

# Community Involvement and Agency Coordination

The Lead Agencies involved the public, local officials, tribes, and regulatory agencies throughout the study by:

- Establishing a stakeholder group during the early phase of the study.
- Meeting regularly with local officials.
- Meeting with interest groups upon request.
- Coordinating regularly with federal and state resource agencies and tribes.
- Conducting public involvement meetings and opportunities for public comment throughout the process.
- Creating a project website.

The following subsections summarize project coordination during three time periods: 2006-2012, the original EIS study period; 2013-2019, the interim period; and 2019-2020, the current Tier 1 EIS study period.

## 4.1 Coordination Activities, 2006-2012

### 4.1.1 Public Involvement

The Lead Agencies invited federal and state agencies, tribes, local officials, and organizations to a project kick-off meeting at the Green Bay Metro Transportation Center on September 19, 2006. Brown County planning staff summarized the project's purpose, the data collection and planning efforts that occurred between 1996 and 2006, and other information that would be used to complete a NEPA analysis. FHWA published the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS in the *Federal Register* on March 11, 2008.

Brown County prepared a Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation to communicate information about the project to the communities, public, tribes, and federal, state, and local agencies. The plan established the timing and communication methods to obtain public, tribal, and agency input on all aspects of the project. The local communities, tribes, and federal, state, and local agencies involved with coordination at that time were:

- |                     |                          |                              |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| • City of De Pere   | • Town of Rockland       | • Oneida Nation of Wisconsin |
| • Town of Glenmore  | • Village of Ashwaubenon | • Corps of Engineers         |
| • Town of Lawrence  | • Village of Bellevue    | • U.S. Coast Guard           |
| • Town of Ledgeview | • Village of Hobart      | • U.S. EPA                   |
|                     |                          | • DNR                        |

### Stakeholder Committee

The Lead Agencies established a Stakeholder Committee to solicit input from citizens, elected officials, and appointed staff. The committee included representatives from:

- |                     |                               |   |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| • City of De Pere   | • Village of Ashwaubenon      | • Green Bay Area School District        |
| • Town of Glenmore  | • Village of Bellevue         | • West De Pere School District          |
| • Town of Lawrence  | • Village of Hobart           | • Oneida Nation of Wisconsin            |
| • Town of Ledgeview | • Ashwaubenon School District | • Austin Straubel International Airport |
| • Town of Rockland  | • De Pere School District     |   |

The Stakeholder Committee met twice and provided input about local planning, existing development patterns in the study area, and expected future development (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1. Stakeholder Committee Meetings, 2006-2012

Date	Meeting Summary
February 24, 2009	This meeting introduced the committee's members and provided an overview of the committee's purpose. The committee reviewed the purpose and need for the project, and the preliminary non-construction (travel demand management and transportation system management) and construction (build) alternatives to be evaluated. A group exercise produced additional alternative corridors that were then incorporated into the study.
March 9, 2010	The committee reviewed and provided comments on the recommendations of the draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report). The members discussed how the alternatives fit into their communities' short- and long-term development plans.

### Public Involvement Meetings

The Lead Agencies held three public involvement meetings between 2006 and 2012 (Table 4-2). Notifications of the meeting included ads in the *Green Bay Press-Gazette*; mailings to study area communities, residents, and property owners along and near the study corridors; and emails and postcards to the project mailing list. Meetings were held in accessible buildings in the study area and were organized to allow and encourage the participants to interact with study team representatives. Comment sheets were available for written comments. Appendix F contains presentations and a list of comments received during or after the public involvement meetings.

Table 4-2. Public Meetings, 2006-2012

Date and Location	Meeting Summary
June 19, 2008 De Pere City Hall	There were two meetings on this date, from 12:00 noon to 1:00 p.m. and from 5:00 to 6:30 p.m. The study team presented the planning process to the public and discussed the Purpose of and Need for the Project. The team presented nine screening criteria <sup>1</sup> developed by Brown County in consultation with WisDOT and FHWA that would be used to evaluate alternatives (described in Section 2), and short- and long-term needs to be addressed in the EIS.  Approximately 20 people attended, and many others contacted staff before and after the meeting.
April 23, 2009 Altmayer Elementary School in De Pere	The meeting was held from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. The study team reviewed the project purpose and need and the nine project screening criteria used to screen alternatives. They explained how non-construction alternatives (travel demand management and transportation system management) did not meet several of the project screening criteria. The team discussed next steps to developing reasonable construction alternatives, and invited participants to draw corridor alternatives on large maps placed around the room. The many corridor suggestions and other comments received from the participants contributed to the initial 11 alternatives developed for the project. Approximately 100 people attended.
May 18, 2010 Altmayer Elementary School in De Pere	The meeting was held from 6:00 to 8:30 p.m. The study team reviewed the project purpose and nine screening criteria used to screen alternatives. They presented the recommendations of the draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report to the public (retained four build alternatives on three alignments), summarized the next steps, and invited public comments. Approximately 400 people attended the meeting and provided many comments.

<sup>1</sup> The nine screening criteria were initially described as objectives when they were developed in 2007.

Following is a summary of the written comments received from the public on the proposed alternatives during and after the public involvement meetings:

- Numerous comments favored an alternative along the Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge corridor (now Corridor Alternative 2) and opposed the Scheuring Road-Heritage Road corridor (now Corridor Alternative 1), because a prior planning process had identified the Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge corridor as the preferred location.
- Some commenters opposed the potential land use impacts of the Scheuring Road-Heritage Road alternative.
- Some commenters opposed the Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge corridor because of property investments that had been made along the corridor.
- Several commenters favored a corridor between CTH S and CTH ZZ along Hickory Road or Little Rapids Road because the river channel is narrow where it would be crossed, and few residences would be affected.
- There was general opposition to Midway Road and the Old Martin Road corridors.
- Regardless of location, there was support for accommodating pedestrians and bicyclists along whichever corridor was eventually selected.
- Commenters noted the need to accommodate existing recreational uses and mentioned that St. Norbert College practices and hosts rowing events along the Fox River.

These comments were collected during the original EIS study period (2006-2012). Section 4.3.1 provides comments received during this Tier 1 study, and the public involvement meeting summary in Appendix F contains responses to the comments received during the Tier 1 study (see Appendix F.7.2).

### **Project Website**

Brown County established a project website that provided general project information, current project status, upcoming meetings, presentations, handouts, and exhibits from public involvement meetings, project updates, and an archive of all the past events. The website included an online comment form that provided the public with an opportunity to submit comments to the study team at any point during the project.

Brown County discontinued the website after the study was placed on hold in 2012 (a new website replaced it in 2019 with the restart of the project).

### **Other Public Involvement Activities**

Brown County met twice with business organizations to present progress on the alternatives analysis and Interstate Access Justification Report and discuss next steps in the study.

- November 11, 2009 — Town of Ledgeview Business Association
- December 7, 2010 — De Pere Area Chamber of Commerce

## 4.1.2 Coordination with Local Officials

The Lead Agencies involved local officials both individually and as part of the Stakeholder Committee, discussed above. Table 4-3 is a record of meetings with local officials and organizations during the early part of the study.

**Table 4-3. Local Officials Meetings, 2006-2012**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Meeting Summary</b>
February 21, 2007	Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission Staff	Presentation to Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission staff about the NEPA process and how Bay-Lake staff could assist with the process.
May 20, 2008	Howard, Hobart, Ashwaubenon, Lawrence, and Oneida Nation of Wisconsin Communities Organization	Presentation to organization about the NEPA process, progress to date, and next steps.
September 15, 2009	Town of Ledgeview Administrative Staff	Presented NEPA status report and answered questions. Also discussed presenting NEPA information to the Town's Business Association.
April 19, 2010	Wisconsin Towns Association, Brown County Unit	Presented progress on the alternatives analysis and Interstate Access Justification Report. Also discussed next steps in the process.
April 18, 2011	Wisconsin Towns Association, Brown County Unit	Presented progress on the alternatives analysis and Interstate Access Justification Report. Also discussed next steps in the process.
June 28, 2011	Brown County Executive and Representatives of De Pere	Presented to Brown County Executive, De Pere's Mayor, and De Pere staff the status of the alternatives analysis and Interstate Access Justification Report. Also discussed next steps in the process.
August 9, 2011	Ledgeview and Bellevue Administrative Staff	Updated administrative staff on the status of the NEPA process and discussed the next steps in the process.
March 6, 2012	Brown County Municipal Issues Group – Transportation Issues Subcommittee	Updated the subcommittee on the status of the NEPA process and Interstate Access Justification Report, discussed the next steps in the process, and answered questions.
March 20, 2012	Howard, Hobart, Ashwaubenon, Lawrence, and Oneida Nation of Wisconsin Communities Organization	Presented the tentative NEPA review/comment/approval process summary and schedule to the group and answered questions.
April 19, 2012	Brown County Municipal Issues Group – Transportation Issues Subcommittee	Updated the subcommittee on the status of the NEPA process and Interstate Access Justification Report, discussed the next steps in the process, and answered questions.
May 21, 2012	Wisconsin Towns Association, Brown County Unit and Brown County Board's Planning, Development, and Transportation Committee	Presentation about the status of the NEPA process and Interstate Access Justification Report processes. Also discussed next steps in the processes and answered questions.

Several communities passed resolutions indicating their support for or opposition to certain Corridor Alternatives (Table 4-4). Appendix F contains copies of the resolutions.

**Table 4-4. Local Resolutions Supporting or Opposing Alternatives, 2006-2012**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
June 14, 2010	Town of Lawrence	2 resolutions adopted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition to an Old Martin Road alternative</li> <li>• Support for a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with a US 41 interchange</li> </ul>
June 21, 2010	Town of Rockland	Opposition to an Old Martin Road alternative
August 17, 2010	Town of Ledgeview	Support for a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with a US 41 interchange
November 15, 2011	City of De Pere	Support for a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with a US 41 interchange

### 4.1.3 Agency Coordination

Coordination with agencies is performed under environmental coordination procedures established in the 2005 federal transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users). Section 6002, Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decision Making (codified at 23 USC 139), includes the following key activities:

- The Lead Agency(ies) invites other agencies, local officials, and other interests to become Cooperating or Participating Agencies in the environmental review process.
  - FHWA, WisDOT, and Brown County are Lead Agencies for this study. They are responsible for managing the environmental review and documentation process.
  - Cooperating Agencies have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to the project’s environmental impacts.
  - Participating Agencies have an interest in the project.
- The Lead Agencies prepare a Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation.
- The Lead Agencies prepare an Impact Analysis Methodology Report to communicate how the impacts of the proposed transportation project and its alternatives will be evaluated.

The following subsections summarize SAFETEA-LU activities for the study.

#### Cooperating and Participating Agencies

The Lead Agencies invited federal, state, and local officials and tribes with jurisdiction by law, special expertise, or direct interest in the project to serve as Cooperating or Participating Agencies (Table 4-5). No local communities or tribes elected to be Participating Agencies. The list of Participating and Cooperating Agencies later expanded for the Tier 1 EIS (see Table 4-10).

Table 4-5. Participating and Cooperating Agencies, 2006-2012

Agency	Responsibility
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cooperating
U.S. Coast Guard	Cooperating
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Participating
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	Cooperating

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service declined the invitation to be a Participating Agency. However, they did provide resource information and recommendations for the project going forward (discussed below).

The Participating and Cooperating Agency responsibilities ended in 2012 when the study was placed on hold.

#### Agency Meetings and Correspondence

In accordance with SAFETEA-LU, the Lead Agencies invited comments from the Cooperating and Participating Agencies on project documents and met with the agencies to discuss the documents, the purpose and need for the project, and development and evaluation of alternatives (Table 4-6).

**Table 4-6. Consultations with Participating and Cooperating Agencies, 2006-2012**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Written Comments</b>
September 19, 2006	The Lead Agencies held a project kick-off meeting with federal and state agencies, tribes, and local officials.	August 29, 2006 – U.S. Coast Guard declined attendance at the meeting and explained their involvement in any new bridge crossings of the Fox River. December 18, 2006 – DNR provided preliminary comments and a list of environmental considerations for the study.
February 2007	Lead Agencies invited other agencies to be Participating and Cooperating Agencies, and to comment on draft Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation.	February 15, 2007 – DNR provided a list of issues that should be addressed during the EIS process. February 22, 2007 – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service accepted the Coordination Plan. February 23, 2007 – U.S. EPA accepted role as a Participating Agency and the Coordination Plan.
April 17, 2007	Initial meeting of Lead, Cooperating, and Participating Agencies to discuss Notice of Intent, draft Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation and the purpose and need.	
January 2008	Lead Agencies again invited U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to be a Cooperating Agency.	February 26, 2008 – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service declined role as a Participating Agency.
July 2008	Lead Agencies invited Participating and Cooperating Agencies to comment on draft Impact Assessment Methodologies.	July 28, 2008 – DNR provided comments on the draft Impact Assessment Methodologies regarding pedestrian and bicyclist impacts, noise impacts, wetland impacts, threatened and endangered species impacts, and construction impacts.
August 2008	Lead Agencies invited Participating and Cooperating Agencies to comment on draft purpose and need statement.	September 3, 2008 – U.S. Coast Guard declined attendance at the upcoming meeting and had no comment on purpose and need.
September 10, 2008	Lead Agencies meeting with Cooperating and Participating Agencies to obtain concurrence on the purpose and need statement and discuss potential project alternatives.	September 24, 2008 – DNR concurred with purpose and need. October 14, 2008 – U.S. EPA concurred with purpose and need. October 28, 2008 – the Corps of Engineers concurred with purpose and need.
October 2009	Invitation to Participating and Cooperating Agencies to comment on draft Project Alternatives Analysis.	November 9, 2009 – U.S. Coast Guard noted a new bridge would require a permit and reserved further comment until a specific design was proposed. December 9, 2009 – U.S. EPA identified four issues concerning the draft report and requested a meeting to resolve these issues before concurring with the recommended alternatives. December 14, 2009 – DNR stated a general preference for an alternative that incorporated existing roadways to the greatest practical extent, minimized the new highway's footprint, and avoided the Niagara Escarpment. December 15, 2009 – the Corps of Engineers concurred with initial range of 11 alternatives.

Table 4-6. Consultations with Participating and Cooperating Agencies, 2006-2012

Date	Consultation	Written Comments
March 2010	Invitation to Participating and Cooperating Agencies to comment on first Draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report.	<p>April 1, 2010 – U.S. EPA acknowledged the report, but with no specific comments on the four build alternatives recommended in the report.</p> <p>April 2, 2010 – DNR commented on the 11 alternatives in the report and reiterated preference for alternatives along existing roadways and avoided the Niagara Escarpment.</p> <p>May 12, 2010 – U.S. Coast Guard commented that all four remaining alternatives under evaluation would require a permit and that they would consult on navigation clearances at the appropriate time.</p>
October 2010	Invitation to Participating and Cooperating Agencies to comment on revised Draft Alternatives Identification, Retention, and Elimination Report.	<p>October 27, 2010 – DNR commented on the retained build alternatives and reiterated a preference for alternatives along existing roadways and avoided the Niagara Escarpment.</p> <p>October 28, 2010 – U.S. EPA recommended that preliminary information about the water crossing locations (width of river, other relevant environmental considerations, etc.) be summarized in the report.</p> <p>November 1, 2010 – U.S. EPA concurred with the recommendation to study three build alternatives and eliminate Old Martin Road alternative.</p> <p>November 8, 2010 – the Corps of Engineers concurred with the analysis of three alternative corridors plus No Build, TSM and TDM alternatives.</p> <p>November 8, 2010 – DNR concurred with the recommendation to study three build alternatives and eliminate Old Martin Road alternative.</p>
November 10, 2010	<p>Lead Agencies meeting with Cooperating and Participating Agencies to obtain concurrence on the three alternatives that would be studied in greater detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheuring Road - Heritage Road Arterial Street</li> <li>• Rockland Road - Red Maple Road Arterial Street with a US 41 interchange</li> <li>• Rockland Road - Red Maple Road Arterial Street without a US 41 interchange</li> </ul>	
June 2011	Lead Agencies outreach to agencies requesting input on retained alternatives.	<p>June 6, 2011 and June 13, 2011 – DNR provided information on natural resources in the study area.</p> <p>July 19, 2011 – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listed issues to be considered in the EIS and project design.</p>
October 12, 2011 and November 14, 2011	DNR, the Corps of Engineers, WisDOT, and Brown County field visits to identify possible wetlands along the Scheuring Road-Heritage Road and Rockland Road-Red Maple Road corridors.	

In their correspondence, the agencies and tribes provided resource information, recommendations, and other considerations for the project as it develops (Table 4-7).

**Table 4-7. Summary of Environmental Considerations from Agencies and Tribes, 2006-2012**

Agency	Comments
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasized avoidance and minimization of impacts on aquatic resources.</li> <li>• Stated that additional coordination with their agency will be required as the project advances, including verification of wetlands, to determine Clean Water Act Section 404 permitting requirements.</li> <li>• Recommended that the Lead Agencies work closely with utility companies and contractors to identify significant environmental resources within the project corridor that might be impacted by utility and/or borrow activities.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided comments and information about wetlands, wildlife corridors, and endangered species along the Fox River, East River, and Ashwaubenon Creek.</li> <li>• Stated that an endangered resource review will be needed once an alternative is chosen.</li> <li>• Stated that a seasonal restriction will apply to in-stream work in the Fox River, East River, and all tributaries of each waterway to avoid impacts to fish during spawning season.</li> </ul>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided comments about endangered species, wetlands and streams, and other issues within and near the build alternatives that were carried forward for detailed study.</li> <li>• Stated that no federally listed, proposed, or candidate species would be expected within the study area (for all alternatives), and no critical habitat is present.</li> <li>• Recommended that structures be constructed to allow terrestrial wildlife to pass without entering waterways and that efforts be made to select an alternative that does not adversely impact wetlands.</li> </ul>
U.S. Coast Guard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed that a new Fox River crossing will require a Coast Guard Bridge Permit.</li> <li>• Stated that the U.S. Coast Guard would be involved in establishing minimum navigation clearances and evaluating potential impacts to navigation.</li> <li>• Recommended that the U.S. Coast Guard be consulted for permit jurisdiction and navigation clearance requirements at the appropriate project development stage.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin Department of Administration, Coastal Management Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Wisconsin Coastal Management Program waived review of the project assuming that WisDOT would coordinate the project with DNR.</li> </ul>
Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stated no objections to the project but requested that work be stopped if human skeletal remains or other objects falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act were uncovered during construction.</li> </ul>
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stated that it was unaware of any cultural resources in the study area but requested to be immediately contacted if any inadvertent discoveries were made at any time throughout the project development.</li> </ul>

## 4.2 Coordination Activities, 2013-2019

There was no public involvement or coordination with the Participating/Cooperating Agencies or tribes during the interim period while the PEOR Traffic Analysis for existing and future traffic operations on I-41 and the interchanges at County S, County F, and County G/WIS 32 was underway (coordination was restarted in late 2019; see Section 4.3).

However, the local communities and organizations were still interested in the project. From 2013 through October 2019, Brown County planning staff attended 17 meetings to update the members on the status of the study (Table 4-8). In 2016, seven local communities passed new or updated resolutions regarding the project (Table 4-9 and Appendix F).

**Table 4-8. Meetings with Local Officials and Community Organizations, 2013-October 2019**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Organization</b>
May 21, 2013	Hobart, Howard, Ashwaubenon, Lawrence, and Oneida Nation of Wisconsin Communities Organization
January 23, 2014 April 25, 2016	Brown County Chapter of Wisconsin Towns Association
May 21, 2013 February 17, 2016 February 7, 2017 April 17, 2018 October 15, 2019	De Pere City Council
December 10, 2013 August 18, 2015	De Pere Men's Club
April 10, 2014	Potentially affected municipalities
December 3, 2015 October 25, 2018	Allouez Optimist Club
April 25, 2018	State and local elected officials, local appointed officials, representatives of federal elected officials, and business owners/representatives
March 12, 2019	Howard Optimist Club
October 7, 2019	Ledgeview Town Board
October 28, 2019	Lawrence Town Board

**Table 4-9. Local Resolutions Supporting or Opposing Alternatives, 2016**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
May 17, 2016	City of De Pere	Supporting a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with a new full interchange at I-41
April 11, 2016	Town of Lawrence	
April 4, 2016	Town of Ledgeview	
April 26, 2016	Village of Ashwaubenon	
May 25, 2016	Village of Bellevue	
June 27, 2016	Village of Hobart	
June 20, 2016	Town of Rockland	Opposing the project

## 4.3 Coordination Activities, 2019-2020

In 2019, the Lead Agencies determined that full funding for the project would not be immediately available. Instead, the project would likely be implemented in smaller sections over an extended timeframe as funds became available. Therefore, to continue and complete the study as a federally approved NEPA action, FHWA recommended that the study transition to a Tier 1 EIS.

The study team also restarted public involvement and agency coordination in November 2019. FHWA published a revised Notice of Intent to prepare a Tier 1 EIS on December 30, 2019. The study team produced a new Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology Report for the Tier 1 EIS.

### 4.3.1 Public Involvement

#### Public Involvement Meetings

The Lead Agencies held one in-person public involvement meeting and one virtual public involvement opportunity prior to the release of the Tier 1 Draft EIS. Two local newspapers (the *Green Bay Press-Gazette* and *The Green Bay Press Times*) ran public meeting notices/display advertisements. Notifications also included press releases to the local media of upcoming meetings, and postcard mailings to study area communities and landowners along and near the study corridors.

#### Public Involvement Meeting—December 11, 2019

The meeting took place on December 11, 2019, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at Altmayer Elementary School in De Pere. The meeting included a presentation on the history of the project and the Tier 1 EIS process going forward. The remainder of the meeting was an open house, where attendees could review exhibits and ask questions of the study team. Comment sheets were available for submitting written comments. Appendix F contains a summary of the meeting, including exhibits, presentation, handouts, and comments. Exhibits included an overview of the Corridor Alternatives identified for detailed analysis in the earlier study (2008-2012); environmental and community resources in the project area; and the history and timelines for the study. Television station WLUK (Fox 11) covered the meeting. Approximately 269 people signed in at the meeting and submitted 40 written comments during and after the meeting.

Public comments included:

- **Preference for an alternative**—An equal number of comments supported two alternative routes: (1) the Rockland-Red Maple Roads Alternative, or (2) an alternative that crosses the river at Little Rapids and links the existing County S interchange and Midway Road (in the vicinity of what is now referred to as Alternative Route 8). A few commenters supported the Scheuring Road-Heritage Road alternative. Some comments opposed all alternatives. Other concerns raised by attendees and commenters included the cost of bridging at a wide point of the river (both of the proposed alternatives) instead of a narrower point (such as Little Rapids), the expense of right of way acquisition, noise impacts, and comments that the bridge would be too close to downtown De Pere to be effective in reducing congestion.
- **Residential impacts**—Comments included questions and concerns about how the project would impact property values, the right of way acquisition process, noise impacts, and aesthetic impacts.
- **Old Plank Road and neighborhood**—Comments included support for preserving Old Plank Road as a Rustic Road,<sup>2</sup> requests for sidewalks and bike lanes, and concerns for the intersection of Rockland Road with WIS 57 (Greenleaf Road) because of traffic speeds.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rustic Roads (WI Statutes 83.42) are designated throughout the state to provide hikers, bicyclists, and motorists an opportunity for leisurely travel. All Rustic Roads have outstanding natural features, are lightly traveled, are not anticipated for major improvements, have speed limits of 45 mph or less, and are at least 2 miles long.

- **Business impacts**—Comments included questions about how businesses would be affected by diverting traffic from downtown De Pere, and the impact to Belmark Products and other businesses along County X (Heritage Road) if that alternative is selected.
- **Environmental impacts**—Comments included concerns regarding impacts to nesting bald eagles, the recently capped Fox River bottom (hazardous waste cleanup of the river), and the recreational use of the river. There were also comments about maintaining the safety of Fox River State Trail users at a new road crossing as well as potential for increased truck noise due to grade changes.
- **Project cost**—Comments included questions about how the project would be funded, who would fund it, the accuracy of the project cost estimate, and the need for a new interchange with I-41.
- **Design**—Comments included questions about the proposed design of the project, including number of lanes, intersection designs, speed limits/controls near a school, bridge type, sidewalks/bike lanes, and whether a new road would intersect County D. There were also comments about bridge safety during winter, and how the project would impact recently installed water lines along Rockland Road.
- **Traffic**—Comments included concerns that the presented alternatives would not address congestion/would not be used, and the impact of traffic on residential areas. Some commented that the existing traffic congestion does not justify a new bridge.
- **Construction**—Comments included questions about the overall construction schedule and section sequencing. Some comments supported construction to begin quickly, while others voiced concerns about the potential for heavy-equipment damage and rushing the project to secure funding.

#### **Public Involvement Event—March 19, 2020**

A public involvement meeting was originally scheduled to be held on Thursday, March 19, 2020, from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at Altmayer Elementary School. This meeting was advertised in the same manner as the previous meeting, with display ads in the local newspapers, a postcard mailing, and press release. However, due to recommendations and orders from the state and federal government to limit the spread of the coronavirus (COVID-19), the in-person meeting was indefinitely postponed. Instead of holding an in-person meeting, the project team posted the meeting materials for public review and comment on the project website on March 19, 2020. A second postcard and press release were issued informing the study area communities and landowners along and near the study corridors of the change in format.

A narrated presentation, narrated exhibits, and project handout and comment form were placed on the website. The presentation provided an update on the project and the environmental process. The exhibits included an overview of the environmental process, study area traffic and crash information, alternatives screening process, information on the Corridor Alternatives retained for detailed study, the impact analysis process, and preferred corridor identification criteria. The South Bridge Connector website was viewed 1,461 times between March 19 and April 20. Of those views, 593 were new, or unique, viewers. Appendix F contains a summary of the meeting, including exhibits, presentation, handouts, and comments.

Comments received included:

- **Support for Corridor Alternative 2 (8 comments)**—This corridor is better located relative to where growth is occurring, would better alleviate congestion to the existing roadway system, and may have less impact to residential neighborhoods than Corridor Alternative 1.
- **Support for Corridor Alternative 1 (2 comments)**—This corridor uses existing roads and is a more direct route so would presumably cost less; much of the corridor is commercial so would presumably be less impactful to residences than Corridor Alternative 2.
- **Suggested using a corridor further south than Corridor Alternative 2, such as crossing the Fox River at Little Rapids and/or using County S or Midway Road (5 comments)**—This corridor would create

a true bypass of the city, would accommodate future regional growth to the south, and would travel through less developed areas so would be expected to have less impact on residences.

- **Concerns about Corridor Alternative 1 (5 comments)**—Commenters expressed concerns over proximity to schools, impact to businesses and residences, and high number of intersection crossings.
- **Concerns about Corridor Alternative 2 (3 comments)**—Commenters expressed concerns over traffic noise, cost, and impact on residences.
- **Comments and request for data regarding other alternatives**—Desire for the project to bypass the city and create a direct route from Highway 43 (I-43) to the new South Bridge, since County GV is already busy; request for data showing that a southern route crossing the Fox River around Little Rapids would not alleviate traffic or improve safety to the same extent as the Corridor Alternatives retained for detailed study.
- **Requests for design of the bridge, roadway, and intersections**—Comments included questions about inclusion of roundabouts, the layout of the intersections, what the bridge will look like, and the speed limit.
- **Cost estimates**—Comments included request for cost estimate of the alternatives; the cost savings by using an existing interchange and shorter bridge; and that the money for this project would be better spent elsewhere.
- **Impacts at County D**—Concerns included truck traffic along County D, desire for project to incorporate designs that steer traffic away from County D to prevent people from using it as a cut through, and request not to make access/exit ramps empty onto County D.
- **Property Concerns**—Comments included request for specific property impacts, whether properties will have access during construction, concerns over traffic noise in residential areas, and how the project will affect home values.
- **Fox River State Trail**—Concerns about impacts to the Fox River State Trail, whether the road would go over the trail, and whether noise reduction measures will be needed on an overpass to the Fox River State Trail.
- **Traffic Concerns**—Comments included the desire to address truck traffic and engine braking along Highway 57, and opinion that the long-term impacts of COVID-19 will reduce traffic and the need for the project. Desire for project to be completed quickly.

The full extent of comments received and responses to these comments can be found in Appendix F.7.2.

### Project Website

In 2019, Brown County established a new project website for the South Bridge Connector.<sup>3</sup> The website provides the information for the Tier 1 EIS, including current project status, upcoming meetings, project documents, exhibits, handouts, and presentations from public involvement meetings. The website included contact information to submit comments to the study team at any point during the project.

### Other Public Involvement Activities

The study team met with several residents of the Fox River Condominiums on County D on March 13, 2020. This condominium is adjacent to Corridor Alternative 2. Topics discussed at the meeting were the Little Rapids alternative that several residents had submitted written comments in favor of, the impact analysis process in a Tier 1 study such as this one, potential impacts to their condominium property, and schedule for the project.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/>

### 4.3.2 Coordination with Local Officials

The Lead Agencies organized group meetings with local officials. Appendix F contains full summaries of the meetings.

#### Local Officials Meeting (December 5, 2019)

The Lead Agencies met with local officials at the Brown County Highway Department in Green Bay, Wisconsin. The meeting provided information about the Tier 1 EIS process and schedule, related it to the previous planning and environmental studies, reviewed key purpose and need factors, provided information on the preliminary range of alternatives, and obtained input from communities on environmental issues to be addressed in the EIS. Representatives attended from:

- City of De Pere
- Village of Allouez
- Village of Ashwaubenon
- Village of Bellevue
- Brown County Supervisor
- Brown County Board
- Town of Glenmore
- Town of Ledgeview
- Town of Rockland
- De Pere School District
- West De Pere School District
- Oneida Nation of Wisconsin

The group discussed the following issues:

- How the Tier 1 EIS would take into consideration the alternatives previously identified in the original EIS study period.
- How any recommended I-41 improvements that may come out of this study would be incorporated into WisDOT's I-41 study (from Appleton to Green Bay), and its relation to the I-41 project construction phasing. Several local officials favored constructing the I-41 interchange (if an interchange is part of the South Bridge Connector Preferred Alternative) at or near the beginning of WisDOT's I-41 reconstruction project, rather than at the end.
- Discussion regarding Brown County's potential funding scenarios for constructing the project east and west of a potential new I-41 interchange (which would be constructed by WisDOT).
- Discussions about river crossing effects on emergency service response times and how congestion at the Claude Allouez Bridge and WIS 172 Bridge crossings impact emergency response (police, fire, ambulance).
- Discussion about downtown De Pere and conflicts between traffic and downtown retail and pedestrians.

The study team noted that during earlier study efforts, several communities provided resolutions supporting or opposing different alternatives. Communities were asked to update their formal positions/resolutions regarding the project alternatives. The study team also requested updates on developments currently under review or in the planning stages in the area.

#### Local Officials Meeting 2 (March 4, 2020)

The Lead Agencies held a second meeting with local officials at the Brown County Highway Department in Green Bay, Wisconsin to discuss the Corridor Alternatives retained for detailed analysis, the processes for assessing impacts of the Corridor Alternatives, and the process for identifying a preferred Corridor Alternative. Representatives attended from:

- City of De Pere
- Village of Allouez
- Village of Ashwaubenon
- Brown County Supervisor
- Brown County Board
- Town of Lawrence
- Town of Ledgeview
- Town of Rockland

### The group discussed:

- The results of the December 2019 public meeting.
- Recent request to the Participating Agencies for comments and to Cooperating Agencies for comments and concurrence (see Table 4-11) on the Purpose of and Need for the Project and on the alternatives retained for detailed study (Corridor Alternatives 1 and 2).
- Recent request for input on the proposed methodology for analyzing impacts, including 500-foot-wide corridors with a 125- to 150-foot working alignment in each corridor for the Tier 1 EIS. The alignment would be adjusted within the corridor to minimize impacts in Tier 2.
- The process by which the Lead Agencies would select a preferred Corridor Alternative. The Lead Agencies will identify the preferred Corridor Alternative in the Draft EIS after input from the Participating and Cooperating Agencies, local communities, and the public.
- Participants recommended that the study team acknowledge at the next public meeting that all communities have supported Corridor Alternative 2 with resolutions.
- A Town of Lawrence representative noted that Corridor Alternative 1 has two schools and a church next to it, citing these as one factor working against Corridor Alternative 1.

### Community Resolutions

Four communities expressed continued support for the project and re-confirmed previously passed resolutions (Table 4-10). Oneida Nation of Wisconsin also passed a resolution in support of the project. Comments from the City of De Pere in their role as a Participating Agency are covered in Section 4.3.3.

**Table 4-10. Local Support for Alternatives, 2019-2020**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
December 17, 2019	Village of Ashwaubenon	Preference for a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with an I-41 interchange
January 16, 2020	Town of Rockland	Letter supporting a Rockland Road alternative
February 3, 2020	Town of Ledgeview	Preference for a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with an I-41 interchange
February 4, 2020	City of De Pere	Preference for a Rockland Road-Red Maple-Southbridge alternative with an I-41 interchange
May 13, 2020	Oneida Nation of Wisconsin	Letter supporting the project

## 4.3.3 Agency Coordination

### Cooperating and Participating Agencies

Because the project was re-initiated as a Tier 1 EIS, the Lead Agencies re-invited regulatory agencies, communities, and tribes to serve as Participating or Cooperating Agencies (Table 4-11). Agencies invited to be Cooperating Agencies were those that may eventually need to provide an approval, permit, or formal agreement for the project in Tier 2 environmental review. Other agencies and communities were invited to be Participating Agencies.

FHWA and WisDOT sent invitations to the agencies on December 18, 2019. The invitations included a request for review and comment on the new Coordination Plan, Impact Analysis Methodology Report, and project schedule. FHWA and WisDOT followed up with a second invitation to agencies (February 14, 2020) and tribes (March 3, 2020) who did not respond to the first invitation.

Table 4-11. Participating and Cooperating Agencies for the Tier 1 EIS

Agency	Responsibility	Response Date
<b>Federal Agencies</b>		
U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs	Participating	
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service	Participating	
U.S. Coast Guard	Cooperating	December 18, 2019; January 13, 2020
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Cooperating	March 2, 2020
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Cooperating	January 2, 2020
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Participating	
<b>Tribal Agencies and Tribal Nations</b>		
Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Part. Agency invite	
Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	Part. Agency invite	
Forest County Potawatomi Community	Participating	March 5, 2020
Ho-Chunk Nation	Participating	February 13, 2020
Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma	Part. Agency invite	
Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Part. Agency invite	
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Part. Agency invite	
Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior	Part. Agency invite	
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	Participating	February 13, 2020
Oneida Nation of Wisconsin	Participating	February 13, 2020
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation	Part. Agency invite	
Prairie Island Indian Community	Part. Agency invite	
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Part. Agency invite	
Sac and Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska	Part. Agency invite	
Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma	Part. Agency invite	
Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa	Part. Agency invite	
Sokaogon Chippewa Community	Part. Agency invite	
St. Croix Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians	Declined	December 19, 2019
<b>State Agencies</b>		
Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	Participating	January 9, 2020
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	Cooperating	January 15, 2020
Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Officer	Cooperating	January 7, 2020
Fox River Navigational System Authority	Participating	January 6, 2020
<b>Local Communities</b>		
City of De Pere	Participating	January 13, 2020
Town of Glenmore	Part. Agency invite	
Town of Lawrence	Part. Agency invite	
Town of Ledgeview	Participating	January 7, 2020
Town of Rockland	Participating	January 16, 2020
Village of Allouez	Participating	January 9, 2020
Village of Ashwaubenon	Part. Agency invite	
Village of Bellevue	Part. Agency invite	
Village of Hobart	Declined	January 9, 2020

## Agency Meetings

### Scoping Meeting, December 11, 2019

The Lead Agencies held an agency scoping meeting at the Brown County Highway Department office. The purpose of the meeting was to re-initiate coordination and obtain input from Cooperating and Participating Agencies. Discussion topics included project history and previous planning and environmental studies, the Tier 1 EIS process and schedule, the relationship of this study to the I-41 improvement study and potential new interchange, the purpose and need factors, as well as Corridor Alternatives that would be evaluated. The Agency Coordination Plan and Impact Analysis Methodology were discussed. The overall schedule was also presented.

The following issues were discussed:

- DNR and the Corps of Engineers suggested that, rather than using published data, wetland information from earlier 2011 field reviews would be more current and accurate.
- The Corps of Engineers suggested using Natural Resources Conservation Service information to determine whether there are any farmed wetlands.
- DNR stated that, because the corridors are broad, potential impacts to the Fox River could vary depending on actual roadway location within the corridor.
- The Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin acknowledged that Section 106 would not be undertaken as part of the Tier 1 studies and asked how coordination would occur with the tribes. The study team noted that there will be outreach, but not through the formal Section 106 consultation process.

### Concurrence Points

Under FHWA's agency coordination process as described in Section 4.1.3 and codified at 23 USC 139, concurrence is written determination by an agency that the information provided to date is adequate to agree that the project can be advanced to the next stage of development. Agencies agree not to revisit the previous process steps unless conditions change. Concurrence by an agency at a concurrence point does not imply that the project has been approved by that agency, nor that it has released its obligation to determine whether the fully developed project meets statutory review criteria. The following three concurrence points were established in the Agency Coordination Plan:

- Concurrence Point 1: Purpose and Need
- Concurrence Point 2: Range of Alternative Corridors to be Carried Forward for Study
- Concurrence Point 3: Identification of the Preferred Corridor Alternative

### ***Concurrence Points 1 and 2***

On March 2, 2020, the Lead Agencies invited the Participating Agencies to comment on and Cooperating Agencies to comment on and concur with the draft Purpose of and Need for the Project, Range of Alternative Corridors to be Carried Forward for Study, and Section 3.1 of the Draft EIS, Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts. On March 16 and 17, 2020, the Lead Agencies held a teleconference to solicit preliminary comments and feedback from agencies, as well as answer any questions that agencies may have midway through their review process. Two teleconference meetings were held to accommodate agency schedules. The Lead Agencies reviewed input received from agencies so far, including:

- DNR's request to add more environmental impact discussion of why alternatives were dropped. The Lead Agencies agreed to follow up with DNR to further discuss and to send updated information to all agencies to consider as part of Concurrence Points 1 and 2 coordination.

- State Historic Preservation Office’s request for clarification of graphics explaining alternatives eliminated, as well as noting that cultural resource surveys and findings, which do not appear to have been done, could warrant alignment shifts.

The Lead Agencies also reviewed their approach to assessing indirect and cumulative impacts and initial findings about which resources may incur indirect or cumulative effects. A one-page summary was presented to the agencies and provided to them following the call.

The following issues were discussed:

- U.S. EPA asked what level of analysis would be included in the Concurrence Point 3 materials (Preferred Alternative), noting that typically it includes information on the operational characteristics of the remaining alternatives and more information on their impacts. The Lead Agencies stated that Concurrence Point 3 will follow that approach and include that level of information.
- Corps of Engineers inquired about the wetland impact methodology used in the Tier 1 study. The Lead Agencies noted that the Tier 1 analysis would rely on published information combined with previous wetland field verifications.
- U.S. Coast Guard asked about the Fox River bridge design. It was noted that the design and schedule will be part of the Tier 2 study.

On March 27, 2020, the Lead Agencies sent an updated version of Table 2-1 in the Alternatives Considered section. It was updated based on comments from DNR to include more information on impacts.

Table 4-12, under Agency Correspondence, summarizes official responses from Cooperating and Participating Agencies.

### ***Concurrence Point 3***

Participating and Cooperating Agencies will be asked to consider and provide concurrence on the identification of the Preferred Corridor Alternative as part of their review of the Draft EIS. The Lead Agencies will incorporate comments received and update Concurrence Point 3 in the Final EIS and Record of Decision.

### **Individual Agency Meetings**

The study team held several one-on-one meetings with federal and state agencies throughout the project to discuss specific issues regarding the study.

#### **Meeting with DNR, January 30, 2020**

The study team met with DNR to discuss potential Fox River bridge location issues, as well as natural resource issues of concern. The group discussed these topics:

- To the extent possible, the project should site the bridge piers and construction activities to minimize impacts to river sediment reclamation accomplished through the Fox River Cleanup Project and specify repairs to sediment caps that are damaged by construction.
- The project design should minimize potential impacts to aquatic life and habitats in the Fox River and other waterways. In-stream construction restrictions (March 1 through June 15) will be in effect.
- The project has low potential to impact notable upland habitats.
- The project could have potential to impact threatened and endangered species; additional study will be needed.
- The project design should accommodate Fox River recreational uses.

- The project design should minimize impact to protected lands, including Section 6(f) and Section 4(f) resources (trails).
- The project has the potential to impact drinking water wells; additional study is needed.
- Managing stormwater runoff for transportation projects is a growing concern.

#### **Meeting with Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, February 13, 2020**

The Lead Agencies held an early project coordination meeting with the tribal historic preservation officers of the Ho-Chunk Nation, Oneida Nation of Wisconsin, and Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin regarding archaeological and historic resources in the study area. Prior to the meeting, the participants drove the alternative corridors to view cultural sites identified from a records search.

The tribal officers raised the following issues:

- Identified a cemetery that did not appear in the record search but may be in the area of potential effects.
- Pointed out the historical significance of the river. Specifically, the Little Rapids dam area was a meeting place for French explorer Jean Nicolet and the Menominee and Winnebago Tribes who were the first inhabitants of the Lower Fox River.
- Noted that sturgeon is an important resource in the Fox River and its tributaries, and the team should be aware of potential impacts to existing fish weirs at the dam/rapids. The Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin stated that it considers the Fox River, specifically spawning areas for sturgeon, to be a Traditional Cultural Property.
- Commented about aviation regulations regarding proposed buildings near airports. WisDOT agreed to verify that the project is in compliance.

The group discussed the cultural resource identification activities to be completed as part of the Tier 1 environmental study and in subsequent Tier 2 studies. The Lead Agencies and tribal officers agreed to share cultural resource records. Tribes agreed to provide any additional tribal/cultural/historical records and review cultural resource materials provided by the study team on March 3, 2020.

The group reviewed the project schedule and established methods for future project communications. The tribes committed to participate in upcoming agency coordination and agreed to the project schedule.

In further follow-up, WisDOT indicated that when field surveys are conducted, all tribes that expressed interest would be contacted and invited to conduct Traditional Cultural Property surveys and/or be onsite when the archaeologist conducts fieldwork. Field surveys would be conducted during Tier 2.

#### **Meeting with DNR, March 16, 2020**

The study team held a teleconference with DNR to discuss initial comments on the material provided by the Lead Agencies for Concurrence Points 1 and 2. The group discussed the following issues:

- Outline of the Lead Agencies' approach to alternatives evaluation and the screening criteria used.
- The plan, based on DNR input, to add information to the document that describes, at a high level, the impacts of the 11 alternative routes considered in Step 2 of the alternative screening process. It was explained that the data presented would be qualitative.
- DNR's concern that there is no mention of environmental factors in the purpose and need. The Lead Agencies agreed to add text to the purpose and need summary stating that environmental impacts will also be used as a factor in alternatives evaluation.
- DNR's indication that it cannot agree on either concurrence point as the document is currently written. The Lead Agencies acknowledged that changes were needed and that they would send an updated portion of the document and ask for a second letter from DNR.

### Meeting with DNR, April 1 and 3, 2020

The study team held teleconference calls with DNR to further discuss comments on the updated material provided by the Lead Agencies for Concurrence Points 1 and 2. Following these discussions, the DNR, in a letter on April 9, 2020, stated that the information provided was adequate and that the project can be advanced to the next step in the Tier 1 process.

### Agency Correspondence

Table 4-12 summarizes agency comments received. Appendix F contains agency correspondence.

Table 4-12. Summary of Comments Received from Agencies and Tribes, 2019-2020

Agency	Date	Comments
U.S. Coast Guard	January 13, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that a new Fox River bridge will require a U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit, but specific comments cannot be provided until a specific bridge design is proposed.</li> <li>Recommended that the Tier 1 EIS identify and address river navigational concerns to the extent possible.</li> </ul>
	April 6, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated concerns for the new Fox River bridge will be regarding clearances as well as any attendant environmental concerns.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources	January 15, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided comments on the Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation and Impact Analysis Methodologies.</li> </ul>
	February 14, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on Community Financial Assistance Funding for Public Lands in the area of Alternatives 1 and 2.</li> </ul>
	March 20, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided comments on the Purpose of and Need for the Project and Range of Alternatives for Study.</li> </ul>
	April 9, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that the information provided to date is adequate and that the project can be advanced to the next stage of project development in the Tier 1 process. Also commented on the quality of resources review.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection	January 9, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided comments on the Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation and Impact Analysis Methodologies.</li> </ul>
	March 27, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concurred with Purpose of and Need for the Project.</li> </ul>
	March 31, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional comments; concurred with the Purpose of and Need for the Project and Range of Alternatives for Study.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Officer	January 7, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided comments on the Coordination Plan for Public and Agency Participation and Impact Analysis Methodologies.</li> </ul>
	March 11, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided comments on the Purpose of and Need for the Project and Range of Alternatives for Study.</li> </ul>
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	March 9, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concurred with Purpose of and Need for the Project, Range of Alternatives for Study, and Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts.</li> </ul>
Fox River Navigational Authority	March 27, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated no opposition to the plans as proposed.</li> </ul>
Ho-Chunk Nation of Wisconsin	March 30, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated no objections to the plans.</li> </ul>
City of De Pere	March 31, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided comments on the Purpose of and Need for the Project and Range of Alternatives for Study.</li> </ul>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	April 21, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concurred with Purpose of and Need for the Project and Range of Alternatives for Study. Also provided comments on the Approach to Analysis of Environmental Impacts.</li> </ul>