this item until the CAC had an opportunity to discuss the issue.

Rhodes-Conway commented the CAC has some smart people and she wants to make sure the MPO is making good use of their time. She’d like to see the discussions that the CAC has brought to the MPO Board. She said staff should ask CAC members what is the best way for them to comment on items on the MPO Board agenda and for the Board to refer issues to them. A suggestion was made to have a CAC member attend meetings as a non-voting liaison. Rhodes-Conway thought that was a good idea. McDonald said informal minutes of the CAC meetings are prepared, which could be made available to the Board. In the cover sheets for agenda items, staff indicates whether the CAC and/or Technical Committee has reviewed and made a recommendation on the item. If there are any significant comments by one or more committee members, that is also sometimes included. Staff has also invited committee members to attend Board meetings and speak on an item if they wish to. Rhodes-Conway said she thought we should be more proactive in getting the committee’s advice. Matano suggested having a CAC member attend the Board meeting at which this issue is next discussed.

Harwood moved, Mandli seconded, to defer further discussion and action on the item. Motion carried.

9. Status Report by TPB Board Members on Projects Potentially Involving the TPB:

- **Transport 2020 Implementation Task Force**
  Matano said the Finance/Governance subcommittee meeting scheduled for this evening had been postponed. McDonald reported on the Legislative Council Study Committee on
Regional Transit Authorities. He said the committee was through with the informational presentations and had directed council staff to start drafting legislation. Issues where there is disagreement will be separated out with options provided for discussion. He said he would provide the Board with copies of the draft legislation when it is made available. Schmidt asked the Board would submit comments on the legislation, and McDonald said the Board could or members could submit comments individually. Clauder asked about the status of the Federal New Starts application. Matano said FTA is currently reviewing the application, but didn’t expect any action or decision soon.

- **USH 51 (USH 12/18 to I 90/94/39) and USH 51 (McFarland to Stoughton) Corridor Studies**
  McDonald said there is nothing new to report, but there should be some meetings in the next couple of months.

- **North Mendota Parkway Implementation Oversight Committee**
  Hinz reported that a public input meeting was held in the Town of Springfield to receive comments on the roadway alignments. There was concern about how the parkway would connect to USH 12 on the west end. A similar meeting is planned in the Town of Westport and the City of Middleton. Opitz added that at the Springfield meeting farmers expressed opposition to routes north of CTH K. They wanted the roadway as far south as possible.

10. **Discussion of Future Work Items:**

- **Approval of 2009 Unified Planning Work Program**
  McDonald said this would be on the next meeting agenda.

- **Verona Road/West Beltline Interim Improvements**
  McDonald said this would also be on the next meeting agenda

- **2009-2013 Transit Development Program (TDP)**
  Staff will bring information and parts of the report to the Board as they are completed. The plan will be completed next year.

- **2009 Federal Certification Review of the MPO**

11. **Announcements and Schedule of Future Meetings**

  Matano congratulated Mayor Clauder for being re-elected as Vice-Chair at the last meeting. It was announced that the next meeting is November 5, 2008.

12. **Adjournment**

  Webber moved, Harwood seconded, to adjourn. Motion carried.
Re: Consideration of Resolution TPB No. 20 Approving the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program and 2009-2011 Overall Program Design Report

**Staff Comments on Item:** A draft of the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program was distributed in September and October to all local units of government within the MPO planning area and appropriate agencies, committees, and commissions for review and comment. A correction sheet, dated November 2008, will be prepared incorporating comments received.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

2. Correction Sheet dated November 2008 (will be distributed at November 5 meeting)
3. Resolution TPB No. 20

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:** Staff recommends approval of Resolution TPB No. 20 and incorporating the changes identified in the correction sheet, dated November 2008. The 2009 Unified Planning Work Program is the basis for MPO contracts with local units of government and with local, state, and federal agencies for 2009 planning activities and funding.

*Please remember to bring your draft copy of the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program dated September 2008*
Resolution TPB No. 20
Approving the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program
and 2009-2011 Overall Program Design Report

WHEREAS a Unified Planning Work Program continues to be a requirement for receiving various state and federal planning financial assistance; and

WHEREAS the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program for the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) is annually updated, and is the first year of the 2009-2011 Overall Program Design Report; and

WHEREAS separate grant applications will be required to apply for the 2009 programmed planning grant funds including applications to the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, Dane County, and various local governmental units; and

WHEREAS the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is a legally constituted entity under the laws of the State of Wisconsin and is legally able to receive these funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board approves the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program and the 2009-2011 Overall Program Design Report dated November 2008 which incorporates the changes reflected in the correction sheet dated November 2008 into the draft 2009 Unified Planning Work Program dated September 2008; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Planning Manager is authorized and directed to submit necessary applications to appropriate state, local, and federal departments for planning activities indicated for 2009 and to execute appropriate contracts with said agencies on behalf of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Transportation Planning Manager of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board is authorized to file appropriate supporting documents and requisitions and to perform other duties and acts which may be required as part of these planning grant contracts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the planning agency agrees to abide by all the provisions, terms, and conditions of said contracts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.334(a) the Madison Area Transportation Board hereby certifies that the metropolitan transportation planning process is addressing major issues facing the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

1. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303, and this subpart;
2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (42 USC 2000d-1) and 49 CFR part 21;
3. 49 USC 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, ex, or age in employment or business opportunity;
4. Sections 1101(b) of the SAFETEA-LU (Pub. L. 109-59) and 49 CFR Part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the US DOT funded projects;
5. 23 CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
7. The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
8. Section 324 of title 23, U.S.C regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender; and

______________________________  _________________________________
Date Adopted  Al Matano, Chair
Re:

Consideration of Letter of Response to WisDOT Regarding Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process of the US 51 (I-39/90 to US 12/18) Corridor Study

**Staff Comments on Item:**

WisDOT is formally inviting the MPO to become a participating agency on the project identified above. This is a SAFETEA-LU requirement in the federal transportation legislation and is similar to other WisDOT requests asking the MPO to be a participating agency in the review of projects and studies. Even though the MPO is involved on the policy advisory committee and technical advisory committee on this project, FHWA and WisDOT need an official response from the MPO.

**Materials Presented on Item:**

1. WisDOT Letter Dated October 10, 2008
2. Draft Letter of Response

**Staff Recommendation/Rationale:**

Staff recommends approval.
October 10, 2008

Robert McDonald
Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
121 S. Pinckney St., Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process
Project I.D. 5845-06-02
US 51 Corridor Study
I-39/90 to US 12/18 (Madison South Beltline)
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. McDonald:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is initiating an Environmental Impact Statement for the US 51 Corridor Study in Dane County, Wisconsin. The project will address safety, operational and capacity concerns on an approximate 19-mile portion of US 51 between I-39/90 east of Stoughton and extending through Stoughton and McFarland to US 12/18 (South Beltline Highway) in Madison, Dane County. The study will also consider improvements to alternative corridors in the area. The alternative corridors are WIS 138, County B and County N. A project location map is enclosed.

The project is a corridor study; no timetable for construction has been set. Representatives of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board have been involved in the study since its start in 2003.

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) establishes an enhanced environmental review process for certain Federal Transit Administration (FTA) projects, increasing the transparency of the process, as well as opportunities for participation. The requirements of section 6002 apply to the project that is the subject of this memorandum. As part of the environmental review process for this project, the lead agencies must identify, as early as practicable, any other Federal and non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in the project, and invite such agencies to become participating agencies in the environmental review process.¹

¹ Designation as a “participation agency” does not imply that the participating agency supports the proposed project or has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise concerning the proposed project or its potential impacts. A “participating agency” differs from a “cooperating agency,” which is defined in regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act as “any Federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.5.
While your agency has already provided verbal input on the US 51 Corridor Study, you are being extended this formal invitation to become actively involved as a participating agency in the environmental review process for the project. As a participating agency, you will be afforded the opportunity, together with the public, to be involved in defining the purpose of and need for the project, as well as in determining the range of alternatives to be considered for the project. In addition, you will be asked to:

- Provide input on the impact assessment methodologies and level of detail in your agency’s area of expertise;
- Participate in coordination meetings, conference calls, and joint field reviews, as appropriate; and
- Timely review and comment on information being prepared for the environmental document to reflect the views and concerns of your agency on alternatives considered, anticipated impacts, mitigation, and other environmental aspects.

We request that your agency provide a written response either accepting or declining designation as a participating agency. If you are declining, please state your reasons. Please transmit your response to me at the WisDOT Southwest Region office in Madison within 30 days of the date of this letter.

With your response, please also confirm that the following contact information for your agency is accurate.

Robert McDonald, (608) 266-4518
rmcdonald@ci.madison.wi.us

If your agency chooses to become a participating agency for the US 51 Corridor Study, please provide your comments on the project’s draft Coordination Plan and draft Impact Analysis Methodology (attached). Your comments, if any, are due within 45 days of the date of this letter.

Additional information will be forthcoming during the public scoping process, notification of which will be provided in the near future. Please contact me by telephone, (608) 245-2656, or e-mail jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us, if you have questions or require additional information.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Jeff Berens
WisDOT Project Manager

Enclosure

Project Location Map  
Project Coordination Plan  
Project Impact Analysis Methodology

cc: Johnny Gerbitz, FHWA – Wisconsin  
Joan Petersen, Strand Associates, Inc
November 5, 2008

Mr. Jeff Berens  
Division of Transportation System Development  
Southwest Region  
2101 Wright Street  
Madison, WI 53704-2583

Re: Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process  
Project I.D. 5845-06-02  
US 51 Corridor Study  
I-39/90 to US 12/18 (Madison South Beltline  
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Berens:

In response to your letter of October 10, 2008, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) accepts the invitation to be a participating agency in the review and development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project referenced above. In accepting this invitation, the Board recognizes that this designation does not imply that the MPO either supports the proposal or has any special expertise with respect to evaluation of the project. Further, the Board understands its role in the development of this project to include the following:

- Provide input on defining the purpose and need, determining the range of alternatives to be considered, and the methodologies and level of detail required in the alternatives analysis.
- Participate in coordination meetings, conference calls and joint field reviews as appropriate.
- Provide timely review and comment on information being prepared for the environmental document to reflect the view and concerns of our agency on alternatives considered, anticipated impacts, mitigation, and other environmental aspects.

In accord with your request and as a participating agency, the MPO Board will provide comments on the project’s draft Coordination Plan and draft Impact Analysis Methodology in a separate letter. The contact person for the MPO is Mr. Robert McDonald and his email address is rmcdonald@cityofmadison.com.

A copy of this letter is being forwarded to Johnny Gerbitz, FHWA Wisconsin Division Office acknowledging our acceptance of the invitation.

Sincerely,

Al Matano  
Chair, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board

cc: Johnny Gerbitz, FHWA Wisconsin Division Office
Re:

Consideration of Letter of Comment to WisDOT Regarding Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents – Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology of US 51 (I-39/90 to US 12/18) Corridor Study

Staff Comments on Item:

The MPO has agreed to be a participating agency in the review of this project in accord with federal transportation legislation (SAFETEA-LU). Being a participating agency in the review of this project does not imply support of the proposal. However, we are expected to provide timely review and comment on information being prepared for the environmental document to reflect the view and concerns of our agency. Therefore, WisDOT is requesting comments from the MPO on the draft Coordination Plan and draft Impact Analysis Methodology of this corridor study.

Materials Presented on Item:

1. WisDOT Letter Dated October 10, 2008
2. Draft Letter of Response
3. Draft Coordination Plan and Draft Impact Analysis Methodology

Staff Recommendation/Rationale:

Staff recommends approval of the letter of comment.
October 10, 2008

Robert McDonald
Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
121 S. Pinckney St., Suite 400
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Invitation to Participate in the Environmental Review Process

Dear Mr. McDonald:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is initiating an Environmental Impact Statement for the US 51 Corridor Study in Dane County, Wisconsin. The project will address safety, operational and capacity concerns on an approximate 19-mile portion of US 51 between I-39/90 east of Stoughton and extending through Stoughton and McFarland to US 12/18 (South Beltline Highway) in Madison, Dane County. The study will also consider improvements to alternative corridors in the area. The alternative corridors are WIS 138, County B and County N.

A project location map is enclosed.

The project is a corridor study; no timetable for construction has been set. Representatives of the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board have been involved in the study since its start in 2003.

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) establishes an enhanced environmental review process for certain Federal Transit Administration (FTA) projects, increasing the transparency of the process, as well as opportunities for participation. The requirements of section 6002 apply to the project that is the subject of this memorandum. As part of the environmental review process for this project, the lead agencies must identify, as early as practicable, any other Federal and non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in the project, and invite such agencies to become participating agencies in the environmental review process.1

1 Designation as a “participation agency” does not imply that the participating agency supports the proposed project or has any jurisdiction over, or special expertise concerning the proposed project or its potential impacts. A “participating agency” differs from a “cooperating agency,” which is defined in regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act as “any Federal agency other than a lead agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.5.
While your agency has already provided verbal input on the US 51 Corridor Study, you are being extended this formal invitation to become actively involved as a participating agency in the environmental review process for the project. As a participating agency, you will be afforded the opportunity, together with the public, to be involved in defining the purpose of and need for the project, as well as in determining the range of alternatives to be considered for the project. In addition, you will be asked to:

- Provide input on the impact assessment methodologies and level of detail in your agency's area of expertise;
- Participate in coordination meetings, conference calls, and joint field reviews, as appropriate; and
- Timely review and comment on information being prepared for the environmental document to reflect the views and concerns of your agency on alternatives considered, anticipated impacts, mitigation, and other environmental aspects.

We request that your agency provide a written response either accepting or declining designation as a participating agency. If you are declining, please state your reasons. Please transmit your response to me at the WisDOT Southwest Region office in Madison within 30 days of the date of this letter.

With your response, please also confirm that the following contact information for your agency is accurate.

Robert McDonald, (608) 266-4518
rmcdonald@ci.madison.wi.us

If your agency chooses to become a participating agency for the US 51 Corridor Study, please provide your comments on the project's draft Coordination Plan and draft Impact Analysis Methodology (attached). Your comments, if any, are due within 45 days of the date of this letter.

Additional information will be forthcoming during the public scoping process, notification of which will be provided in the near future. Please contact me by telephone, (608) 245-2656, or e-mail jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us, if you have questions or require additional information.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Jeff Berens
WisDOT Project Manager

Enclosure  Project Location Map
            Project Coordination Plan
            Project Impact Analysis Methodology

cc: Johnny Gerbitz, FHWA – Wisconsin
    Joan Petersen, Strand Associates, Inc
November 5, 2008

Mr. Jeff Berens
Division of Transportation System Development
Southwest Region
2101 Wright Street
Madison, WI 53704-2583

Re: Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents-
Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology
Project I.D. 5845-06-02
US 51 Corridor Study
I-39/90 to US 12/18 (Madison South Beltline)
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Berens:

In response to your letter of October 10, 2008, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has reviewed the Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents (Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology) for the US 51 Corridor Study (I-39/90 to US 12/18) and offers the following comments.

The MPO’s comments on this project are almost identical to the comments provided on the US 51 (Stoughton Road) Corridor Study (Terminal Drive/Voges Road to Token Creek Park Road). The MPO notes again, that providing a document which identifies the plan to be used to facilitate and document the lead agencies’ structured interaction with the public and other agencies and to inform the public and other agencies of how the coordination plan will be accomplished is a good approach. The Coordination Plan should help to streamline the EIS process and provide good project management through coordination, scheduling, and early resolution of issues. The same can be said of the Impact Analysis Methodology document. The Board found both documents to be relatively complete and does not have any significant comments to make at this time. However, the Board may wish to comment more extensively in the near future following the review of the application of the methodologies and the quality of the results.

The MPO would like to request that a presentation of this project be made before the full Board as part of your coordination plan with local officials. The MPO completed a federal redesignation process in 2007 resulting in a restructured Board with many new members that are unfamiliar with the project.

Also, the MPO Board is not asking for your consideration of conducting a Mobile Source Air Toxics analysis as part of your air quality impact methodology, as requested for the other US 51 corridor project. The corridor of this project is very rural and has much lower traffic volumes.

As a minor point, in the Coordination Plan - Item 5.5 Coordination With Local Officials, the MPO should be listed as having representation on the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC).

In conclusion, the MPO appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology for this project. If you have any questions, please contact Robert McDonald, Transportation Planning Manager, at 266-4518 or rmcdonald@cityofmadison.com.

Sincerely,

Al Matano
Chair, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Coordination Plan
Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU 6002) requires lead agencies for proposed federally funded transportation projects to establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation during the environmental review process. SAFETEA-LU 6002 applies to projects for which an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared and is not optional for such projects. SAFETEA-LU 6002 may be applied to projects being advanced through Environmental Assessments (EAs) or Categorical Exclusions (CEs) at the discretion of the Project’s lead agencies.

The purposes of the SAFETEA-LU 6002 coordination plan are to facilitate and document the lead agencies’ structured interaction with the public and other agencies and to inform the public and other agencies of how the coordination plan will be accomplished. The coordination plan is meant to promote an efficient and streamlined process and good project management through coordination, scheduling, and early resolution of issues.

SAFETEA-LU 6002 coordination plans outline how the lead agencies have divided responsibilities for compliance with various aspects of the environmental review process, such as the issuance of invitation letters, and how the lead agencies will provide the opportunities for input from the public and other agencies. The coordination plan also identifies coordination points and project milestones and may establish a schedule of meetings and identify timeframes for input and review by the participating and cooperating agencies, as well as by the public.

The coordination plan will be shared with federal, state, and local agencies, local units of government, and Native American Tribes who have expressed interest in the proposed project. The draft coordination plan will be sent to interested parties for review and comment, and follow up as deemed appropriate to resolve any issues. The final coordination plan and any substantive changes in the plan will also be sent to interested parties. The draft and final coordination plan will be shared with the public through availability at public information meetings and the public hearing or by individual request. The coordination plan will also be posted on the project's website with availability announced in project newsletters and other news releases.

1.2 Project Background
The US 51 study corridor extends approximately 19 miles, beginning at I-39/90 east of Stoughton and extending through Stoughton and McFarland to US 12/18 (Madison South Beltline), Dane County, Wisconsin. Communities in the study area are the towns of Albion, Dunkirk, Dunn, Pleasant Springs, and Rutland, the City of Stoughton, and the Village of McFarland. A map of the study corridor area is provided in Section 1.4.

In 2002, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) initiated a transportation needs study of the US 51 corridor from I-39/90 to McFarland. The US 51 Needs Assessment report was completed in February 2004. The report identified the following needs to be addressed:

- Corridor Preservation and Long-Term Planning
- Traffic Demand
- Safety
- Substandard Roadway Items
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

In the first part of 2005, the study team began work on an EA for US 51 and held an Alternatives Workshop for the public that solicited input on transportation problems and brainstormed possible solutions. An Alternatives Screening process was completed to determine what impact expansion of adjacent highway corridors and/or US 51 would have on traffic patterns within the general study area. This was done using the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (TPB) 2030 Regional Travel Demand Model (April 2005 version).

In November 2005, a WisDOT Majors Peer Review meeting gave approval to the study team to include non-US 51 corridor improvements as possible study alternatives to US 51 expansion. The Federal Highway Association (FHWA) concluded an EIS would be the appropriate environmental documentation. An Agency
Scoping meeting was held in January 2006 to discuss an initial draft of the purpose and need and several concept alternatives. Five concept alternatives were presented to the public at information meetings in May 2006. A second Agency Scoping Meeting was held in November 2006 to determine if public and agency input would allow any of the concepts to be dismissed from consideration in the study. None of the concepts were dismissed.

The purpose of the current US 51 Corridor Study is to evaluate alternatives that will improve vehicular traffic flow and safety and address facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. The study will examine capacity and safety improvements on rural portions of US 51 in the study area as well as potential operational improvements in the Village of McFarland and the City of Stoughton. Transportation needs have already been established in concert with input from FHWA, WisDOT, local government, and the public based on efforts beginning in 2002. These earlier efforts resulted in agreement the study will consider improvements on highways other than US 51 to address the needs of travelers moving between the southeast portion of Dane County and the City of Madison area as alternatives to major capacity improvements on US 51.

1.3 Agency Coordination Prior To The Coordination Plan
Agency coordination for the US 51 Corridor Study was already underway when the requirement for a more formalized coordination plan was established under SAFETEA-LU. Actions to date involving key state and federal review agencies (DNR, USEPA, USACOE, and US Fish and Wildlife) are listed as follows:

**January 12, 2006:** Preconsultation/NEPA 404 merger scoping meeting to acquaint agencies with the project, review project purpose and need, review results of preliminary alternatives screening process leading to development of draft initial alternatives, and review potentially affected resources.

**February 16, 2006:** US Fish and Wildlife responded to the study team’s scoping meeting invitation with a letter stating initial concurrence in Purpose and Need with the understanding the crash rates in urban and rural areas will be defined and final concurrence will be issued after further review. Concurrence with alternatives was granted but strong concern with resource impacts from the four-lane conversion of US 51 alternative was noted.

**May 18, 2006:** Letter from WisDOT SW Region Director to USACOE requesting it be a Cooperating Agency and concurrence with the project purpose and need as revised following the January 12, 2006, agency meeting (and noting concurrence in the range of alternatives to be carried forward in the EIS to be requested later in 2006), in accordance with the *Concurrent NEPA/404 Process for Transportation Projects* (“404” refers to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act).

**May 18, 2006:** Letter from WisDOT SW Region Director to USEPA requesting concurrence with the project purpose and need as revised following the January 12, 2006, agency meeting.

**May 18, 2006:** Letter from WisDOT SW Region Director to US Fish and Wildlife requesting concurrence with the project purpose and need as revised following the January 12, 2006, agency meeting.

**July 18, 2006:** USEPA stated the agency required a detailed purpose and need document before concurrence could be provided.
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Section 2: Lead/Cooperating/Participating Agencies

2.1 Agency Definitions and Roles
The standard responsibilities for each Lead, Cooperating, and Participating Agency invited to participate in the environmental review process for this project are as follows:

**Federal Lead Agency:** Manage 6002 process; prepare EIS; provide opportunity for public and participating/cooperating agency involvement. For the US 51 project the Federal Lead Agency is the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

**Joint Lead Agency:** A project sponsor that is a state or local government receiving SAFETEA-LU funds. For US 51, this is WisDOT.

**Cooperating Agency:** Federal agencies other than the Federal Lead Agency who have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposal (or a reasonable alternative) for legislation or other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. For the US 51 project several agencies were invited to participate. The status of those invited is included in Section 2.3.

**Participating Agency:** Participating agencies include federal, state or local agencies who may have interest in the project. These agencies participate in the National Environment Protection Agency (NEPA) process, identify issues of concern regarding the project’s potential impacts, and provide meaningful and timely input on unresolved issues. Provide comments on purpose and need, methodologies, and range of alternatives. For the US 51 project several agencies were invited to participate. The status of those invited is included in Section 2.3.

2.2 List of Agencies, Roles, and Responsibilities
The intent of coordination with federal, state, and local review agencies is to cooperatively identify and resolve issues that could delay the environmental process or that could result in denial of any approvals required to implement the proposed project. The agencies listed in the following table have been identified as preliminary affected agencies based on the natural, cultural, and socioeconomic resources in the project area and agency jurisdiction and expertise. All the agencies noted in the table and possibly others yet to be identified have been invited per SAFETEA-LU by FHWA or WisDOT to become Participating Agencies\(^1\) for the US 51 Corridor Study.

Those agencies noted in the table (and possibly others yet to be identified) have been invited by FHWA and WisDOT to be cooperating or participating agencies for the US 51 Corridor Study. Agency responses to this invitation are indicated in Section 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td>Federal Lead Agency</td>
<td>Manage 6002 process, prepare EIS, provide opportunity for public and cooperating/participating agency involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FHWA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>Participating and Cooperating Agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act Section 404 permit jurisdiction. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(USACOE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Participating and Cooperating Agency</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(US Fish and Wildlife)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
\(^1\) FHWA’s NEPA regulations (23 CFR 771) require that those federal agencies with jurisdiction by law (permitting or land transfer authority) be invited to be Cooperating Agencies for an EIS. SAFETEA-LU created a new Participating Agency category for the EIS process. Participating Agencies are federal and non-federal governmental agencies that may have an interest in the project because of their jurisdictional authority, special expertise and/or statewide interest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)</td>
<td>Participating and Coordinating Agency</td>
<td>NEPA and Clean Water Act Jurisdiction. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Farmland Protection Policy Act and Food Security Act Jurisdiction. Provide comments on farmland impact rating and programs such as Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) and Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) as applicable to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)</td>
<td>Joint Lead Agency</td>
<td>Manage 602 process, prepare EIS, provide opportunity for public and cooperating/participating agency involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)</td>
<td>Participating and Coordinating Agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act and WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement authority. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Authority under Section 32.035, Wisconsin Statutes to prepare an Agricultural Impact Statement if needed. Provide comments on alternatives and their impacts on agricultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agencies/Other Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stoughton</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Oregon</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Albion</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dunkirk</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dunn</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pleasant Springs</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rutland</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Area Transportation Planning Board</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Project area stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act Section 106. Provide comments on cultural resource aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Tribes</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Provide comments and consultation on tribal cultural resources and National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Agency Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Date Invitation Issued</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
<th>Date of Follow-up</th>
<th>Agency Participating?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Johnny Gerbitz, (608) 829-7511 <a href="mailto:Johnny.Gerbitz@fhwa.dot.gov">Johnny.Gerbitz@fhwa.dot.gov</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Federal Lead Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE)</td>
<td>Robert J. Whiting, (651) 290-5264 (<a href="mailto:robert.j.whiting@usace.army.mil">robert.j.whiting@usace.army.mil</a>) Stacy Marshall, (262)547-3064, ext. 104 (<a href="mailto:stacy.l.marshall@usace.army.mil">stacy.l.marshall@usace.army.mil</a>) Tamera Cameron, (651) 290-5197 (<a href="mailto:tamera.e.cameron@usace.army.mil">tamera.e.cameron@usace.army.mil</a>)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (US Fish and Wildlife)</td>
<td>Louise Clemency, (920) 866-1725 <a href="mailto:louise_clemency@fws.gov">louise_clemency@fws.gov</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)</td>
<td>Ken Westlake, (312) 886-2910 (<a href="mailto:westlake.kenneth@epa.gov">westlake.kenneth@epa.gov</a>) Sherry Kamke, (312) 353-5794 (<a href="mailto:Kamke.Sherry@epa.gov">Kamke.Sherry@epa.gov</a>)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Dept of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td>Pat Murphy, (608) 662-4422, ext. 258 <a href="mailto:Pat.murphy@wi.usda.gov">Pat.murphy@wi.usda.gov</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), SW Region</td>
<td>Jeff Berens, (608) 245-2656 <a href="mailto:jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us">jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us</a> Jennifer Grimes, (608) 245-2630 <a href="mailto:jennifer.grimes@dot.state.wi.us">jennifer.grimes@dot.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Joint Lead Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Dept of Transp. (WisDOT), Bur of Equity and Env Services (BEES)</td>
<td>Shar Te Beest, (608) 266-1476 <a href="mailto:sharlene.tebeest@dot.state.wi.us">sharlene.tebeest@dot.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Joint Lead Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Date Invitation Issued</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
<td>Date of Follow-up</td>
<td>Agency Participating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)</td>
<td>Russ Anderson, (608) 275-3467 <a href="mailto:russell.anderson@wisconsin.gov">russell.anderson@wisconsin.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>Sherman Banker, (608) 264-6507 <a href="mailto:sherman.banker@wisconsinhistory.org">sherman.banker@wisconsinhistory.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)</td>
<td>Peter Nauth, (608) 224-4650 <a href="mailto:Peter.Nauth@datcp.state.wi.us">Peter.Nauth@datcp.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Kathleen Falk, (608) 266-4114 <a href="mailto:falk@co.dane.wi.us">falk@co.dane.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Highway &amp; Transportation Department</td>
<td>Pam Dunphy, (608) 266-4036 <a href="mailto:dunphy@co.dane.wi.us">dunphy@co.dane.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Planning Department</td>
<td>Pam Andros, (608) 267-2536 <a href="mailto:Andros@co.dane.wi.us">Andros@co.dane.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stoughton</td>
<td>Rodney Scheel, (608) 873-6619 <a href="mailto:rjscheel@ci.stoughton.wi.us">rjscheel@ci.stoughton.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland</td>
<td>Mike Harried, (608) 838-3136 <a href="mailto:Mike.harried@mcfarland.wi.us">Mike.harried@mcfarland.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Oregon</td>
<td>Mark Below, (608) 835-6290 <a href="mailto:mbelow@vil.oregon.wi.us">mbelow@vil.oregon.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Albion</td>
<td>Roger Olson, (608) 884-4930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dunkirk</td>
<td>Jerry Sellers, (608) 873-6966 <a href="mailto:dunkirk@chorus.net">dunkirk@chorus.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dunn</td>
<td>Ed Minihan, (608) 255-4219 <a href="mailto:townhall@town.dunn.wi.us">townhall@town.dunn.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Pleasant Springs</td>
<td>Richard Green, (608) 852-4165 <a href="mailto:cttops@tds.net">cttops@tds.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rutland</td>
<td>Dale Beske, (608) 835-7606 <a href="mailto:chair@town.rutland.wi.us">chair@town.rutland.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Area Transportation Planning Board</td>
<td>Robert McDonald, (608) 266-4518 <a href="mailto:rmcdonald@ci.madison.wi.us">rmcdonald@ci.madison.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Barbara Weber, (608) 266-9113 <a href="mailto:BarbaraW@CapitalAreaRPC.org">BarbaraW@CapitalAreaRPC.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Tribes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council</td>
<td>Michael Allen, Sr. P.O. Box 9 2939 Highway 47 N. Lac du Flambeau, WI 54538 <a href="http://www.glitc.org">http://www.glitc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of WI</td>
<td>Edith Leoso, THPO PO Box 39 Odanah, WI 54861 (715) 682-7121 <a href="http://www.badriver.com">www.badriver.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest County Potawatomi Community of WI</td>
<td>Mike Alloway Tribal Office PO Box 340 Crandon, WI 54520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Date Invitation Issued</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
<td>Date of Follow-up</td>
<td>Agency Participating?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-Chunk Nation</td>
<td>Bill Quackenbush, THPO Executive Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>405 Airport Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black River Falls, WI 54615</td>
<td>(715) 284-9343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://ho-chunknation.com">http://ho-chunknation.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>giiwegiizhigoookway Martin/THPO Ketegitigaaning Ojibwe Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watersmeet, MI 49969</td>
<td>(906) 358-4577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.lvdtribal.com">www.lvdtribal.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee Indian Tribe of WI</td>
<td>David Grignon, THPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keshena, WI 54135</td>
<td>(715) 799-5100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.menominee-nsn.gov">http://www.menominee-nsn.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation</td>
<td>Linda Yazzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16281 Q Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayetta, KS 66509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ppbindiantribe.com">http://www.ppbindiantribe.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of WI</td>
<td>Larry Babler, THPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88385 Pike Road, Highway 13</td>
<td>(715) 779-3700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayfield, WI 54814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.redcliff-nsn.gov">www.redcliff-nsn.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Mississippi in Iowa</td>
<td>Jonathan Buffalo, NAGPRA Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>349 Meswaki Road</td>
<td>(641) 484-4678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tama, IA 52339-9626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska</td>
<td>Joe Nioce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305 North Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve, KS 66434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sandra Massey, NAGPRA Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 2, Box 246</td>
<td>(918) 968-3526 ext 1048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stroud, OK 74079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sacandfoxnation-nsn.gov/index.htm">http://www.sacandfoxnation-nsn.gov/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Coordination Points and Responsibilities

3.1 Agency Expectations

The expectations for Federal Lead and Joint Lead Agencies are:

- Take such action as is necessary and proper to facilitate the expedited review of the environmental review process.
- Ensure that any EIS or other document required under NEPA is completed in accordance with SAFETEA-LU and applicable federal and state law.
- Provide, as early as practicable but no later than the appropriate project milestone, project information on purpose and need, environmental resources, alternatives and proposed methodologies.
- Provide the Plan to Participating and Cooperating Agencies.
- The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) will have ultimate responsibility for:
  1. Review and adoption of a NEPA document.
  2. Ensuring that the Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT) complies with all design and mitigation commitments.
- Develop a project purpose and need, the range of alternatives to be considered and other procedural matters.
- Involve tribal governments in the NEPA process.

The expectations for Cooperating Agencies are:

- Identify as early as practicable any issue of concern regarding the project’s environmental or socioeconomic impacts.
- Identify as early as practicable any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approval needed for the project.
- Share information that may be useful to the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT), Cooperating and Participating Agencies.
- Participate in meetings and field reviews.
- Assume, at the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) request, responsibility for preparing analysis over which that Cooperating Agency has special expertise, depending on Cooperating Agency’s resource availability.
- Make support staff available at the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) request.
- Generally use their resources and funds.
- Provide comments on purpose and need, coordination plan, methodologies, alternatives within 30 days of receipt thereof.
- Review and comment on preliminary drafts of Draft EIS and Final EIS.

The expectations for Participating Agencies are:

- Identify as early as practicable any issue of concern regarding the project’s environmental or socioeconomic impacts.
- Identify as early as practicable any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit, delay completion of the environmental review process, or result in denial of approval needed for the project.
- Provide input on purpose and need, methodologies, alternatives within 30 days of receipt thereof.
- Respond affirmatively in writing to the letter of invitation (for non-federal agencies) within 30 days of receipt thereof.
- Respond in writing to the letter of invitation if you wish to decline the invitation and opt out of the role/process (for federal agencies) within 30 days of the receipt thereof.
- Provide input on this Plan and schedule.
- Participate as needed in Issues Resolution Process described in Section 3.3.
- Specific coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will be in accordance with the WisDOT/SHPO Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
3.2 Coordination Points, Information Requirements, and Responsibilities

The following table lists the key coordination points including which agency is responsible for activities during that coordination point, the information required at each point, and who is responsible for transmitting the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Coordination Plan Point</th>
<th>Initiating Agencies</th>
<th>Information Provided or Action</th>
<th>Contacted Agencies</th>
<th>Information Requested or Action</th>
<th>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notice of Intent and Proposed Project Scope</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>NOI and Proposed Project Scope</td>
<td>Federal Register</td>
<td>NOI and Proposed Project Scope Published in Federal Register</td>
<td>7 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies Identified</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Letters of Invitation to Potential Agencies</td>
<td>Interested Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Written Acceptance or Reason for Non-Acceptance</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agency Input on Scope and Reaffirmation of Purpose and Need (Equiv to NEPA/404 Coordination Point One)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Letter of information about proposed scope of DEIS with copy of Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Review for Acceptance, or Reply on Issues to be Resolved</td>
<td>45 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agency input on Draft Coordination Plan and Analysis Methodologies</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Draft Coordination and Methodology Plans</td>
<td>Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on Draft Coordination and Methodology Plan</td>
<td>45 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public input on Draft Coordination Plan and Analysis Methodologies</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Availability of Draft Coord and Methodology Plans through media releases, on Project Web Site, Local Libraries, etc</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, etc</td>
<td>Provide comments on Draft Coordination and Methodology Plan</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coordination and Final Methodologies Plans Issued and Follow-up</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Final Coordination and Methodologies Plans</td>
<td>Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Review for Acceptance, or Reply on Issues to be Resolved</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agency Meeting on Final Purpose and Need, Proposed Alternatives, and Follow-up (Equiv to NEPA/404 Coordination Point Two)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss Proposed Alternatives</td>
<td>Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Review for Acceptance, or Reply on Issues to be Resolved</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days (preliminary information sent 30 days prior to meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Information Meetings on Purpose and Need, Proposed Alternatives, and Follow-up</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss Purpose and Need, and Proposed Alternatives</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials</td>
<td>Provide comments on Purpose and Need, and Proposed Alternatives</td>
<td>To be specified in public information material, typically 14 calendar days after public meeting(s) are held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Recommended Alternatives with Anticipated Impacts and Follow-up</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Pre-DEIS</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Review Pre-DEIS for completeness, accuracy, or questions, and provide comments</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DEIS Adopted and Filed with EPA</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>DEIS</td>
<td>EPA Filing Section</td>
<td>Availability of DEIS Published in Federal Register</td>
<td>14 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Coordination Plan Point</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action</td>
<td>Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Information Requested or Action</td>
<td>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DEIS Circulated for Review and Comment (concurrent with DEIS being filed with EPA)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>DEIS</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Review DEIS for completeness, accuracy, or questions, and provide comments</td>
<td>15 Calendar Days Min before Public Hearing, 45 Calendar Days Min Total Comment Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public Hearing On DEIS and Follow-up</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss Purpose and Need, Recommended Alternatives, and Anticipated Impacts</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on Purpose and Need, Recommended Alternatives, and Anticipated Impacts</td>
<td>15 Calendar Days from notice of Draft EIS in Federal Register (CEQ minimum) 30 Calendar Days from first legal notice of public hearing in official newspaper for project area 30 Calendar Days (preliminary information sent 30 days prior to meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Agency Meeting on Preferred Alternative with Anticipated Impacts and Follow-up (Equiv to NEPA/404 Coordination Point Three)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss Preferred Alternatives, Anticipated Impacts, Proposed Mitigation Measures, etc</td>
<td>Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on Preferred Alternatives, Anticipated Impacts, Proposed Mitigation Measures, etc.</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days (preliminary information sent 30 days prior to meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pre-FEIS Review (Cooperating Agencies) and Follow-up</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Pre-FEIS</td>
<td>Cooperating Agencies</td>
<td>Review Pre-FEIS for completeness, accuracy, or questions, and provide comments</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FEIS Adopted and Filed with EPA</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>FEIS</td>
<td>EPA Filing Section</td>
<td>Availability of FEIS Published in Federal Register</td>
<td>14 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FEIS Circulated for Review and Comment (concurrent with FEIS being filed with EPA)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>FEIS</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Review FEIS for completeness, accuracy, or questions, and provide comments</td>
<td>30 Calendar Day Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Draft ROD Prepared and Follow-up on Substantive Comments Received on FEIS (only if substantive comments are received)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Information, Meetings, Etc as Deemed Necessary to Address any Unresolved Issues</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
<td>Agreement on Resolution of all Significant Unresolved Issues</td>
<td>Un-programmed Time As Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ROD Issued</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>Cooperating Participating Agencies, and as Deemed Appropriate Local Officials and Public</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of receiving copy of the ROD</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Statue of Limitations (SOL) notice published in Federal Register announcing final action has been taken (ROD) in project’s NEPA phase</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>SOL Notice</td>
<td>Federal Register</td>
<td>SOL published n Federal register announcing final action taken (ROD) in project’s NEPA phase</td>
<td>7 Calendar Days for SOL notice publication; 180 calendar days to file a claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Final Concurrence in Individual Contract Level Mitigation Measures Obtained</td>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Proposed mitigation measures for commitments made in FEIS, ROD, and Coordination &amp; input from Cooperating &amp; Participating</td>
<td>Provide Comments, &amp;/or process approval requests on Proposed</td>
<td>Un-programmed (Prior to 90% PS&amp;E Review Mtgs. Approx 3-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Coordination Plan Point</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action</td>
<td>Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Information Requested or Action</td>
<td>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Permits and Other Approvals Obtained as Required (401, Air Quality, etc)</td>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Permits and Other Approval Requests w/ appropriate documentation</td>
<td>Appropriate Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Permits and Other Approvals Obtained as Required (ie – 401, Air Quality, etc)</td>
<td>Un-programmed (Prior to Advertising for Letting of Individual Contracts. 30 Calendar Days minimum before individual contract Letting dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es for Individual Contracts Processed &amp; Advertised for Letting</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es, Statements that environmental commitments have been completed or are included, and Certifications Right-of-Way has been acquired &amp; Utility Adjustments have been coordinated, etc.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es approved and projects advertised for Letting</td>
<td>Un-programmed (30 calendar days minimum between advertising and Letting dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Implementation of Mitigation Commitments</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Mitigation Commitments in FEIS and ROD</td>
<td>Coordinate with Cooperating Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
<td>Provide Comments, Recommendation, and/or process approval requests on Proposed Mitigation Measures, etc.</td>
<td>Un-programmed Time As Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Issues Resolution Process

The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), the Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT) and Cooperating and Participating Agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review process or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

Based on information received from the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT), Cooperating and Participating Agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project’s potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts. Issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approval that is needed for the project.

The following issues resolution process will be followed:

- Meetings will be held as needed during the course of the NEPA process to discuss and resolve issues.
- If issues are not being resolved in a timely manner:
  1. An official issues resolution meeting will be scheduled.
  2. If resolution cannot be achieved within 30 days following such a meeting and a determination has been made by the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) that all information necessary to resolve the issues has been obtained, then
  3. The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) will notify the heads of all Participating and Cooperating Agencies and the Council of Environmental Quality, and
  4. The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) will publish such notice in the Federal Register.
## Section 4: Project Schedule

### 4.1 Project Schedule and Coordination Points

Key coordination/decision points and agency responsibilities for completing the US 51 Corridor EIS are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Coordination/Decision Points</th>
<th>Anticipated Date Information Sent</th>
<th>Initiating Agencies and Contacts</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Response</th>
<th>Responding Agencies and Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare DEIS with Proposed Scope</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT with proposed NOI to Federal Register</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>NOI in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Send Letters of Invitation to potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Interested Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request Agency Input on Scope of DEIS and Reaffirmation of Purpose and Need (Equivalent to NEPA/404 Coordination Point One)</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>45 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Request Agency input on Draft Coordination Plan and Analysis Methodologies</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>45 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide Opportunity for Public input on Draft Coordination Plan and Analysis Methodologies</td>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Availability of Draft Coord and Methodology Plans through media releases, on Proj WEB Site, Local Libraries, etc to the public, Local Officials and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Public, Local Official, and other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coordination and Final Methodology Plans Issued and Follow-up</td>
<td>Winter 2008-2009</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conduct Agency Meeting on Final Purpose and Need and Proposed Alternatives with Prelim Impacts and Follow-up (Equivalent to NEPA/404 Coordination Point Two)</td>
<td>Winter 2008-2009</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies and other interested state and local agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conduct Public Information Meeting and Follow-up (Purpose and Need, Proposed Alternatives, Prelim Impacts)</td>
<td>Winter 2008-2009</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to public and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>To be specified in public information material, typically 14 calendar days after public meeting(s) are held</td>
<td>Agency and Public Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Recommended Alternatives with Anticipated Impacts Issued and Follow-up</td>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DEIS Adopted and Filed With EPA</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT with DEIS to EPA Filing Section</td>
<td>14 Cal Days</td>
<td>Notice of SDEIS Availability in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Coordination/Decision Points</td>
<td>Anticipated Date Information Sent</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies and Contacts</td>
<td>Anticipated Date of Response</td>
<td>Responding Agencies and Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Circulation of DEIS for Review and Comment (concurrent with DEIS being filed with EPA)</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>15 Cal Days Min Before Public Hearing 45 Cal Days Min Total</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Conduct public hearing on DEIS and Follow-up</td>
<td>Winter 2009-2010</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to participating cooperating agencies, public and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days from first legal notice of public hearing in official newspaper for project area</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conduct Agency Meeting on Preferred Alternative with Anticipated Impacts and Follow-up (i.e. Equivalent to NEPA/404 Coordination Point Three)</td>
<td>Winter 2009-2010</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies and other interested state and local agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Circulate Pre-FEIS for Cooperating Agencies Review and Follow-up</td>
<td>Summer 2010</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating Agencies</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Final EIS (FEIS) Adopted and Filed With EPA</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT with FEIS to EPA Filing Section</td>
<td>14 Cal Days</td>
<td>Notice of FEIS Availability in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Circulation of FEIS for Review and Comment. and Follow-up (concurrent with FEIS being filed with EPA)</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders</td>
<td>30 Cal Days Min</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Draft ROD Prepared and Follow-up on Substantive Comments Received on FEIS (only if substantive comments are received)</td>
<td>Winter 2010-2011</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA with Information, Meetings, Etc shared as Deemed Necessary in order to Address significant Unresolved Issues</td>
<td>30 Cal Days anticipated</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Record of Decision (ROD) Issued</td>
<td>Winter 2010-2011</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT with circulation to Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders</td>
<td>30 Cal Days</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating Agencies, public and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Statue of Limitations (SOL) Notice Published in Federal Register Announcing Final Action Has Been Taken (ROD) in project’s NEPA Phase</td>
<td>Winter 2010-2011</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT Federal Register</td>
<td>7 Cal Days for SOL Notice Publication; 180 Cal Days to File a Claim</td>
<td>Notice of SOL in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Final Concurrence in Individual Contract Level Mitigation Measures Obtained</td>
<td>Prior to 90% PS&amp;E Review Meetings</td>
<td>FHWA &amp; WisDOT w/ coordination &amp; input from Cooperating and Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
<td>Approx 3-6 months in advance of proposed Letting dates</td>
<td>Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Permits and Other Approvals Obtained as Required (ie–401, Air Quality, etc)</td>
<td>401 Water Quality Certification, Section 404 Permit</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days minimum before individual contract Letting Dates</td>
<td>Appropriate Cooperating Participating Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es for Individual Contracts Processed &amp; Advertised for Letting</td>
<td>Un-programmed, subject to availability of funding</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT</td>
<td>30 Calendar Days minimum between Advertising and Letting dates</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>Coordination/Decision Points</td>
<td>Anticipated Date Information Sent</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies and Contacts</td>
<td>Anticipated Date of Response</td>
<td>Responding Agencies and Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Implementation of Mitigation Commitments in FEIS and ROD</td>
<td>On-going until Construction Activities are Completed</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT with coordination and input from Cooperating and Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
<td>Time As Required</td>
<td>Public, Local Officials, Cooperating Participating Agencies as Deemed Appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5: Public Involvement

5.1 Public Involvement Process
Public involvement includes engaging key stakeholders, community members and the general public in the planning, design and development of proposed improvements in the US 51 corridor and other potentially affected corridors. The general public involvement approach is based on the following objectives:

- Actively seek public input on the project’s proposed purpose and need, alternatives, and recommended course of action.
- Consider, answer and account for public inquiries, suggestions and ideas in the decision making process.
- Provide opportunities for the public to affect major decisions before they are made.
- Publicize project activities through a variety of communication venues such as newsletters, news releases, and informational meetings.
- Provide the public with efficient access to project information.

Public involvement for the US 51 Corridor Study was already underway when the requirement for a more formalized coordination plan was established under SAFETEA-LU. Following is a summary of key public involvement activities that have occurred to date.

5.2 Public Involvement in Needs Assessment Phase (April 2003–February 2004)

April 2003: Newsletter 1 was sent to the public to introduce them to the study and its purpose, inform them of the public involvement opportunities and provide an overview of other concurrent studies in the area. Provide updates of project progress, and summarize results and recommendations of the needs assessment study.

July 2003: Newsletter 2 distributed a transportation needs survey to determine perception of US 51 congestion and general corridor needs.

April and May 2003: Three meetings were held with four focus groups to allow in-depth discussions of specific issues related to the US 51 corridor.

July 4-5 and September 12-14, 2003: Information booths were staffed at two community functions: Stoughton Junior Fair and McFarland Family Fest.

October 2003: Three community workshops were held to obtain input on perceived problems and concerns in the US 51 corridor.

November 2003: Approximately nine interviews conducted on a one-on-one basis with area stakeholders to solicit feedback on US 51 needs.


January 2004: A public information meeting was held to present the results of the US 51 Needs Assessment.

5.3 Public Involvement in EA Corridor Study Phase (2005)

April 8, 2005: A postcard advertising notice of the Alternative Solutions Workshop was mailed.

April 28, 2005: Alternative Solutions Workshop was held to confirm public’s perception of problems on the US 51 corridor and then brainstorm solutions.

5.4 Public Involvement in EIS Corridor Study Phase (2006–present)

May 4, 2006: A newsletter was mailed advertising notice of the public information meetings and the preliminary range of alternatives.

May 16-17, 2006: Two public information meetings were held to review needs and public input to date, present concept alternatives that included improvements on other corridors, and obtain public input.
One more public information meeting is planned for early 2009. It is anticipated the public hearing for the DEIS will be held in 2009. Information on the US 51 project is also available on WisDOT’s Web site.

5.5 Coordination with Local Officials

The US 51 Corridor Study has a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). These committees were established to provide local input and guidance and to provide an additional communications link between the project team, affected communities, and resource agencies. The PAC includes representatives from adjacent communities, Dane County, MMPO, and community leaders. The TAC was established by the project team and includes technical resource staff from WisDOT, FHWA, DNR, Dane County, MMPO, and adjacent communities.

In the Needs Assessment phase, four meetings were held with the PAC and seven meetings with the TAC. During the EA phase in 2005, there were two meetings each with the PAC and the TAC. Since the EIS phase was initiated in early 2006, there have been three PAC and four TAC meetings. Meetings with these groups in the early phases were held to assist in defining existing conditions and problems in the US 51 corridor, data collection, developing the community involvement plan, and establishing the framework for the Corridor Study phases. During the EIS phase, these meetings have focused on refining project purpose and need objectives and developing the range of reasonable alternatives. Meetings will continue throughout the corridor study phase to assist in refining the alternatives and providing input on a preferred alternative.

Representatives on the TAC for the US 51 Corridor Study are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHWA</th>
<th>City of Stoughton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Village of McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Highway Department Asst.</td>
<td>Town of Dunn Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Town of Rutland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Planning</td>
<td>DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representatives on the PAC for the US 51 Corridor Study are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Dane County Board Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Stoughton Mayor</td>
<td>Dane County Highway Department Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland President</td>
<td>Town of Dunkirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Albion</td>
<td>Town of Pleasant Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dunn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rutland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Summary of Project Meetings to Date

6.1 List of Project Meetings
Following is a list of project meetings held to date with agencies, local governments, and the public during the US 51 Needs Assessment phase, the EA Corridor Study phase and the current EIS Corridor Study phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/05/03</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting</td>
<td>Describe needs assessment project approach and local/public interactions and schedule. Determine information needed to effectively model the US 51 study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/03</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting</td>
<td>Describe needs assessment project approach and local/public interactions and schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/03</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Update on data collection activities, land use projections, public and local interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/03</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting with local businesses and industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/03</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting with local government officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/03</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Meeting with community and environmental groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/08/03</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed data collection, transportation needs survey, recent focus group meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/03</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed land use project growth scenarios, existing operations modeling, completion of Existing Conditions and Deficiencies reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/03</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed calibration of existing demand model, use of projected land use maps, Transportation Needs survey results, showed Paramics model of existing corridor, and recent public outreach activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/03</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Update on demand and operations modeling, discussed results of Transportation Needs Survey, and public outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/03</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed updated demand and operations modeling, upcoming workshops, and individual interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28-30/03</td>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops held in Stoughton, McFarland, and Town of Dunn to obtain input on specific needs along the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/03</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed TAZ revisions, existing and future operations modeling in Paramics based on specific growth scenarios; reviewed workshop summaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03</td>
<td>Individual interview meetings with local officials and area stakeholders</td>
<td>Approximately nine one-on-one interviews with area stakeholders completed to provide input regarding needs for US 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/03</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed modeling summary for intersections and relationship between traffic operations and population growth, summary of nine interviews conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/29/04</td>
<td>Public Information Meeting—Stoughton</td>
<td>Discuss findings of Need Assessment Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/05</td>
<td>US 51 EA Kickoff Meeting</td>
<td>Reviewed scope for EA and schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/05</td>
<td>Community Workshop- Alternative Solutions</td>
<td>Opportunity for the public to provide additional input on needs and suggest potential solutions for US 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/05</td>
<td>Meeting with City of Stoughton</td>
<td>Discuss results from workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/05</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Reviewed findings from Alternative Solutions Workshop and discussed potential screening of alternatives that would improve other corridors besides US 51 to address US 51 concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/05</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Recap of Alternative Solutions Workshop and feedback from TAC on alternatives other than improving US 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/05</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Presentation of screening results of various improvement alternatives and discussion of implications of other alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/05</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Presentation of screening results of various improvement alternatives, comments from TAC, and discussion of implications of other alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/02/05</td>
<td>WisDOT Majors Peer Review Committee meeting</td>
<td>Peer Review committee provided permission to look at routes other than US 51 to address needs on US 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/06</td>
<td>Agency NEPA 404/Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Discuss an initial draft of the purpose and need and several concept alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/20/06</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed recent meetings, revised P &amp; N, discussed concept alternatives and suggested refinements and a sub alternative of US 51 located west of Stoughton, and upcoming PIM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/06</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed recent meetings and concept alternatives as well as the sub alternative of US 51 located west of Stoughton, and upcoming PIM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16-17/06</td>
<td>Public information Meeting</td>
<td>Presented corridor needs, five concept alternatives, and preliminary environmental scan of impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/06</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Provided summary of PIMs, discussed the potential to reduce the number of concepts (result: no), and discussed next steps in agency coordination process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/06</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Provided summary of PIMs and discussed next steps in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/06</td>
<td>Agency Scoping meeting</td>
<td>Discussed whether public and agency input would eliminate any alternative. No concepts were dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/26/07</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed scope for EIS with overview of requirements of SAFETEA-LU; reviewed alternatives typical sections and design criteria, EIS schedule, and public involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/07</td>
<td>US 51 Sub alternative location meeting</td>
<td>Discussed location issues for this alternative with Town of Rutland and City Planner for Stoughton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/09/07</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed scope for EIS with overview of requirements of SAFETEA-LU; reviewed alternatives typical sections and design criteria, EIS schedule and public involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/07</td>
<td>US 51 Sub alternative location meeting</td>
<td>Discussed location issues for this alternative with Town of Dunn and Mayor of Stoughton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14-18/08</td>
<td>Value Engineering Study</td>
<td>VE Study completed and presentation of results made to WisDOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/6/08</td>
<td>TAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed project schedule and SAFETEA-LU status; reviewed Value Engineering Study goals and recommendations; discussed alternatives to add/remove from EIS and next public information meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAFETEA-LU 6002 Coordination Plan

**Project ID 5845-06-02**

**Date:** October 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/19/08</td>
<td>PAC Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed project schedule and SAFETEA-LU status; reviewed Value Engineering Study goals and recommendations; discussed alternatives to add/remove from EIS and next public information meeting. Shared input from 3/6/08 TAC Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/08</td>
<td>Meeting with City of Stoughton</td>
<td>Reviewed alignments and typical sections and discussed options for backage road, sidewalks/paths, and signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/5/08</td>
<td>Meeting with Dane County Parks</td>
<td>Reviewed alignments and typical sections and discussed options for sidewalks/paths at Babcock Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Impact Analysis Methodology
Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires lead agencies for proposed federally funded transportation projects to determine the appropriate methodology and level of detail for analyzing impacts, in collaboration with cooperating and participating agencies.

The purpose of the impact analysis methodology is to communicate and document the lead agency’s structured approach to analyzing impacts of the proposed transportation project and its alternatives. Collaboration on the impact analysis methodology is intended to promote an efficient and streamlined process and early resolution of concerns or issues.

1.2 Project Background
The US 51 study corridor extends approximately 19 miles, beginning at I-39/90 east of Stoughton and extending through Stoughton and McFarland to the Madison South Beltline Highway (US 12/18) in Madison, Dane County, Wisconsin. Communities in the study area are the towns of Albion, Dunkirk, Dunn, Pleasant Springs, and Rutland, the city of Stoughton, and the village of McFarland.

The purpose of the US 51 Corridor Study is to evaluate alternatives that will improve vehicular traffic flow and safety, and address facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. The study will examine capacity and safety improvements on rural portions of US 51 in the study area as well as potential operational improvements in the Village of McFarland and the City of Stoughton. Transportation needs have already been established in concert with input from FHWA, WisDOT, local government, and the public based on efforts beginning in 2002. These earlier efforts resulted in agreement the study will consider improvements on highways other than US 51 to address the needs of travelers moving between the southeast portion of Dane County and the City of Madison area, as alternatives to major capacity improvements on US 51.

Alternatives that will be evaluated in the study include the following:

- **No Build** - No improvements to existing roadway geometry or capacity.
- **Alternative A** - US 51 safety improvements throughout (from County MN in McFarland, through Stoughton to I-39/90)
- **Alternative B** - Four-lanes on US 51 from McFarland to Stoughton (includes US 51 Safety Improvements within and east of Stoughton and possible mobility enhancements around Stoughton)
- **Alternative C** - Four-lanes on WIS 138 from Stoughton to Oregon (includes US 51 Safety Improvements within and East of Stoughton and possible mobility enhancements around Stoughton)
- **Alternative D** - Four-lanes on County N from Stoughton to I-39/90 (includes US 51 Safety Improvements within and east of Stoughton and possible mobility enhancements around Stoughton)
- **Alternative E** - Four-lanes on WIS 138 from Stoughton to Oregon and four-lanes on County N from Stoughton to I-39/90 (includes US 51 Safety Improvements within and east of Stoughton and possible mobility enhancements around Stoughton)
1.3 Project Vicinity Map

Project Location

Project ID 5845-06-02
US 51 Corridor Study
I-39/90 to US 12/18 (Madison South Beltline)

LEGEND

US 51 Corridor Study
Alternative Corridors Studied
1.4 NEPA Studies in the Project Corridor

In 2002, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) initiated a transportation needs study of the US 51 corridor from I-39/90 to McFarland. The US 51 Needs Assessment report was completed in February 2004. The report identified the following needs to be addressed:

- Corridor Preservation and Long-Term Planning
- Traffic Demand
- Safety
- Substandard Roadway Items
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

In the first part of 2005, the study team began work on an Environmental Assessment for US 51 and held an “Alternatives Workshop” for the public that solicited input on transportation problems and brainstormed possible solutions. An “Alternatives Screening” process was completed to determine what impact expansion of adjacent highway corridors and/or US 51 would have on traffic patterns within the general study area. This was done using the Madison Area MPO’s 2030 Regional Travel Demand Model (April 2005 version).

In November 2005, a WisDOT Majors Peer Review meeting gave approval to the study team to include non-US 51 corridor improvements as possible study alternatives to US 51 expansion. FHWA concluded an EIS would be the appropriate environmental documentation. An Agency Scoping meeting was held in January 2006 to discuss an initial draft of the purpose and need and several concept alternatives. Five concept alternatives were presented to the public at information meetings in May 2006. A second Agency Scoping Meeting was held in November 2006 to determine if public and agency input would allow any of the concepts to be dismissed from consideration in the study. None of the concepts were dismissed.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for the US 51 Corridor Study in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures. The EIS is a full disclosure document that details how the project was developed. It includes project purpose and need, alternatives considered, description of the affected environment, environmental consequences of the proposed action, and the results of coordination with agencies and the public. The EIS also demonstrates compliance with other applicable environmental laws and regulations, and is made available for review by agencies and the public. The EIS process includes a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the EIS, Draft EIS, Final EIS, and Record of Decision (ROD).
Section 2: General Economics Impact Methodology

2.1 Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines

Key regulations and guidance:

- Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) Technical Advisory 6640.8A.
- WisDOT's Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapter 25, Socioeconomic Factors.

2.2 General Methodology

The socioeconomic methodology evaluates social and economic impacts that occur in the project area. Social impacts that will be evaluated include changes in neighborhood or community cohesion, changes in travel and traffic, accessibility, impacts to community facilities and businesses, impacts on traffic safety, public safety, and impacts on special groups such as elderly, handicapped, minority, and transit-dependent persons.

The specific economic impacts that will be evaluated will focus on primary impacts, which include employment opportunities, highway-dependent businesses, and existing and planned business development.

2.3 Project Specific Methodology

No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study. Data for the socioeconomic impact assessment will be obtained primarily from the 2000 US Census of Population and Housing. Supplemental data will be obtained from the Metropolitan Planning Organization, local and regional land use plans, development plans, and discussion with local officials.
Section 3: Business and Residential Impact Methodology

3.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Key regulations and guidance:


- FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A.


3.2 General Methodology
Business/Commercial impacts for this project will include measuring the primary impacts to businesses. This includes right-of-way required and relocations. It will also include how right-of-way requirements and access changes affect the viability of businesses.

Residential impacts are evaluated by estimating the number of residential relocations there are and the characteristics of those properties, including family characteristics, availability of comparable decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the area, measures to replace insufficient housing, and special relocation needs.

Depending on the number and types of homes or businesses displaced, a Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan may be prepared as part of the EIS. Impacts to homes and businesses due to changes in access during and after construction are also evaluated.

3.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study. A Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan will be prepared by the Department and included in the EIS.
Section 4: Environmental Justice Impact Methodology

4.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Key regulations and guidance:

- Executive Order 12898.
- Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (1994).
- The 1997 United States Department of Transportation Order on Environmental Justice (5680-1).

4.2 General Methodology
The environmental justice section analyzes each impact category to determine whether the alternatives under construction would have any disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority populations and low-income populations.

The potential impacts that can be evaluated include air, noise, water pollution, soil contamination, decrease in aesthetic value, increase in traffic congestion or vibration, disconnection or disruption in community cohesion, decrease in economic vitality, disruption of cultural resources, negative effects to public and private facilities, adverse employment effects, and displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.

4.3 Project Specific Methodology
The State of Wisconsin Department of Transportation has integrated environmental justice analysis into its Facilities Development Manual (FDM). Chapter 21, Section 15 Subject 1 of the FDM integrates environmental justice analysis into the EIS process. The US 51 Corridor Study will use the methodology for environmental justice analysis contained in this document. The environmental justice analysis will be based on income and race information from the 2000 U.S. Census. Additional information on race and income will be obtained from local agencies and organizations, and through public involvement and community outreach activities.
Section 5: Indirect and Cumulative Effects Methodology

5.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Indirect and cumulative effects for transportation projects are evaluated in accordance with the following key regulations and guidance:

- The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) publication.

Indirect and Cumulative effects are defined as:

**Indirect effects** are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems (40 CFR 1508.8)

**Cumulative effects** are impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or nonfederal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7).

5.2 General Methodology
The indirect and cumulative effects methodology identifies areas potentially at risk for indirect and cumulative effects. Indirect effects are discovered through analyzing the study area’s goals and important features such as land use/development trends, demographics, and natural resources. Next, impact-causing activities such as disruption to travel patterns or access are identified and qualitatively analyzed. This process is completed through community outreach in the study area.

The cumulative effects methodology qualitatively analyzes the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project. It is a resource-based evaluation. It looks at valuable resources within the project boundary and then evaluates how the transportation project, along with all the other influential factors, will affect it.

5.3 Project Specific Methodology
The indirect effects analysis will include a series of meetings with local experts with knowledge in land use planning and transportation. The expert panel is one of the forecasting tools described in NCHRP Report 466, Desk Reference for Estimating the Indirect Effects of
Proposed Transportation Projects, and has been used in many environmental impact studies in Wisconsin, including the STH 26 EIS, USH 41 EIS, Hwy 18-151/Verona Rd EIS., I-39/90 EIS, USH 8 EIS, and the USH 12 Fort Atkinson EIS. Using a series of smaller, face-to-face meetings is convenient for participants and will allow them to provide in-depth discussion and analysis of the specific geographic area of their expertise. The expert panel methodology is derived from the Delphi method, a systematic and iterative survey research technique directed toward the systematic solicitation and organization of expert opinion from a group of knowledgeable people. The Delphi method is carefully structured and requires several survey iterations. The less formal technique proposed for this study means a reduced time commitment for participants, ensuring better participation.

Information about the purpose and need of the project, an explanation of the alternatives, and a summary of the direct effects of each alternative will be provided to each participant in advance of the meeting. Participants will be asked to determine the areas within their community that will be likely to experience indirect effects, including the magnitude of the effect, the certainty with which they feel the effect will happen, the timing of the potential effect, and what might be done to avoid or minimize the effect.

The cumulative effects of the alternatives must be discussed in the greater context of other activities that have occurred in the past, as well as those that may be reasonably foreseen. The DEIS document will include an estimation of potential cumulative effects of the alternatives based on the direct and indirect effects. A more comprehensive evaluation of cumulative effects will be conducted in the FEIS, once a preferred alternative has been recommended and a construction schedule identified. This will include more precisely defined improvements, updated status of local comprehensive planning efforts, and greater knowledge of the potential direct impacts.
Section 6: Agricultural Impact Methodology

6.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology

Key regulations and guidance:

- WisDOT’s Facilities Development Manual (FDM), Chapter 24, Section 10, Agricultural Lands, and Chapter 32.035, Wisconsin Statutes (Agricultural Impact Statement).

6.2 General Methodology

The Agricultural impact methodology is developed to minimize adverse impacts on farmland and maximize the project’s ability to be compatible and work with the state and local farmland programs and policies.

6.3 Project Specific Methodology

No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study. At this time, it is anticipated that an Agricultural Impact Statement will be required.
Section 7: Air Quality Impact Methodology

7.1 Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines
Air quality impacts for transportation projects are evaluated in accordance with the following key regulations and guidance: The Clean Air Act as amended (42 USC 7401), FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents (1987), FHWA air quality conformance guidance (23 CFR 450), FHWA guidance on analyzing Mobile Source Air Toxics (February 2006), Wisconsin’s State Implementation Plan, and Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 411, Construction and Operation Permits for Indirect Sources.

7.2 General Methodology
The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set national air quality standards for six principal air pollutants (also referred to as criteria pollutants): carbon monoxide (CO), lead, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide. Transportation contributes to CO, NO₂, ozone, and particulate matter. Air quality impacts for transportation projects are evaluated in view of these criteria pollutants using established air quality assessment techniques.

As part of the US 51 project, WisDOT will assess three distinct types (ozone, carbon monoxide, and mobile source air toxics) of traffic-related air quality issues. Each distinct air pollutant will be analyzed using the appropriate analysis tool and the results will be recorded in the project’s EIS.

Ozone
At the mesoscale level, the motor vehicle pollutants of concern are oxides of nitrogen (NOₓ) and volatile organic compounds (VOC), which can be combined in a series of chemical reactions catalyzed by sunlight to produce ozone (O₃).

No federal agency may approve or fund a transportation project until the project has been shown to conform to the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality. The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) provide a general definition of SIP conformity, applicable to all transportation plans, programs, and projects funded under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Act, which states that such activities will not:

- Cause or contribute to any new violation of any National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) in any area.
- Increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of an NAAQS in any area.
- Delay timely attainment of any NAAQS or any required interim emissions reductions or other milestones in any area.

Carbon Monoxide
In Wisconsin, CO is the only motor vehicle pollutant currently analyzed at the microscale level as required by NEPA. The NAAQS criteria for an adverse CO impact are an exceedence of the one-hour standard of 35 parts per million (ppm) or the eight-hour average of 9 ppm. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) requires a construction permit when any
modeled receptor will be exposed to more than 75 percent but less than 100 percent of the NAAQS for CO within ten years of construction.

**Mobile Source Air Toxics**

FHWA developed interim guidance in 2006, titled *FHWA’s Interim Guidance on Air Toxics Analysis in NEPA Documents*, on when and how to analyze Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) since MSAT science continues to evolve. The FHWA’s interim guidance on air toxins lists three categories of potential MSATs.

- No analysis for projects with no potential for meaningful MSAT effects.
- Qualitative analysis for projects with low potential MSAT effects.
- Quantitative analysis to differentiate alternatives for projects with higher potential MSAT effects.

According to that guidance, any project exceeding the 150,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) traffic volume in the design year (2035) is categorized as a “project with higher potential MSAT effects” and thus would require a quantitative MSAT analysis.

**7.3 Project Specific Methodology**

No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 8: Noise Impact Methodology

8.1 Laws, Regulations, and Guidelines
Highway noise impacts are evaluated in accordance with the following key regulations and guidance: FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents (1987), FHWA’s Federal Aid Policy Guide, Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise (23 CFR 772), and Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter TRANS 405, Siting Noise Barriers.

8.2 General Methodology
Transportation projects are evaluated for traffic noise impacts and abatement measures to help protect the public health and welfare, to supply noise abatement criteria, and to provide information to local officials for land use planning near highways. The noise analysis also provides information on noise generated from typical construction equipment during the construction period.

Existing and design year traffic noise levels are modeled at residential, commercial, and other sensitive receptors along the project corridor using FHWA’s Traffic Noise Prediction Model (TNM)® 2.5 computer program. The TNM® includes traffic characteristics that yield the greatest hourly traffic noise on a regular basis for existing conditions and the future design year. Field sound level readings may also be taken at select locations. Under TRANS 405, noise impacts will be evaluated further to determine the reasonableness and feasibility of potential mitigation measures such as noise walls or berms. If noise mitigation is reasonable under TRANS 405 criteria, additional public involvement related to noise mitigation would be initiated.

8.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 9: Wetland Impact Methodology

9.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key regulations and guidance:

- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251).
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands (42 FR 26961).
- DOT Executive Order 5660.1A, Preservation of the Nation’s Wetlands, Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended (16 USC 661-667).
- FHWA’s policy and procedures for evaluation and mitigation of adverse environmental impacts to wetland and natural habitat (23 CFR 777).
- WisDOT’s Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapter 24, Section 5, Aquatic Systems.
- WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guidelines as amended.
- WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement Amendment on Compensatory Mitigation for Unavoidable Wetland Losses Resulting from State Transportation Activities (2001).

9.2 General Methodology
Environmental documents measure wetland impact through existing mapping sources and field delineation. Transportation alternatives then seek to reduce impacts by avoiding wetlands where possible, minimize impacts to wetlands that cannot be avoided, and mitigate all unavoidable wetland loss through various compensation measures.

9.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study. Preliminary wetland boundaries will be determined through existing GIS and other mapping information and field delineation of wetlands on the Preferred Alternative will be completed in consultation with WDNR.
Section 10: Water Resource/Floodplain Impact Methodology

10.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key regulations and guidance:

- The Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251) including Section 303(d), impaired waters, Executive Order 11988.
- Floodplain Management (42 FR 26951).
- DOT Executive Order 5650.2, Floodplain Management and Protection.
- Policies and Procedures (23 CFR 650).
- WisDOT’s Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapter 24.
- Land and Water Resources Impacts and FDM Chapter 10, Erosion Control, Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 116.
- Wisconsin’s Floodplain Management Program, the WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement Amendment.
- Memorandum of Understanding on Erosion Control and Storm Water Management (1994).
- Cooperative Agreement Amendment, Memorandum of Understanding on Erosion Control and Storm Water Management (1994).
- Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter TRANS 401, Construction Site Erosion Control and Storm Water Management Procedures for Department Actions.

10.2 General Methodology
Transportation improvement alternatives for water resources and floodplain impacts involve finding ways to minimize negative impacts to water quality, floodplains, and stream hydraulics. This may be implemented through using sound erosion control and stormwater management practices and by sizing new and replacement structures to minimize floodplain encroachment and increases in the height of the regional (100-year) floodplain elevation. Properly minimizing adverse effects requires assessment of existing conditions such as water quality, fishery resources, floodplain functions and values, potential undesirable outcomes to these conditions, and proposed measures to minimize the adverse effects.

10.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 11: Upland Habitat/Wildlife Impact Methodology

11.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key regulations and guidance:

- The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended (16 USC 661-667).

11.2 General Methodology
Upland habitats are made up of non-wetland areas in the transportation project’s region of potential effect that has vegetative cover suitable for supporting wildlife. Upland areas include remnant prairies dominated by grasses and forbs, woodlands/shrubs thickets, fallow fields, and fence lines.

Impact evaluation includes an assessment of existing conditions (community type, connectivity to other resources, wildlife associations), amount and type of habitat affected by the proposed project, fragmentation or severance of ecosystems, and consequential effects on wildlife permanently inhabiting or passing through the upland habitat areas. At this time, FHWA does not have a policy for mitigating upland habitat impacts. It is FHWA’s position that normal practices such as providing appropriate management of land within the highway right-of-way, using location, design and construction techniques to minimize habitat impacts, and possible acquisition of wider rights-of-way will adequately mitigate the loss of upland wildlife habitat.

11.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 12: Threatened and Endangered Species Impact Methodology

12.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key regulations and guidance:

- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 661).
- WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement Amendment.
- WisDOT Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapter 24, Land and Water Resources.

12.2 General Methodology
The impact evaluation for threatened and endangered species includes a determination of the presence or absence of any federally listed or state listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat in the transportation project’s area of potential effect. The DNR along with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service determines the presence or absence of threatened or endangered species.

If threatened and endangered species or their critical habitat is present and cannot be avoided by location and design refinements to the proposed transportation project, WisDOT and FHWA would proceed with consultation steps under the Endangered Species Act for federally listed species. For state listed species, WisDOT would develop a conservation plan or lay the groundwork for an incidental take permit in consultation with DNR.

12.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 13: Public Use Lands Impact Methodology

13.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Public use land impacts (existing and planned public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, other public-use lands, and historic sites) for transportation projects are evaluated in accordance with the following key regulations and guidance:

- Section 4(f) of the U.S. DOT Act (23 USC 138; 49 USC 303).
- Section 6(f) of the Land & Water Conservation Fund Act as amended (16 USC 4601), the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (Dingell-Johnson Act) as amended (16 USC 777).
- Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 USC 669).
- WisDOT’s Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapters 20, 21, and 26 and other public use land funding programs such as those administered by DNR.

13.2 General Methodology
Public use land impacts are evaluated through an inventory of potentially affected public use land in the project area. The evaluation also includes existing and planned use for the land, funding sources, and jurisdictional agencies. Where it is impossible to avoid public use resources, impacts would be analyzed by the amount of land required from the resource or any constructive use impacts such as increased traffic noise, changes in the visual setting, or impacts that would adversely affect the public land use.

13.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 14: Cultural Resources Impact Methodology

14.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key regulations and guidance:

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended (16 USC 470).
- FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A.
- WisDOT’s Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapter 26, Historical Preservation.

14.2 General Methodology
The cultural resource impact evaluation includes the identification of cultural resources in the transportation project’s area. Qualified archaeologists and historians evaluate the resources to determine the potential effect from the project. The evaluation includes identifying cultural resources, National Register of Historic Places, and an assessment of whether adverse effects will occur.

14.3 Project Specific Methodology
US 51 Corridor Study will identify the Area of Potential Effect for existing US 51 and the other alternatives and conduct a reconnaissance survey following the procedures specified in the WisDOT Facilities Development Manual for archaeology and history. A report will document the results of the reconnaissance surveys. A Determination of Eligibility will be completed for historic properties that are recommended for consideration as eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places will be prepared. Documenting the eligibility of archaeological site(s) for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and preparation of documentation for the determination of effects will be considered if needed as part of an amendment to the study contract services.
Section 15: Contaminated Sites Impact Methodology

15.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key regulations and guidance:

- FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A.
- WisDOT’s Facilities Development Manual (FDM), Chapter 21, Section 35, Contaminated Site Assessments and Remediation.

15.2 General Methodology
The Phase 1 investigation uses field observations, interviews and records searches to identify sites that have a high likelihood of contamination. Phase 1 screening is performed for all alternatives carried forward in the environmental documentation process. A Phase 2 investigation, which includes subsurface testing, is performed on sites which fall within the preferred alternative. Further investigation is performed when necessary after a preferred alternative is selected.

15.3 Project Specific Methodology
A Phase 1 screening investigation will be completed for each of the alternatives carried forward for detailed analysis in the EIS. Following selection of the preferred alternative, a Phase 1 Hazardous Materials Assessment will be completed in accordance with the FDM on the preferred alternative. The Phase 1 will identify specified sites, if any, along the preferred alternative that require additional investigation (Phase 2 to Phase 3, with subsurface testing).

After subsurface testing is completed, the DNR and possibly affected parties will be notified of the results. WisDOT will work with all concerned to ensure that the disposition of any petroleum contamination is resolved to the satisfaction of the Wisconsin DNR, WisDOT BEES, and FHWA before acquisition of any questionable site and before advertising the project for letting. Non-petroleum sites will be handled on a case-by-case basis with detailed documentation and coordination with FHWA as needed.
Section 16: Aesthetic Impact Methodology

16.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Aesthetic (visual) impacts for transportation projects are evaluated in accordance with the following key regulations and guidance:

- FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A.

16.2 General Methodology
The purpose of the visual impact assessment is to protect the visual character of the project corridor. This task is accomplished through identifying the visual character of the project corridor, characterizing the visual quality of the area, and identifying the groups viewing the project from the highway and of the highway. The impact assessment will also describe the visual change that will occur to the project corridor through the proposed transportation improvements. Mitigation will take place where adverse visual effects are identified. Mitigation measures could include landscaping and aesthetic treatments such as bridge abutments, retaining walls, and sidewalks in the project area.

16.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the US 51 Corridor Study.
Section 17: Construction Impact Methodology (Transportation Management Plans)

17.1 Laws, Regulations, Guidelines, and Methodology
Key guidelines:

- FHWA’s Technical Advisory 6640.8A.
- Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents (October, 1987).

17.2 General Methodology
Construction Impacts

During the construction of the project, additional assessment of the following impacts may be conducted:

- Access to facilities and service.
- Emergency response services.
- Air quality (emissions and fugitive dust).
- Construction solid and hazardous waste.
- Economic impacts.
- Noise.
- Vibration.
- Water quality/erosion and sedimentation.

Transportation Management Plans for Work Zones

A transportation management plan (TMP) for work zones provides management strategies of work zone impacts and safety in all project development phases. Transportation management strategies for a work zone include temporary traffic control measures and devices, public information and outreach, and operational strategies such as travel demand management, signal retiming, and traffic incident management.

FHWA’s TMP for work zones provides for systematic consideration and management of work zone impacts and safety in all project development phases. Preliminary information is developed in the project’s planning phase with input from the public, local officials and other interests, and developed further in subsequent environmental assessment and engineering design phases.
A TMP helps to reduce traffic and mobility impacts, improve safety, and promote coordination within and around the work zone. The TMP must be developed to best serve the specific community, project, road users, businesses, and highway workers.

The (23CFR450) Rule updates and broadens the former regulation to address more of the current issues affecting work zone safety and mobility by:

- Fostering systematic assessment of the work zone impacts of road projects and development and implementation of transportation management strategies that help manage these impacts.
- Expanding thinking beyond the project work zone itself to address corridor, network, and regional issues while planning and designing road projects.
- Expanding work zone impacts management beyond traffic safety and control to address mobility in addition to safety and to address the broader concepts of transportation operations and public information.
- Advocating innovative thinking in work zone planning, design, and management to consider alternative/innovative design, construction, contracting, and transportation management strategies.

17.3 Project Specific Methodology
After a preferred alternative has been selected, construction impacts and traffic management strategies will be broadly addressed in the FEIS. This discussion will include the following:

- Probable construction staging of the preferred alternative.
- Probable traffic control concepts necessary during the construction of the preferred alternative, which also consider motor vehicle and worker safety.
- Traffic management measures available to help mitigate the effects of the construction staging.
- A discussion with local officials of these probable construction staging and traffic control measures.
Re:
Consideration of Letter of Comment to WisDOT Regarding Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents – Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology of US 51 (Terminal Drive to Token Creek Park Road) Corridor Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Comments on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MPO has agreed to be a participating agency in the review of this project in accord with federal transportation legislation (SAFETEA-LU). Being a participating agency in the review of this project does not imply support of the proposal. However, we are expected to provide timely review and comment on information being prepared for the environmental document to reflect the view and concerns of our agency. Therefore, WisDOT is requesting comments from the MPO on the draft Coordination Plan and draft Impact Analysis Methodology of this corridor study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Presented on Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. WisDOT Letter Dated October 8, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Draft Letter of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Draft Coordination Plan and Draft Impact Analysis Methodology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation/Rationale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends approval of the letter of comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 8, 2008

Robert McDonald
Transportation Planning Manager
Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
121 S. Pinckney Street #400
Madison, WI 53703

Re: Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents – Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology
Project I.D. 5411-02-03
US 51 (Stoughton Road) Corridor Study
(Terminal Drive/Voges Road – Token Creek Park Road)
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. McDonald:

As you are aware, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is completing an Environmental Impact Statement for the US 51 (Stoughton Road) Corridor Study in Dane County, Wisconsin. A description of the project was presented in WisDOT’s September 19, 2007 letter to you.

Our September 19, 2007 letter described the project’s relationship to Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). In the letter, you were offered the opportunity to become actively involved as a participating agency in the environmental review process for the project. We appreciate your agency’s acceptance of this offer. As part of the environmental process, we ask that you provide written comments on the enclosed draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Coordination Plan and draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Impact Analysis Methodology within 30 days of receipt of this letter. Preliminary drafts of these documents were made available to the public for review and comment at the October 2007 Public Information Meeting.

Your letter or email response may be sent to: Jeff Berens
WisDOT SW Region
2101 Wright Street
Madison, WI 53704-2583
(608) 245-2656
jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us

We ask that your response include verification that your contact information is correct or an update of the information if it is incorrect. If you would like to discuss the Stoughton Road Corridor Study in more detail, or if you have any questions on the SAFETEA-LU requirements or other aspects, please contact me. Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this project.

Sincerely,

Jeff Berens
WisDOT Project Manager

Enclosures: Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Coordination Plan & Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Impact Analysis Methodology

cc: Johnny Gerbitz, FHWA – Wisconsin
Scott Cramer, KL Engineering
November 5, 2008

Mr. Jeff Berens  
Division of Transportation System Development  
Southwest Region  
2101 Wright Street  
Madison, WI 53704-2583

Re: Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents-  
Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology  
Project I.D. 5411-02-03  
US 51 (Stoughton Road) Corridor Study  
(Terminal Drive/Voges Road to Token Creek Park Road)  
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Berens:

In response to your letter of October 8, 2008, the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board, a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has reviewed the Draft SAFETEA-LU 6002 Documents (Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology) for the US 51 (Stoughton Road) Corridor Study (Terminal Drive/Voges Road to Token Creek Park Road) and offers the following comments.

Providing a document that identifies the plan to be used to facilitate and document the lead agencies’ structured interaction with the public and other agencies and to inform the public and other agencies of how the coordination plan will be accomplished is a good approach. The Coordination Plan should help to streamline the EIS process and provide good project management through coordination, scheduling, and early resolution of issues. The same can be said of the Impact Analysis Methodology document. The Board found both documents to be relatively complete and does not have any significant comments to make at this time. However, the Board may wish to comment more extensively in the near future following the review of the application of the methodologies and the quality of the results.

The MPO would like to request that a presentation of this project be made before the full Board as part of your coordination plan with local officials. Although this project was presented to the MPO back in March of 2005, the MPO completed a federal redesignation process in 2007 resulting in a restructured Board with many new members that are unfamiliar with the project.

The MPO Board also asks that you consider conducting a Mobile Source Air Toxics analysis as part of your air quality impact methodology, even though the Stoughton Road corridor does not exceed the 150,000 AADT criterion identified in FHWA interim guidance. This 11-mile roadway corridor is heavily traveled and passes through a very urbanized area of the City of Madison.

As a minor point, in the Coordination Plan - Item 5.4 Coordination With Local Officials, the MPO should be listed in the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as Madison MPO rather than City of Madison MPO.

In conclusion, the MPO appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology for this project. If you have any questions, please contact Robert McDonald, Transportation Planning Manager, at 266-4518 or rmcdonald@cityofmadison.com.

Sincerely,

Al Matano  
Chair, Madison Area Transportation Planning Board
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**Revision History**

This section of the Coordination Plan is reserved for documenting any substantive changes that might occur during the EIS Corridor Study phase (such as schedule revisions), and how the changes were communicated to cooperating/participating agencies and the public.
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Coordination Plan
Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU 6002) requires lead agencies for proposed federally funded transportation projects to establish a plan for coordinating public and agency participation during the environmental review process. SAFETEA-LU 6002 applies to projects for which an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared and is not optional for such projects. SAFETEA-LU 6002 may be applied to projects being advanced through Environmental Assessments (EAs) or Categorical Exclusions (CEs) at the discretion of the project’s lead agencies.

The purposes of the SAFETEA-LU 6002 coordination plan are to facilitate and document the lead agencies’ structured interaction with the public and other agencies and to inform the public and other agencies of how the coordination plan will be accomplished. The coordination plan is meant to promote an efficient and streamlined process and good project management through coordination, scheduling, and early resolution of issues.

SAFETEA-LU 6002 coordination plans outline how the lead agencies have divided responsibilities for compliance with various aspects of the environmental review process, such as issuance of invitation letters, and how the lead agencies will provide opportunities for input from the public and other agencies. The coordination plan also identifies coordination points and project milestones; establishes a schedule of meetings; and identifies timeframes for input and review by the participating and cooperating agencies and the public.

The Stoughton Road Corridor Study was initiated before the requirements of SAFETEA-LU 6002 became applicable. Therefore, initial coordination with state and federal review agencies, local officials and the public has already occurred. See Section 1.3 for more information on previous coordination.

The coordination plan will be shared with federal, state, and local agencies, local units of government, and Native American Tribes who have expressed interest in the proposed project. The draft coordination plan will be sent to interested parties for review and comment, and follow up as deemed appropriate to resolve any issues. The final coordination plan and any substantive changes in the plan will also be sent to interested parties. The draft and final coordination plan will be shared with the public through availability at public information meetings and the public hearing or by individual request. The coordination plan will also be posted on the project’s website with availability announced in project newsletters and other news releases.

1.2 Project Background
The approximate 10-mile Stoughton Road corridor extends from Terminal Drive/Voges Road in the Village of McFarland to STH 19 in the town of Burke (see map on page 4). The initial Stoughton Road Needs Assessment completed in June 2003 determined existing conditions and how future traffic volumes would impact traffic flow and safety. It evaluated future land use, population growth, projected traffic volumes, existing and future traffic operations, crash data, existing/desired bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit, and other factors. The needs assessment identified numerous deficiencies that contribute to congestion and safety concerns, a poor operational level of service, traffic diversion to local streets, and insufficient facilities for bicycle and pedestrian travel at many locations. The needs assessment also included extensive community outreach and participation (see page 22 for more information).
The purpose of the current Stoughton Road Corridor Study is to identify and evaluate alternatives that will improve vehicular traffic flow and safety, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Alternatives that will be evaluated in the study include the following:

- **No Build** — No improvements to existing roadway geometry or capacity.
- **Alternative A** — Reconstruct existing intersections to provide additional turning capacity and provide new or relocated frontage roads at select locations to enhance mobility.
- **Alternative B** — Convert existing intersections to grade separated interchanges at 4 locations and provide free-flow ramps to and from the west side of the existing USH 12/18 Beltline interchange.
- **Alternative C** — Convert existing intersections to grade separated interchanges at 6 locations and construct express lanes over the USH 12/18 Beltline and STH 30 to provide free flow movements for through traffic.

All of the build alternatives include enhanced bicycle and pedestrian travel in the Stoughton Road corridor.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures. The EIS is a full disclosure document that details how the project was developed. It includes project purpose and need, alternatives considered, description of the affected environment, environmental consequences of the proposed action, and the results of coordination with agencies and the public. The EIS also demonstrates compliance with other applicable environmental laws and regulations, and is made available for review by agencies and the public. The EIS process includes a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the EIS, Draft EIS, Final EIS, and Record of Decision (ROD). The proposed time frame for EIS activities is found on page 19.

**1.3 Previous Agency Coordination Prior to Coordination Plan**

Agency coordination for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study was already underway when the requirement for a more formalized coordination plan was established under SAFETEA-LU. Actions to date involving key state and federal review agencies are listed as follows:

- **April 5, 2005**—Agency scoping meeting to acquaint agencies with the project, review potentially affected resources, review project purpose and need, and to present the initial range of alternatives.

- **April 15, 2005**—Letter requesting initial concurrence in project purpose and need, and range of alternatives to be carried forward in the EIS in accordance with the *Concurrent NEPA/404 Process for Transportation Projects* (“404” refers to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act).

- **May 3, 2005**—U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (U.S. Fish & Wildlife) concurred in Purpose and Need and Alternatives.

- **June 2, 2005**—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) concurred in Purpose and Need and Alternatives.

- **August 26, 2005**—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) concurred in Purpose and Need and Alternatives.
September 11, 2006—Interagency meeting to discuss potential wetland impacts; in particular, the possibility of affecting a previously established wetland mitigation site at the south end of the Stoughton Road corridor (USH 12/18 Beltline Highway).

October 13, 2006—Corridor wide wetland site review with Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

1.4 Project Vicinity Map
Section 2: Lead/Cooperating/Participating Agencies

2.1 Agency Definitions and Roles

The standard responsibilities for each lead, cooperating, and participating agency invited to participate in the environmental review process for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study are as follows:

**Federal Lead Agency:** The federal lead agency is the responsible federal agency for managing the 6002 SAFETEA-LU process, preparing the EIS, and providing opportunities for public and participating/cooperating agency involvement. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the federal lead agency for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.

**Joint Lead Agency:** A joint lead agency is a project sponsor (state or local government) receiving SAFETEA-LU funds. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is the joint lead agency for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.

**Cooperating Agency:** Cooperating agencies are generally federal agencies, other than the federal lead agency, that have jurisdiction by law (permitting or land transfer authority) or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in a proposed project or reasonable project alternative. By agreement with the lead agencies, state or local agencies with similar qualifications as the federal agencies, or Native American Tribes (when projects affect lands of tribal interest) may also become cooperating agencies. The US Army Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.

**Participating Agency:** Participating agencies include federal, state or local agencies that may have interest in the project because of their jurisdictional authority, special expertise and/or statewide interest. These agencies are formally invited to participate in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process by identifying issues and concerns regarding the project’s potential impacts, and providing meaningful and timely input on unresolved issues. Participating agencies also provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives considered, and impact assessment methodologies. Several agencies were invited to be participating agencies in the Stoughton Road Corridor Study (see section 2.2). The status of those agencies invited to be participating agencies is provided in Section 2.3.

2.2 List of Agencies, Roles and Responsibilities

The intent of coordination with federal, state, and local review agencies is to cooperatively identify and resolve issues that could delay the environmental process or that could result in denial of any approvals required to implement the proposed project. The agencies listed in the following table have been identified as preliminary affected agencies based on the natural, cultural, and socioeconomic resources in the project area and agency jurisdiction and expertise.

Those agencies noted in the table (and possibly others yet to be identified) have been invited by FHWA and WisDOT to be cooperating or participating agencies for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. Agency responses to this invitation are indicated in Section 2.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Jurisdiction/Responsibility/Potential Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Federal Lead Agency</td>
<td>Manage SAFETEA-LU 6002 process, prepare EIS, provide opportunity for public and cooperating/participating agency involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act Section 404 permit jurisdiction. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (US Fish &amp; Wildlife)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act, Fish &amp; Wildlife Coordination Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>NEPA and Clean Water Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Farmland Protection Policy Act and Food Security Act jurisdiction. Provide comments on farmland impact rating and programs such as Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) and Cropland Reserve Program (CRP) as applicable to project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)</td>
<td>Joint Lead Agency (with FHWA)</td>
<td>Manage SAFETEA-LU 6002 process, prepare EIS, provide opportunity for public and cooperating/participating agency involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)</td>
<td>Cooperating/Participating Agency</td>
<td>Clean Water Act and WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement authority. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS); State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 jurisdiction. Review and approve cultural resource investigation reports/materials. Provide comments and consultation on cultural resources, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Authority under Section 32.035, Wisconsin Statutes to prepare an Agricultural Impact Statement if needed. Provide comments on alternatives and their impacts on agricultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Jurisdiction/Responsibility/Potential Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Project area stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monona</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of DeForest</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Blooming Grove</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Burke</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Local government stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Project area stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Area Transportation Planning Board</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
<td>Project area stakeholder. Provide comments on purpose and need, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Tribes and Great Lakes Intertribal Council</td>
<td>Participating Agencies</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act Section 106. Provide comments and consultation on tribal cultural resources, range of alternatives, selected alternative, impact analysis methodologies and mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Agency Contact Information

The following table lists primary contact persons for the federal, state, and local agencies having jurisdiction, responsibility or potential interest in the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. The table also indicates agency contacts made and responses received with respect to invitations to be cooperating or participating agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Date Invitation Issued</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
<th>Date of Follow up</th>
<th>Agency Response/ Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Johnny Gerbitz</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Federal Lead Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(608) 829-7511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnny.gerbitz@fhwa.dot.gov">johnny.gerbitz@fhwa.dot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)</td>
<td>St. Paul District</td>
<td>9/6/07</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Whiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(651) 290-5200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.j.whiting@usace.army.mil">robert.j.whiting@usace.army.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stacy Marshall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(262) 547-6986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:stacy.marshall@usace.army.mil">stacy.marshall@usace.army.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamera Cameron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(651) 290-5197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tamera.e.cameron@usace.army.mil">tamera.e.cameron@usace.army.mil</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (US Fish &amp; Wildlife)</td>
<td>Louise Clemency</td>
<td>9/6/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(920) 866-1717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:louise_clemency@fws.gov">louise_clemency@fws.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)</td>
<td>Ken Westlake</td>
<td>9/6/07</td>
<td>9/28/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(312) 886-2910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:westlake.kenneth@epa.gov">westlake.kenneth@epa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherry Kamke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(312) 353-5794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kamke.sherry@epa.gov">kamke.sherry@epa.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td>Pat Murphy</td>
<td>9/6/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(608) 662-4422, ext. 258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pat.Murphy@wi.usda.gov">Pat.Murphy@wi.usda.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETEA-LU 6002 Coordination Plan
Project ID 5411-02-03
Date: September 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Date Invitation Issued</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
<th>Date of Follow up</th>
<th>Agency Response/ Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT)</td>
<td>Jeff Berens, P.E. (608) 245-2656 <a href="mailto:jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us">jeff.berens@dot.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Joint Lead Agency with FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Grimes (608) 245-2630 <a href="mailto:jennifer.grimes@dot.state.wi.us">jennifer.grimes@dot.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WisDOT Bureau of Equity &amp; Environmental Services</td>
<td>Shar TeBeest (608) 266-1476 <a href="mailto:sharlene.tebeest@dot.state.wi.us">sharlene.tebeest@dot.state.wi.us</a></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Joint Lead Agency with FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)</td>
<td>Russ Anderson (608) 275-3467 <a href="mailto:russell.anderson@wisconsin.gov">russell.anderson@wisconsin.gov</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/9/07 (Email from R. Grasshoff)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating / Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ron Grasshoff (608) 275-3481 <a href="mailto:ronald.grasshoff@wisconsin.gov">ronald.grasshoff@wisconsin.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS)</td>
<td>Sherman Banker (608) 264-6507 <a href="mailto:sherman.banker@wisconsinhistory.org">sherman.banker@wisconsinhistory.org</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP)</td>
<td>Peter Nauth (608) 224-4650 <a href="mailto:peter.nauth@wisconsin.gov">peter.nauth@wisconsin.gov</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>3/13/08 (Email from P. Nauth)</td>
<td>2/27/08</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Date Invitation Issued</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
<td>Date of Follow up</td>
<td>Agency Response/ Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County</td>
<td>Kathleen Falk (608) 266-2643 <a href="mailto:falk@co.dane.wi.us">falk@co.dane.wi.us</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/8/07 (Email from P. Dunphy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Dunphy (608) 266-4036 <a href="mailto:dunphy@co.dane.wi.us">dunphy@co.dane.wi.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>Rodney Knight (608) 246-3388 <a href="mailto:knight@msnairport.com">knight@msnairport.com</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/5/07 (Letter from R. Knight)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Kirchner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>Mayor Dave Cieslewicz (608) 266-4611 <a href="mailto:mayor@cityofmadison.com">mayor@cityofmadison.com</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/4/07 (Letter from D. Cieslewicz)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Monona</td>
<td>Mayor Robb Kahl (608) 222-2525 <a href="mailto:mayorkahl@ci.monona.wi.us">mayorkahl@ci.monona.wi.us</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/10/07 (Email from R. Vela)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Vela, DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of DeForest</td>
<td>Jeff Miller (608) 225-5216 <a href="mailto:jmdeforest@charter.net">jmdeforest@charter.net</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/19/07 (Email from DPW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick VanderSanden, DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland</td>
<td>Mike Harried (608) 838-3136 <a href="mailto:mike.harried@mcfarland.wi.us">mike.harried@mcfarland.wi.us</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2/27/08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Blooming Grove</td>
<td>Dwight Johnson (608) 223-1104 <a href="mailto:bgadmin@blmgrove.com">bgadmin@blmgrove.com</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/2/07 (Letter from M. Wolt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Wolt, Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Burke</td>
<td>Kevin Viney (608) 837-0810 <a href="mailto:kevin.viney@usbank.com">kevin.viney@usbank.com</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>10/25/07 (Email from Town Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Barbara Weber (608) 266-9113 <a href="mailto:BarbaraW@CapitalAreaRPC.org">BarbaraW@CapitalAreaRPC.org</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>Will be invited when Coord Plan is mailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Area Transportation Planning Board</td>
<td>Robert McDonald (608) 266-4518 <a href="mailto:rmcdonald@ci.madison.wi.us">rmcdonald@ci.madison.wi.us</a></td>
<td>9/19/07</td>
<td>02/27/08 (Email from R. McDonald)</td>
<td>2/27/08</td>
<td>Participating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Date Invitation Issued</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
<td>Date of Follow up</td>
<td>Agency Response/ Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Inter-tribal Council</td>
<td>Michael Allen PO Box 9; Lac du Flambeau, WI 54538 <a href="http://www.glitc.org">http://www.glitc.org</a></td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Edith Leoso, THPO (715) 682-7123, Ext. 1662 PO Box 39; Odanah, WI 54861 <a href="mailto:thpo@badriver.com">thpo@badriver.com</a></td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Michael Alloway PO Box 340; Candon, WI 54520 (715) 478-7483</td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-Chunk Nation</td>
<td>William Quackenbush, THPO PO Box 667 Black River Falls, WI 54615 (715) 284-7181 <a href="mailto:bquackenbush@ho-chunk.com">bquackenbush@ho-chunk.com</a></td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>giiwegiizhigookway Martin, THPO Kelegitigaaning Ojibwe Nation PO Box 249; Watersmeet, MI 49969 <a href="http://www.lvdtribal.com">http://www.lvdtribal.com</a></td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin</td>
<td>David Grignon, THPO PO Box 910; Keshena, WI 54135 (715) 799-5258 <a href="mailto:dgrignon@mitw.org">dgrignon@mitw.org</a></td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation</td>
<td>Rey Kitchkumme Linda Yazzie, THPO 16281 Q Road; Mayetta, KS 66509 <a href="http://www.pbpindiantribe.com">http://www.pbpindiantribe.com</a></td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>10/3/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>No objections to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Larry Balber, THPO 88385 Pike Road; Bayfield, WI 54814 (715) 779-3648 (Initial contact was Lisa Bressette)</td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac &amp; Fox Nation of the Mississippi in Iowa</td>
<td>Jonathan Buffalo, NAGPRA Rep 349 Meskwaki Road; Tama, IA 52339 (641) 484-4678</td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>10/1/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>No objections to project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac &amp; Fox Nation of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Sandra Massey, NAGPRA Rep RR 2, Box 246; Stroud, OK 74079 (918) 968-3526, Ext. 1048</td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sac &amp; Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska</td>
<td>Deanne Bahr / Jane Nice 305 N. Main; Reserve, KS 66434 (715) 742-7471</td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>11/16/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>No objections to project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Coordination Points and Responsibilities

3.1 Agency Expectations

The expectations for Federal Lead and Joint Lead Agencies are:

- Take such action as is necessary and proper to facilitate the expedited review of the environmental review process.

- Ensure that any EIS or other document required under NEPA is completed in accordance with SAFETEA-LU and applicable federal and state law.

- Provide, as early as practicable, but no later than the appropriate project milestone, project information on purpose and need, environmental resources, alternatives and proposed impact analysis methodologies.

- Provide the Coordination Plan to Participating and Cooperating Agencies.

- The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) will have ultimate responsibility for:
  1. Review and adoption of a NEPA document.
  2. Ensuring that the Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT) complies with all design and mitigation commitments.

- Develop a project purpose and need, the range of alternatives to be considered and other procedural matters.

- Involve tribal governments in the NEPA process.

The expectations for Cooperating Agencies are:

- Identify as early as practicable any issue of concern regarding the project’s environmental or socioeconomic impacts.

- Identify as early as practicable any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approvals needed for the project.

- Share information that may be useful to the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT), Cooperating and Participating Agencies.

- Participate in meetings and field reviews.

- Assume, at the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA) request, responsibility for preparing analysis over which the Cooperating Agency has special expertise, depending on Cooperating Agency’s resource availability.
• Make support staff available at the request of the Federal Lead Agency (FHWA).

• Generally use Cooperating Agency’s own resources and funds.

• Provide comments on purpose and need, coordination plan, impact analysis methodologies, and alternatives within 30 days of receipt thereof.

• Review and comment on preliminary versions of Draft EIS and Final EIS.

The expectations for Participating Agencies are:

• Identify as early as practicable any issue of concern regarding the project’s environmental or socioeconomic impacts.

• Identify as early as practicable any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit, delay completion of the environmental review process, or result in denial of approval needed for the project.

• Provide input on purpose and need, impact analysis methodologies and alternatives within 30 days of receipt thereof.

• (For non-federal agencies) respond affirmatively in writing to the letter of invitation to be a participating agency within 30 days of receipt thereof.

• (For federal agencies) respond in writing to the letter of invitation to be a participating agency if you wish to decline the invitation and opt out of the role/process within 30 days of the receipt thereof.

• Provide input on the Coordination Plan and schedule.

• Participate as needed in Issues Resolution Process described in Section 3.3.

• Specific coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will be in accordance with the WisDOT/SHPO Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
3.2 Coordination Points, Information Requirements, and Responsibilities

The following table lists the Coordination Plan’s key coordination points including which agency is responsible for activities during that coordination point, the information required at each point, and who is responsible for transmitting the information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Plan Point</th>
<th>Initiating Agencies</th>
<th>Information Provided or Action</th>
<th>Contacted Agencies</th>
<th>Information Requested or Action</th>
<th>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare EIS and information on project scope</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare EIS and information on project scope</td>
<td>Cooperating and Participating agencies through Federal Register notice</td>
<td>NOI to prepare EIS and information on project scope published in Federal Register</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cooperating and participating agencies identified</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Letters of invitation to be cooperating and/or participating agencies</td>
<td>Potentially interested cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Written acceptance or reason for non-acceptance</td>
<td>30 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agency input on scope of Draft EIS and project purpose and need (Equiv. to NEPA/404 Coord Point 1)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Information about proposed scope of Draft EIS, purpose and need</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Review for acceptance or reply on issues to be resolved</td>
<td>45 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agency input on draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>45 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Public input on draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Availability of draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology through media releases, project website and other sources such as public meetings</td>
<td>Public, local officials and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Provide comments on draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>30 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Coordination plan and final impact analysis methodology with follow up as needed</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Final coordination plan and final impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Review for acceptance or reply on issues to be resolved</td>
<td>30 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Agency meeting on final purpose and need and proposed alternatives with preliminary impacts and follow up as needed (Equiv. to NEPA/404 Coord Point 2)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss proposed alternatives, identified resources and potential impacts</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Review for acceptance or reply on issues to be resolved</td>
<td>30 calendar days (Preliminary information sent 30 days prior to meeting.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Public information meetings on purpose and need and proposed alternatives with, follow up as needed</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss purpose and need and proposed alternatives</td>
<td>Public, local officials, other stakeholders</td>
<td>Provide comments on purpose and need and proposed alternatives</td>
<td>To be specified in public information material, typically 14 calendar days after public meeting(s) are held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Plan Point</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action</td>
<td>Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Information Requested or Action</td>
<td>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finalize alternatives, identify recommended alternative with anticipated impacts if deemed appropriate by FHWA and WisDOT and follow up as needed</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Finalize alternatives, identify recommended alternative</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on finalized alternatives and recommended alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Draft EIS adopted and filed with EPA for availability notice in Federal Register</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Draft EIS</td>
<td>EPA filing section</td>
<td>Availability of Draft EIS published in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Draft EIS circulated for review and comment</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Draft EIS availability through distribution to cooperating and participating agencies, local officials and others on EIS mailing list, and through media announcements, project website and other sources</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Review Draft EIS for Completeness and accuracy, provide questions or comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Public hearing on Draft EIS with follow up as needed</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss purpose and need, alternatives, recommended alternative (if identified) and anticipated impacts</td>
<td>Public, local officials, cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on purpose and need, alternatives, recommended alternative (if identified) and anticipated impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Agency meeting on preferred alternative with anticipated impacts and follow up as needed (Equiv. to NEPA/404 Coord Point 3)</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Discuss preferred alternative, anticipated impacts, proposed mitigation measures</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Provide comments on preferred alternative, anticipated impacts, proposed mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Preliminary Final EIS review and follow up as needed</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Preliminary Final EIS</td>
<td>Cooperating agencies</td>
<td>Review preliminary Final EIS for completeness and accuracy, provide questions or comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Plan Point</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action</td>
<td>Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Information Requested or Action</td>
<td>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Final EIS</td>
<td>EPA filing section</td>
<td>Availability of Final EIS published in Federal Register</td>
<td>14 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Final EIS availability through distribution to cooperating and participating agencies, local officials and others on EIS mailing list, and through media announcements, project website and other sources</td>
<td>Public, local officials, cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>Review Final EIS for Completeness and accuracy, provide questions or comments</td>
<td>30 calendar days from notice of Final EIS in Federal Register (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Information and meetings as deemed necessary to address any unresolved issues</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, other stakeholders and public as deemed appropriate</td>
<td>Agreement on resolution of all substantial unresolved issues</td>
<td>Un-programmed 30 calendar days anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>ROD availability through distribution to cooperating and participating agencies, and through local media announcements, project website and/or other sources</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies and as deemed appropriate, local officials and the public</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of receipt of the ROD</td>
<td>30 calendar days from notice of Final EIS in Federal Register or 45 calendar days from notice of Draft EIS in Federal Register (minimum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>SOL notice</td>
<td>Federal Register</td>
<td>SOL published in Federal Register announcing final action taken (ROD) in project’s NEPA phase</td>
<td>7 calendar days for SOL notice publication; 180 calendar days to file a claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Proposed mitigation measures for commitments made in Final EIS, ROD, final design, and/or during individual agency contacts</td>
<td>Coordination with cooperating and participating agencies as deemed appropriate</td>
<td>Provide comments and/or process approval requests on proposed environmental commitments and mitigation measures</td>
<td>Un-programmed (prior to 90% Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&amp;E) review meetings, approximately 3-6 months in advance of proposed contract letting dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Plan Point</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies</td>
<td>Information Provided or Action</td>
<td>Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Information Requested or Action</td>
<td>Response Time Anticipated or Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Permits and Other Approvals as required for project</td>
<td>WisDOT</td>
<td>Permits and other approval requests with appropriate documentation</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies as applicable based on jurisdiction by law or other inter-agency agreements</td>
<td>Permits and other project approvals as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS&amp;Es for individual contracts processed and advertised for construction letting</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es, statements that environmental commitments have been completed or are included, certifications of right-of-way and utility adjustment coordination</td>
<td>Internal contacts within WisDOT and FHWA</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es approved and projects advertised for construction letting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Implementation of mitigation commitments in Final EIS and ROD</td>
<td>WisDOT FHWA</td>
<td>Mitigation commitments in Final EIS and ROD</td>
<td>Coordinate with cooperating and participating agencies as deemed appropriate</td>
<td>Provide comments and recommendations, and/or process approval requests on proposed mitigation commitments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. This SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 coordination point is equivalent to “concurrence point 1” (purpose and need) under the Concurrent NEPA/404 Process for Transportation Projects (see below).
2. This SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 coordination point is equivalent to “concurrence point 2” (alternatives to be carried forward for detailed study) under the concurrent NEPA/404 Process.
3. This SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 coordination point is equivalent to “concurrence point 3” (selected alternative) under the concurrent NEPA/404 process.

The concurrent NEPA/404 process, also referred to as the merged NEPA/404 process, was established through a March 1994 inter-agency agreement in Federal Highway Administration Region 5 which includes Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio. Signatory agencies include the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The purpose of the merged process is to allow NEPA and Clean Water Section 404 permit activities to be developed concurrently. Concurrence by agencies at a particular concurrence point does not indicate agency agreement that the project must be built or that a permit will be issued. It only indicates that the information developed at a particular step in the process is adequate to advance to the next.
3.3 Issues Resolution Process
The Federal Lead Agency (FHWA), Joint Lead Agency (WisDOT), and Cooperating and Participating Agencies shall work cooperatively in accordance with this section to identify and resolve issues that could delay completion of the environmental review process or could result in denial of any approvals required for the project under applicable laws.

Based on information received from FHWA and WisDOT, Cooperating and Participating Agencies shall identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project’s potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts. Issues of concern include any issues that could substantially delay or prevent the granting of a permit or other approval needed for the project.

The following issues resolution process will be followed:

- Meetings will be held as needed during the course of the NEPA process to discuss and resolve issues.

- If issues are not being resolved in a timely manner:

  1. Official issues resolution meeting(s) will be scheduled by FHWA and WisDOT. All Cooperating and Participating Agencies with an interest or expertise in the issues will be invited to attend and participate in the meeting(s).

  2. If resolution cannot be achieved within 30 days following such a meeting, and a determination has been made by FHWA that all information necessary to resolve the issues has been obtained, then

  3. FHWA will notify the heads of all Participating and Cooperating Agencies and the Council of Environmental Quality, and

  4. FHWA will publish such notice in the Federal Register within 21 days of this notification action.
### Section 4: Project Schedule

#### 4.1 Project Schedule and Coordination Points

The schedule for completing key coordination/decision points and agency responsibilities for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study are listed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coordination/Decision Points</th>
<th>Anticipated Date Information Sent</th>
<th>Initiating Agencies/Contacted Agencies</th>
<th>Anticipated Date of Response</th>
<th>Responding Agencies/Other Project Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare EIS and information on project scope</td>
<td>Sent to Federal Register on 6/6/2006</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT Cooperating and Participating agencies through Federal Register notice</td>
<td>NOI published in Federal Register on 6/12/2006</td>
<td>NOI in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Send letters of invitation to potential cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>9/21/07</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Potential cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>02/27/2008 30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Interested cooperating and participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Request agency input on scope of Draft EIS and project purpose and need (Equiv. to NEPA/404 Coord Point 1)</td>
<td>04/15/05</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>05/03/05 USFWS 06/02/05 EPA 08/26/05 USACE 45 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Request agency input on draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>Fall ’08</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>45 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for public input on draft coordination plan and draft impact analysis methodology</td>
<td>10/16/07 and 10/18/07 PIM #2</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Public, local officials and other interests through media releases/other sources</td>
<td>No responses received 30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Public, local officials and other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Circulate final coordination plan and final impact analysis methodology with follow up as needed</td>
<td>Winter ’08-'09</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conduct agency meeting on final purpose &amp; need and alternatives with preliminary impacts; follow up as needed (Equiv. to NEPA/404 Coord Point 2)</td>
<td>04/05/05</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>05/03/05 USFWS 06/02/05 EPA 08/26/05 USACE 30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials and other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Coordination/Decision Points</td>
<td>Anticipated Date Information Sent</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies/Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Anticipated Date of Response</td>
<td>Responding Agencies/Other Project Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Conduct public information meeting(s) on purpose and need and proposed alternatives, with follow up as needed</td>
<td>PIM #1: March 29 &amp; 30, 2006 PIM #2: October 16 &amp; 18, 2007 (meetings covered preliminary purpose and need and alternatives)</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Public, local officials, other interested stakeholders</td>
<td>PIM #1: April 17, 2006 PIM #2: November 5, 2007 to be specified in public information meeting material, typically 14 calendar days after public meeting(s) are held</td>
<td>Public, local officials, other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Finalize alternatives, identify recommended alternative with anticipated impacts if deemed appropriate by FHWA and WisDOT at this point in the process</td>
<td>Spring ’09</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Participating and cooperating agencies</td>
<td>30 calendar days after information is sent (typical)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Draft EIS adopted and filed with EPA for availability notice in Federal Register</td>
<td>Spring ’09</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT EPA filing section</td>
<td>14 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Notice of Draft EIS in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Circulate Draft EIS for review and comment</td>
<td>Spring ’09</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Public, local officials, cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>45 calendar days after information is sent (minimum total comment period)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, public and other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Conduct public hearing on Draft EIS with follow up as needed</td>
<td>Summer ’09</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Public, local officials, cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>15 calendar days from notice of Draft EIS in Federal Register (CEQ minimum) 30 calendar days from first legal notice of public hearing in official newspaper for project area</td>
<td>Public, local officials, other interested stakeholders, cooperating and participating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conduct agency meeting on preferred alternative with anticipated impacts and follow up as needed (Equiv. to NEPA/404 Coord Point 3)</td>
<td>Summer ’09</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, public and other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Circulate preliminary Final EIS for review and follow up as needed</td>
<td>Fall ’09</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating agencies</td>
<td>30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination/Decision Points</td>
<td>Anticipated Date Information Sent</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies/Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Anticipated Date of Response</td>
<td>Responding Agencies/Other Project Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Final EIS adopted and filed with EPA for availability notice in Federal Register</td>
<td>Winter ’09-’10</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT EPA filing section</td>
<td>14 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Notice of Final EIS in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Circulate Final EIS for review and comment and follow up as needed</td>
<td>Winter ‘09-’10</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Public, local officials, cooperating and participating agencies</td>
<td>30 calendar days from notice of Final EIS in Federal Register (minimum)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, public and other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Prepare draft Record of Decision (ROD) and follow up on substantive comments received on Final EIS as needed (if substantive comments are received)</td>
<td>Spring ‘10</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Public, local officials, cooperating and participating agencies as deemed appropriate</td>
<td>anticipated 30 calendar days after information is sent</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, public and other interested stakeholders as deemed appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Final ROD issued</td>
<td>Spring ‘10</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT Cooperating and participating agencies and as deemed appropriate, local officials and the public</td>
<td>30 calendar days from notice of Final EIS in Federal Register or 45 calendar days from notice of Draft EIS in Federal Register (minimums)</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, public and other interested stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Statue of Limitations (SOL) notice published in Federal Register announcing final action has been taken (ROD) in project’s NEPA phase</td>
<td>Summer ‘10</td>
<td>FHWA and WisDOT Federal Register</td>
<td>7 calendar days for SOL notice publication; 180 calendar days to file a claim</td>
<td>Notice of SOL in Federal Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Final concurrence in project contract-level mitigation measures</td>
<td>Un-programmed</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA With coordination and input from cooperating and participating agencies as deemed appropriate</td>
<td>Un-programmed</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies and local officials as deemed appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Obtain permits and other approvals as required for project</td>
<td>Un-programmed</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA Cooperating and participating agencies as applicable based on jurisdiction by law or other inter-agency agreements</td>
<td>Un-programmed</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination/Decision Points</td>
<td>Anticipated Date Information Sent</td>
<td>Initiating Agencies/Contacted Agencies</td>
<td>Anticipated Date of Response</td>
<td>Responding Agencies/Other Project Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PS&amp;Es for individual contracts processed and advertised for construction letting</td>
<td>Un-programmed</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA</td>
<td>Un-programmed 30 calendar days between advertising and let dates (minimum)</td>
<td>Internal contacts within WisDOT and FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Implementation of mitigation commitments in Final EIS and ROD</td>
<td>Ongoing until construction activities are completed</td>
<td>WisDOT and FHWA</td>
<td>Un-programmed coordination and consultation initiated within 30 days of unanticipated impacts or identification of mitigation issues</td>
<td>Cooperating and participating agencies, local officials, public and other stakeholders as deemed appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5: Public Involvement

5.1 Public Involvement Process
Public involvement includes engaging key stakeholders, community members and the general public in the planning, design and development of proposed improvements in the Stoughton Road corridor. The general public involvement approach is based on the following objectives:

- Actively seek public input on the project’s proposed purpose and need, alternatives, and recommended course of action
- Consider, answer and account for public inquiries, suggestions and ideas in the decision making process
- Provide opportunities for the public to affect major decisions before they are made
- Publicize project activities through a variety of communication venues such as newsletters, news releases, and informational meetings
- Provide the public with efficient access to project information.

Public involvement for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study was already underway when the requirement for a more formalized coordination plan was established under SAFETEA-LU. Following is a summary of key public involvement activities that have occurred to date.

5.2 Public Involvement in Needs Assessment Phase
(October 2001—June 2003)

*June through July 2002*—A public opinion survey was distributed early in the study process to determine perceptions of Stoughton Road users on the levels of roadway congestion.

*June through August 2002*—Interviews were conducted with approximately 20 businesses located along Stoughton Road to obtain input on congestion and other problems or concerns that potentially affect the businesses.

*March through July 2002*—Three focus group workshops were held to obtain input on perceived problems and concerns in the Stoughton Road corridor; the focus groups included neighborhood, business and bicycle/pedestrian interests.

*March 2003*—A project video was prepared to provide information on why Stoughton Road is being studied for future improvements, traffic congestion and safety issues, pedestrian and bicycle issues, neighborhood issues, projected growth and change in the corridor and the next steps in developing possible solutions. The video was presented at the April 2003 public information meeting sessions and made available to interested groups and individuals.

*April 7-10, 2003*—Three public information meeting sessions were held to present the results of the Stoughton Road Needs Assessment.

*July 2003*—A Technical Report detailing the results of the Needs Assessment was prepared and distributed.
5.3 Public Involvement in EIS Corridor Study Phase
(March 2004—present)

May 3, 2004—A workshop was conducted to give the public an opportunity to participate in defining project purpose and need and developing preliminary solutions. Public participation was solicited through a postcard mailing that was sent to approximately 13,000 homes and businesses in the Stoughton Road corridor. The first part of the workshop focused on identifying existing problems such as traffic backups, lack of turning capacity at intersections, safety concerns, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Specific problems identified throughout the corridor were ultimately used to assist the project team in defining the project purpose and need. The second part of the workshop focused on identifying possible solutions such as improving intersections, possible grade separations, improving signal timing, improving traffic flow and safety on Stoughton Road to preclude traffic from using other local roads through neighborhoods. Specific solutions identified throughout the corridor were ultimately used to assist the project team in developing the initial range of alternatives.

March 29-30, 2006—Two public information meeting sessions were held to review the purpose and need for proposed improvements in the Stoughton Road corridor, review the results of the May 2004 workshop effort, present the preliminary range of alternatives, and obtain public input.

November 9-10, 2006—Two business focus group meeting sessions were held to discuss issues with the businesses located in the study area. Approximately 1,000 businesses were invited to review the purpose and need for proposed improvements in the Stoughton Road corridor, the results of the May 2004 workshop effort, and the preliminary range of alternatives.

October 16 and 18, 2007 – Two public information meeting sessions were held to present the final alternatives and their potential impacts prior to full analysis in the EIS. Public comments were solicited, a public survey was conducted, and the public was updated on the status of the project and project schedule.

Additional public involvement will include a public hearing on the Draft EIS in spring 2009. Information on the Stoughton Road project is also available on WisDOT’s web site.
5.4 Coordination with Local Officials

A Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) were established in the Stoughton Road Needs Assessment phase to provide local input and guidance, and to provide an additional communications link between the project team and affected communities.

The PAC was established with input from the City of Madison. PAC members include representatives from the following agencies and stakeholder interests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WisDOT</th>
<th>Dane County Public Works and Transportation Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison City Alder #3</td>
<td>Dane County Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison City Alder #15</td>
<td>Far Eastside Business Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison City Alder #16</td>
<td>Business Representatives (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison City Alder #17</td>
<td>Neighborhood Representatives (3)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison MPO</td>
<td>Monona Alder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Town of Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison City Engineering</td>
<td>Town of Blooming Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Public Works Director</td>
<td>*Includes representative from Stoughton Road Revitalization Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TAC, established by the Stoughton Road project team, includes representatives from the following agencies and stakeholder interests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHWA and WisDOT</th>
<th>City of Madison Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Highway Department</td>
<td>City of Madison Office of Business Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>City of Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane County Planning</td>
<td>City of Madison Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Blooming Grove</td>
<td>City of Monona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Burke</td>
<td>Madison Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of McFarland Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison Planning</td>
<td>Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meetings were held with and PAC and TAC during the Needs Assessment phase to assist in defining existing conditions and problems in the Stoughton Road corridor, data collection, developing the community involvement plan, and establishing the framework for the Corridor Study phase.

In the Corridor Study phase, meetings with the PAC and TAC have focused on refining project purpose and need objectives and developing the range of reasonable alternatives. Meetings will continue throughout the Corridor Study phase to assist in refining the alternatives and selecting a preferred alternative.

PAC and TAC meetings held to date are listed in the table in Section 6.1.
## Section 6: Summary Meetings to Date

### 6.1 List of Project Meetings

Following is a list of meetings held to date with agencies, local governments, other stakeholders, and the public during the Stoughton Road Needs Assessment phase and the current EIS Corridor Study phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/9/04</td>
<td>Town of Blooming Grove Town Board</td>
<td>Provided project summary and status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/04</td>
<td>City of Madison Department of Neighborhood Planning</td>
<td>Discussed neighborhood plans and environmental justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/22/04</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Outlined roles and responsibilities of the Committee; the scope of Phase 2– Alternatives Analysis and Environmental Assessment; short term improvements; and future public outreach efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/04</td>
<td>Town of Blooming Grove Town Board</td>
<td>Provided project summary and status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3/04</td>
<td>Alternative Solutions Workshop</td>
<td>Conducted workshop to get general public input on purpose and need and possible alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16/04</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Conducted a mini-workshop to brainstorm potential solutions to the traffic problems identified in the Needs Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/04</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Initiated coordination with the Committee on the status of the study and outlined their responsibilities for the duration of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/09/04</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Evaluated preliminary alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16/04</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Reviewed needs identified in Phase 1; discussed preliminary alternatives/alternative that have been eliminated; determined potential corridor scenarios; reviewed schedule for public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/04</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Clarified funding schedule and process for WisDOT funded future projects; presented summary of needs identified in Phase 1; discussed preliminary alternatives and public involvement schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/04</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Presented updates on corridor alternatives; traffic modeling and operations; bicycle accommodations; and public involvement schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/04</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed refining alternatives for presentation at neighborhood and business focus groups; established that the options presented address the needs of the project area; discussed a planned Value Engineering review of the alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/04</td>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>Discussed alternatives for the Rieder Road through Hoepker Road section of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27/05</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Finalized alternatives and discussed environmental document type; presented traffic modeling assumptions and initial results; updated planned short term improvements; updated public involvement efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/05</td>
<td>WisDOT Bureau of Aeronautics</td>
<td>Discussed WisDOT’s options regarding Hanson Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/05</td>
<td>Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Staff</td>
<td>Discussed integrating transit options into the alternatives and how to model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/05</td>
<td>City of Madison Long Range Transportation Planning Commission (LRTPC)</td>
<td>Made presentation to LRTPC on project status and alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/05</td>
<td>Madison Area MPO Board</td>
<td>Provided project update, summarized alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/05</td>
<td>Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Staff</td>
<td>Continued discussion on integrating transit options into the alternatives and how to model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/05</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed final alternatives and agency coordination for environmental document; updated results of traffic modeling; discussed bike/ped facilities; discussed incremental implementation of alternatives; updated short term improvements and public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/05</td>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>Discussed alternatives for the Rieder Road through Hoepker Road section of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/05</td>
<td>MATC, Dane County Airport East Washington/Anderson Street Alternatives</td>
<td>Discussed access to MATC and the airport, via Anderson Road, discussed proposed alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/05</td>
<td>Project Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Updated the status of the project, discussed refinements to the Alternatives, and presented the schedule for upcoming Public Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/05</td>
<td>Agency Scoping Meeting</td>
<td>Presented Purpose and Need and Alternatives, completed field review of corridor. Discussion of modeling transit alternatives. MPO to incorporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/05</td>
<td>MPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Presentation</td>
<td>Presentation of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/05</td>
<td>City of Monona Board of Public Works</td>
<td>Presentation of alternatives to the Public Works Committee. Discussed the Stoughton Road Study and City Monona's comments and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/05</td>
<td>Madison Mayor</td>
<td>Presentation of alternatives of Madison Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/05</td>
<td>Madison Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Staff</td>
<td>Discussed integrating transit options into the alternatives and how to model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/21/05</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Updated traffic modeling, alternatives, public involvement, and the environmental document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/05</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Updated results of the Demand and Operations traffic modeling; presented revisions to Alternative C; and determined a schedule for future public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>MPO, City of Madison Engineering</td>
<td>Discussed alternatives for East Washington Avenue in Alternative B. Determined that CFI wouldn't be feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/05</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Presented preliminary results of traffic modeling, presented refinements to Alternatives A and C, discussed potential options for Alternative B, and presented the schedule for upcoming Public Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/05</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Updated results of the Demand and Operations traffic modeling; presented the revisions to Alternative B; updated the status of the short term improvements; and discussed a schedule for future public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/05</td>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>Discussed alternatives for the Rieder Road through Hoepker Road section of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19/06</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Updated results of the Demand and Operations traffic modeling; discussed Alternative B to provide concurrence so the modeling of the alternative can begin; updated the status of the short term improvements; and discussed a schedule for future public involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/06</td>
<td>MPO, Madison Metro Transit Alternatives</td>
<td>Discussed the MPO's plans for transit in the Long Range Transportation Plan, Madison Metro's proposed expansions, integration with Transport 2020 transit planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/06</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Updated results of the Demand and Operations traffic modeling of Alternative B; discussed the upcoming Public Information Meeting; and provided concurrence of the Beltline / Stoughton Road interchange alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/06</td>
<td>Backbone Interchange Study Team</td>
<td>Informational meeting about integrating the backbone study at the Beltline/Stoughton Road interchange with this study. They will use our alternatives in their study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/06</td>
<td>Bike Facilities</td>
<td>Discussed current bicycle accommodations map and proposed accommodations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/06</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Provided preliminary results of the traffic modeling, presented Alternatives A, B, and C, and presented the schedule for upcoming Public Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/29-30/06</td>
<td>Public Information Meetings</td>
<td>Presentation of Alternatives A, B, and C to the public for comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/06</td>
<td>MPO Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)</td>
<td>Presentation of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/06</td>
<td>Far East Business Association</td>
<td>Presented project status and alternatives to members of the business association. Solicited help in distributing the information to other businesses, asked for suggestions for open house format, hours, locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/06</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Reviewed comments from public information meetings; discussed revisions to alternatives; reviewed traffic modeling summary; discussed format and impact areas for environmental document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22/06</td>
<td>Stoughton Road Revitalization Project</td>
<td>Presented alternatives from Beltline to STH 30, discusses differences between alternatives and possible land use implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/20/06</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed the format of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), determined if parts of the current alternatives could be discarded before EIS analysis or if they needed to be refined to better address Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/06</td>
<td>City of Madison Long Range Transportation Planning Commission (LRTPC)</td>
<td>Made presentation to LRTPC on project status and alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/06</td>
<td>City of Madison LRTPC Pedestrian, Bike, Motor Vehicle (PBMVC), Transit &amp; Parking, MPO</td>
<td>Presented the project alternatives and discussed the committees' concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/06</td>
<td>City of Monona Board of Public Works</td>
<td>Presentation of alternatives to the Public Works Committee. Discussed the Stoughton Road Study and City Monona's comments and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/06</td>
<td>Inter-agency coordination meeting</td>
<td>Discuss potential wetland impacts; in particular, the possibility of affecting a previously established wetland mitigation site at the south end of the Stoughton Road corridor (USH 12/18 Beltline Highway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/06</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed revisions to Alternatives including access to Hanson Rd and Broadway, and alternatives to be eliminated from further study. Updated public involvement and environmental document progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/06</td>
<td>Policy Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Provided an update on the project, comments on the revised alternatives, and notice of the upcoming Business Information Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/06</td>
<td>Wetland Field Meeting DNR</td>
<td>Site review of wetlands within the corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9/2006</td>
<td>Business Information Meetings</td>
<td>Presentation of Alternatives A, B, and C to the area businesses for comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/06</td>
<td>PDQ Representatives</td>
<td>Discussion regarding impacts of Alternatives to PDQ properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/07</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Reviewed VE Study, Hanson/Hoepker Rd alternatives, and Traffic/Operations modeling revisions; updated public involvement and environmental document progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/13/07</td>
<td>Dane County Regional Airport</td>
<td>Discussed alternatives for the Rieder Road through Hoepker Road section of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/07</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed traffic modeling issues at Broadway, Lien/E. Wash intersection, and Hanson Rd; discussed EIS issues including SAFETEA LU compliance, Indirect and Cumulative Effects (ICE) methodology, Stoughton Road Revitalization Project (SRRP), and the updated schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/07</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed results of demand modeling; updated operations modeling; discussed EIS issues including the impacts matrix, SAFETEA-LU compliance, and ICE; discussed coordination of study with SRRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/07</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Discussed EIS issues including the coordination plan, invitation letters, the methodology statement, Native American coordination, and ICE; updated public involvement and traffic demand and operations modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/07</td>
<td>Public Information Meetings</td>
<td>Presentation of Alternatives A, B, and C to the public for comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/17/08</td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Presented EIS alternatives, discussed ICE, discussed impacts to Lien Rd and Reindahl Park; updated short term improvement schedule; reviewed short and long term scheduling goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Impact Analysis Methodology

Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires lead agencies for proposed federally funded transportation projects to determine the appropriate methodology and level of detail for analyzing impacts, in collaboration with cooperating and participating agencies.

The purpose of the impact analysis methodology is to communicate and document the lead agency’s structured approach to analyzing impacts of the proposed transportation project and its alternatives. Collaboration on the impact analysis methodology is intended to promote an efficient and streamlined process and early resolution of concerns or issues.

1.2 Project Background

The approximate 11-mile Stoughton Road corridor extends from Terminal Drive/Voges Road in the Village of McFarland to STH 19 in the town of Burke (see map on page 2). The initial Stoughton Road Needs Assessment completed June 2003 determined existing conditions and how future traffic volumes would impact traffic flow and safety. It evaluated future land use, population growth, projected traffic volumes, existing and future traffic operations, crash data, existing/desired bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit, and other factors. The needs assessment identified numerous deficiencies that contribute to congestion and safety concerns, a poor operational level of service, traffic diversion to local streets, and insufficient facilities for bicycle and pedestrian travel at many locations.

The purpose of the current Stoughton Road Corridor Study is to identify and evaluate alternatives that will improve vehicular traffic flow and safety, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Alternatives that will be evaluated in the study include the following:

- **No Build**—No improvements to existing roadway geometry or capacity.
- **Alternative A**—Reconstruct existing intersections to provide additional turning capacity and provide new or relocated frontage roads at select locations to enhance mobility.
- **Alternative B**—Convert existing intersections to grade separated interchanges at 4 locations and provide free-flow ramps to and from the west side of the existing USH 12/18 Beltline interchange.
- **Alternative C**—Convert existing intersections to grade separated interchanges at 6 locations and construct express lanes over the USH 12/18 Beltline and STH 30 to provide free flow movements for through traffic.

All of the build alternatives include enhanced bicycle and pedestrian travel in the Stoughton Road corridor.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being prepared for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) procedures. The EIS is a full disclosure document that details how the project was developed. It includes project purpose and need, alternatives considered, description of the affected environment, environmental consequences of the proposed action, and the results of coordination with agencies and the public. The EIS also demonstrates compliance with other applicable environmental laws and regulations, and is made available for review by agencies and the public. The EIS process includes a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the EIS, Draft EIS, Final EIS, and Record of Decision (ROD).
1.3 Project Vicinity Map
Section 2: Socioeconomic Impact Methodology

2.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Socioeconomic impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents (1987)
- WisDOT Facilities Development Manual (FDM) Chapter 25, Socioeconomic Factors

2.2 General Methodology
Evaluation of social impacts includes applicable changes in neighborhoods or community cohesion; changes in travel patterns and accessibility; impacts on community facilities; impacts on traffic safety/public safety; and impacts on any special groups such as elderly, handicapped, minority, and transit-dependent persons. Evaluation of economic impacts includes cost estimates of the proposed action and its alternatives, effects on highway-dependent businesses and effects on existing and planned business development. Socioeconomic impacts that can be quantified based on available data will be presented as such in the EIS and other impacts will be discussed qualitatively.

2.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. Data for the socioeconomic impact assessment will be obtained primarily from the 2000 US Census of Population and Housing. Supplemental data will be obtained from the Metropolitan Planning Organization, local and regional land use plans, development plans, and discussion with local officials.
Section 3: Business and Residential Impact Methodology

3.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Business and residential impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended (49 CFR Part 24)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987

3.2 General Methodology
Evaluation of business impacts includes an estimate of the number and types of businesses to be displaced, number of employees/jobs affected, any special characteristics, and availability of replacement business sites. Evaluation of residential impacts includes an estimate of the number of homes to be displaced including family characteristics; availability of comparable decent, safe, and sanitary housing in the area; any measures to be taken when replacement housing is insufficient; and identification of any special relocation needs. Depending on the number and types of businesses or homes displaced, a Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan may be prepared as part of the EIS. Impacts to businesses and homes due to changes in access during and after construction are also evaluated.

3.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. A Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan will be prepared and included in the EIS.
Section 4: Environmental Justice Impact Methodology

4.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Environmental Justice impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, 1994
- U.S. DOT Order on Environmental Justice, DOT Order 5610.2, 1997
- FHWA Order 6640.23, *FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, 1998
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 21-15-1, *Format and Content of Environmental Documents* (includes Environmental Justice as one of the factors to be considered when evaluating resource impacts)

4.2 General Methodology
The proposed action and its alternatives are evaluated to determine whether there would be disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low income populations with respect to human health and the environment. The potential impacts to be evaluated as applicable include air, noise, or water pollution; increase in traffic congestion; soil contamination; decrease in aesthetic value, disruption of community cohesion or economic vitality, disruption of cultural resources, changes in the availability of public and private facilities and services; adverse employment effects; and displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or non-profit organizations. Consideration of Environmental Justice in transportation decision-making is based on the following principles listed in WisDOT FDM Chapter 21-15-1:

- Avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations
- Ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process
- Prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations

4.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. The environmental justice analysis will be based on income and race information from the 2000 U.S. Census. Additional information on race and income will be obtained from local agencies/organizations, and through public involvement and community outreach activities.
Section 5: Indirect and Cumulative Effects Methodology

5.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Indirect and cumulative effects are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) publication, *Considering Cumulative Effects under the National Environmental Policy Act*, 1997

Indirect and cumulative effects are defined as follows:

**Indirect effects** are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems (40 CFR 1508.8).

**Cumulative effects** are impacts on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7).

5.2 General Methodology
The indirect and cumulative effects methodology identifies areas potentially at risk for indirect and cumulative effects. Indirect effects are discovered through analyzing the study area’s goals and important features such as land use/development trends, demographics, and natural resources. Next, impact-causing activities such as disruption to travel patterns or access are identified and qualitatively analyzed. This process is completed through community outreach in the study area.

The cumulative effects methodology qualitatively analyzes the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project. It is a resource-based evaluation. It looks at valuable resources within the project boundary and then evaluates how the transportation project, along with all the other influential factors, will affect it.

5.3 Project Specific Methodology
The indirect effects analysis will include a series of meetings with local experts with knowledge in land use planning and transportation. The expert panel is one of the forecasting tools described in NCHRP Report 466 and has been used in many environmental impact studies in Wisconsin. Using a series of smaller, face-to-face meetings is convenient for participants and will allow them to provide in-depth discussion and analysis of the specific geographic area of their expertise.
The expert panel methodology is derived from the Delphi method, a systematic and iterative survey research technique directed toward the systematic solicitation and organization of expert opinion from a group of knowledgeable people. The Delphi method is carefully structured and requires several survey iterations. The less formal technique proposed for this study means a reduced time commitment for participants, ensuring better participation.

Information about the purpose and need of the project, an explanation of the alternatives, and a summary of the direct effects of each alternative will be provided to each participant in advance of the meeting. Participants will be asked to determine the areas within their community that will be likely to experience indirect effects, including the magnitude of the effect, the certainty with which they feel the effect will happen, the timing of the potential effect, and what might be done to avoid or minimize the effect.

The cumulative effects of the alternatives must be discussed in the greater context of other activities that have occurred in the past, as well as those that may be reasonably foreseen in the future. The DEIS document will include an estimation of potential cumulative effects of the alternatives based on the direct and indirect effects. A more comprehensive evaluation of cumulative effects will be conducted in the FEIS, once a preferred alternative has been recommended and a construction schedule identified. This will include more precisely defined improvements, updated status of local comprehensive planning efforts, and greater knowledge of the potential direct impacts.
Section 6: Agricultural Impact Methodology

6.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Agricultural impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 USC 4201-4209)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 24, Section 10, Agricultural Lands
- Chapter 32.035, Wisconsin Statutes, Agricultural Impact Statement

6.2 General Methodology
To the extent practicable, the proposed transportation action and its alternatives are developed to minimize impacts on farmland and maximize compatibility with state and local farmland programs and policies. Agricultural impacts are quantified and reported to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP). Based on the extent of the impacts, DATCP will determine whether an Agricultural Impact Statement is required. If needed, a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form would also be prepared and coordinated with the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS).

6.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. There is minimal agricultural land in the area of potential effect for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study alternatives. Land that is currently being farmed is not zoned for agricultural use. At this time, an Agricultural Impact Statement is not anticipated to be required.
Section 7: Air Quality Impact Methodology

7.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Air Quality impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Clean Air Act as amended (42 USC 7401)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- FHWA air quality conformance guidance (23 CFR 450)
- FHWA Interim Guidance on Air Toxics Analysis in NEPA Documents, 2006
- Wisconsin State Implementation Plan
- Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 411, Construction and Operation Permits for Indirect Sources

7.2 General Methodology
The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set national air quality standards for six principal air pollutants (also referred to as criteria pollutants): Carbon Monoxide (CO), lead, Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂), ozone, particulate matter and sulfur dioxide. Transportation contributes to CO, NO₂, ozone and particulate matter. Air quality impacts for transportation projects are evaluated in view of these criteria pollutants using established air quality assessment techniques.

FHWA’s interim guidance provides information on when and how to analyze Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) for transportation projects. The interim guidance lists three evaluation categories:

- No analysis for projects without any potential for meaningful MSAT effects
- Qualitative analysis for projects with low potential MSAT effects
- Quantitative analysis to differentiate alternatives for projects with higher potential for MSAT effects. Any project exceeding an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) traffic volume of 150,000 in the project’s design year is categorized as a “project with higher potential MSAT effects” and thus would require a quantitative MSAT analysis.

7.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. The AADT in the Stoughton Road corridor does not exceed the 150,000 AADT criterion identified in the FHWA interim guidance for MSAT. Therefore, a qualitative MSAT analysis will be done.
Section 8: Noise Impact Methodology

8.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Highway noise impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, *Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents*, 1987
- Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter TRANS 405, *Siting Noise Barriers*

8.2 General Methodology
Transportation projects are evaluated for traffic noise impacts and abatement measures to help protect the public health and welfare, to supply noise abatement criteria, and to provide information to local officials for land use planning near highways. The noise analysis also provides information on noise generated from typical construction equipment during the construction period.

Existing and design year traffic noise levels are modeled at residential, commercial, and other sensitive receptors along the project corridor using FHWA’s Traffic Noise Prediction Model (TNM)® 2.5 computer program. The TNM includes traffic characteristics that yield the greatest hourly traffic noise on a regular basis for existing conditions and the future design year. Under TRANS 405, noise impacts will be evaluated further to determine the reasonableness and feasibility of potential mitigation measures such as noise walls or berms. If noise mitigation is reasonable under TRANS 405 criteria, additional public involvement related to noise mitigation would be initiated.

8.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.
Section 9: Wetland Impact Methodology

9.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Wetland impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251)
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands (42 FR 26961)
- DOT Executive Order 5660.1A, Preservation of the Nation’s Wetlands
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended (16 USC 661-667)
- FHWA policy and procedures for evaluation and mitigation of adverse environmental impacts to wetland and natural habitat (23 CFR 777)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 24, Section 5, Aquatic Systems
- WisDOT Wetland Mitigation Banking Technical Guideline as amended
- WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement Amendment, Compensatory Mitigation for Unavoidable Wetland Losses Resulting from State Transportation Activities, 2001

9.2 General Methodology
Environmental documents measure wetland impact through existing mapping sources and field delineation. Transportation alternatives then seek to reduce impacts by avoiding wetlands where possible, minimizing impacts to wetlands that cannot be avoided, and mitigating all unavoidable wetland loss through various compensation measures.

9.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. Preliminary wetland boundaries were determined through existing information and field inspection in consultation with DNR.
Section 10: Water Resource/Floodplain Impact Methodology

10.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Water Resource and floodplain impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251) including Section 303(d), impaired waters
- Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management (42 FR 26951)
- DOT Executive Order 5650.2, Floodplain Management and Protection; Policies and Procedures (23 CFR 650)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 24, Land and Water Resources Impacts and FDM Chapter 10, Erosion Control
- Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 116, Wisconsin’s Floodplain Management Program
- WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement Amendment, Memorandum of Understanding on Erosion Control and Storm Water Management, 1994
- Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter TRANS 401, Construction Site Erosion Control and Storm Water Management Procedures for Department Actions.

10.2 General Methodology
Transportation alternatives involving water resources and floodplain impacts are developed to minimize adverse impacts to water quality, floodplains and stream hydraulics to the extent practicable. Measures to minimize adverse effects include using sound erosion control and stormwater management practices, and sizing new and replacement structures to reduce floodplain encroachment and increases in the height of the regional (100-year) floodplain elevation. Properly minimizing adverse effects requires assessment of existing conditions such as water quality, fishery resources, floodplain functions and values, potential undesirable outcomes to these conditions, and proposed measures to minimize the adverse effects.

The extent to which erosion control and storm water management measures are proposed in the EIS depends on the type of transportation improvements being proposed, the construction time frame, and the extent of water and floodplain resources in the project’s area of effect. A planning level project generally includes conceptual Best Management Practices. Other projects may require more specific erosion control and storm water management commitments.

10.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.
Section 11: Upland Habitat/Wildlife Impact Methodology

11.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Upland habitat/wildlife impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act as amended (16 USC 661-667)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, *Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents*, 1987
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 24, *Land and Water Resource Impacts*
- FHWA *Guidelines for Consideration of Highway Project Impacts on Fish and Wildlife Resources*, 1989

11.2 General Methodology
Upland habitat includes non-wetland areas that have vegetative cover suitable for supporting wildlife. Such areas include woodlands/shrub thickets, fallow fields, fence lines, and remnant prairies dominated by grasses and forbs. WisDOT coordinates with DNR, other agencies, and regional planning commissions as appropriate to obtain information on the quality and classification of wildlife habitat in the project’s area of potential effect.

Impact evaluation includes an assessment of existing conditions (community type, connectivity to other resources, wildlife associations), amount and type of habitat affected by the proposed project, fragmentation or severance of ecosystems, and consequential effects on wildlife permanently inhabiting or passing through the upland habitat areas.

11.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study. Due to the urban nature of the Stoughton Road Corridor, there is minimal upland habitat present.
Section 12: Threatened and Endangered Species Impact Methodology

12.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Threatened and endangered species impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (7 USC 136; 16 USC 1531)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 661)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 27, Endangered and Threatened Species, 2005
- WisDOT/DNR Cooperative Agreement Amendment, Memorandum of Understanding on Endangered and Threatened Species Consultation, 1998
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 24, Land and Water Resources

12.2 General Methodology
The impact evaluation for threatened and endangered species includes a determination of the presence or absence of any federally listed or state listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat in the transportation project’s area of effect. The presence or absence determination is made in consultation with DNR and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and may include field inventories by qualified resource biologists.

If threatened and endangered species or their critical habitat is present and cannot be avoided by location and design refinements to the proposed transportation project, WisDOT and FHWA would proceed with consultation steps under the Endangered Species Act for federally listed species. For state listed species, WisDOT would develop a conservation plan or lay the groundwork for an incidental take permit in consultation with DNR.

12.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.
Section 13: Public Use Lands Impact Methodology

13.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Impacts to public use lands (existing and planned public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, other public-use lands and historic sites) are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Section 4(f) of the U.S. DOT Act (23 USC 138; 49 USC 303)
- FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper, 2005
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- Section 6(f) of the Land & Water Conservation Fund Act as amended (16 USC 4601)
- Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (Dingell-Johnson Act) as amended (16 USC 777)
- Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 USC 669)
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 21, Environmental Documents, Reports and Permits, and Chapter 26, Historic Preservation
- Other public use land funding programs such as those administered by the National Park Service and DNR.

Section 4(f) of the U.S. DOT Act applies only to the actions of agencies within the U.S. Department of Transportation including FHWA. While other agencies may have an interest in Section 4(f), FHWA is responsible for applicability determinations, evaluations, findings and overall compliance.

13.2 General Methodology
The public use land impact evaluation includes an inventory of such resources in the transportation project’s area of effect, a description of the resources including existing and planned use, funding sources, and jurisdictional agencies. The transportation improvements are located and designed to avoid or minimize impacts to public use land to the extent practicable. Where such resources cannot be avoided, impacts would be analyzed by the amount of land required from the resource and any constructive use impacts such as increased traffic noise, changes in the visual setting, or other impacts that would adversely affect the public use land. WisDOT would coordinate with the jurisdictional agencies to obtain information on resource use, funding and management, and to obtain input on potential effects and possible mitigation measures.

13.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.
Section 14: Cultural Resources Impact Methodology

14.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Impacts on cultural resources (archaeological sites and historic structures) are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended (16 USC 470)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 26, Historic Preservation

14.2 General Methodology
Impact evaluation includes identification of cultural resources in the transportation project’s area of potential effect. Qualified archaeologists and historians evaluate the resources to determine potential eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. The assessment of effects includes a determination whether an adverse effect will occur, consultation with parties indicating an interest in the cultural resources, and implementation of any agreements reached to account for unavoidable adverse impacts.

14.3 Project Specific Methodology
Due to the long-term construction time frame for Stoughton Road improvements, archaeological investigations will consist of a literature search by a qualified archaeologist to identify any previously recorded archaeological sites in the project’s area of potential effect, and a field reconnaissance to inspect for undisturbed land along the corridor. Any additional archaeological investigations if needed would be conducted during a future engineering phase. Similarly, a field reconnaissance will be conducted by a qualified historian to determine whether there are any structures in the projects area of potential effect that would warrant further evaluation for potential eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.
Section 15: Contaminated Sites Impact Methodology

15.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
The impacts of potential environmental contaminants are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 as amended (42 USC 6901)
- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- WisDOT FDM, Chapter 21, Section 35, Contaminated Site Assessments and Remediation

15.2 General Methodology
The phase 1 investigation for potentially contaminated sites uses field observations, interviews and records searches to identify sites that have a high likelihood for contamination. Phase 1 screening is performed for all alternatives carried forward in the environmental document. A Phase 2 investigation which includes subsurface testing, is performed on sites located within the area of effect for the preferred alternative. Further investigation is performed when necessary after a preferred alternative is selected. WisDOT also evaluates existing highway structures that need to be replaced or rehabilitated as part of a proposed transportation improvement to determine whether any asbestos materials were used in the construction, renovation or rehabilitation of the structures.

15.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.
Section 16: Aesthetic Impact Methodology

16.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Aesthetic (visual) impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, *Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents*, 1987
- FHWA publication *Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects* (DOT FHWA-HI-88-054)
- WisDOT FDM Chapter 27, Section 10, *Visual Impact Assessment*

16.2 General Methodology
The purpose of the visual impact assessment is to preserve the visual character of the project corridor. This is accomplished by identifying the visual character of the project corridor, characterizing the visual quality of the area, and identifying the groups with a view of the highway and those with a view from the highway. The impact assessment also describes the visual change that will occur due to the proposed transportation improvements. Mitigation measures, where adverse visual effects are identified, could include landscaping and aesthetic treatments such as retaining walls, bridge abutments and sidewalks in the project area.

16.3 Project Specific Methodology
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.
Section 17: Construction Impact Methodology and Transportation Management Plans

17.1 Laws, Regulations and Guidelines
Construction impacts are evaluated in accordance with these key laws, regulations or guidelines:

- FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987
- FHWA Work Zone Safety and Mobility Rule (69 FR 54562), 2004

17.2 General Methodology for Construction Impacts
During construction of the project, the following construction impacts may be assessed:

- Access to facilities and services
- Emergency response services
- Air quality (emissions and fugitive dust)
- Economic impacts
- Noise
- Water quality/erosion and sedimentation
- Construction solid waste and hazardous waste
- Vibration

17.3 Transportation Management Plans
A transportation management plan (TMP) for work zones provides management strategies for work zone impacts and safety in all project development phases. Strategies include temporary traffic control measures and devices, public information and outreach; and operational strategies such as travel demand management, signal retiming and traffic incident management. Preliminary information is developed in the project's planning phase with input from the public, local officials and other interests, and developed further in subsequent environmental assessment and engineering design phases.

A TMP helps reduce traffic and mobility impacts, improves safety, and promotes coordination within and around the work zone. The TMP must be developed to best serve the specific community, project, road users, businesses, and highway workers.

The current Work Zone and Mobility Rule updates and broadens the former regulation (Traffic Safety in Highway and Street Work Zones, 23 CFR 630, Subpart J) to address more of the current issues affecting work zone safety and mobility by:

- Fostering systematic assessment of the work zone impacts of road projects and development and implementation of transportation management strategies that help manage these impacts.
- Expanding thinking beyond the project work zone itself to address corridor, network, and regional issues while planning and designing road projects.
- Expanding work zone impacts management beyond traffic safety and control to address mobility in addition to safety, and to address the broader concepts of transportation operations and public information.

- Advocating innovative thinking in work zone planning, design, and management so as to consider alternative/innovative design, construction, contracting, and transportation management strategies.

17.4 **Project Specific Methodology**
No additional project specific methodology has been identified for the Stoughton Road Corridor Study.