Section 1: Purpose and Need
- Describes the purpose of the project (what the project is intended to accomplish)
- Describes why the project is needed (explains the transportation concerns and/or deficiencies that the project would address)

Section 2: Alternatives Considered
- Describes the range of alternative corridors identified
- Describes how alternative corridors were evaluated and retained or eliminated from detailed study

Section 3: Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences
- Describes the project area’s existing social, economic, and environmental setting
- Describes the project’s beneficial and adverse social, economic, and environmental consequences

Section 4: Public Involvement and Agency Coordination
- Describes the results of public and interest group meetings
- Describes coordination efforts with local, state, and federal agencies
Existing and Future Traffic Volumes and Future Level of Service under No Build

Legend

- LOS Level of Service
- LOS E Locations

**Level of Service (LOS)**

- A: Excellent
- B: Good
- C: Satisfactory
- D: Marginally Satisfactory
- E: Unacceptable
- F: Inadequate

**Bridge Crossing**

- Level of Service E in 2045 on a scale from A to F

* The 2018 traffic count was impacted due to construction at Main Avenue just east of I-41; therefore, 2015 traffic count is used for existing traffic volumes.
The Lead Agencies considered the input of the public, tribes, agencies, and local governments in the development and screening of alternatives.
Initial Range of Corridor Alternatives Considered

Legend
- Alternative Routes Considered
- Reconstructed in 2012-2014
- Included in Routes 1, 2, and 4, Prior to GV Reconstruction
- Lake, Pond, or River
- River or Stream
- Interstate/Highway
- Major Road
- Minor Road
- Multi-Use Trail
- Railroad
Corridor Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study

Legend
- Corridor Alternative 1
- Corridor Alternative 2 (With I-41 Interchange)
- Corridor Alternative 2 may include a collector-distributor road on I-41 between the new interchange and Scheuring Rd

- Lake, Pond, or River
- River or Stream
- Interstate/Highway
- Major Road
- Minor Road
- Multi-Use Trail
- Railroad

- Conceptual 4-Lane Divided Roadway (Rural) to be Evaluated in Tier 2
- To be evaluated in Tier 2
- Conceptual 4-Lane Divided Roadway (Urban) to be Evaluated in Tier 2

- Williams Grant Dr
- Matthew Dr
- Southbridge Rd
- De Pere
- Ashwaubenon
- Allouez
- Hobart
- Glenmore
- Lawrence
- Rockland
- Old Martin Rd
- Midway Rd
- Fox River
- Lawrence
- Belleuve
The decision on cross sections will be evaluated and finalized during Tier 2 analyses.
During the December 2019 Public Involvement Meeting, several commenters suggested an alternative that uses the existing County S interchange to connect with I-41 and crosses the Fox River at the relatively narrow location near Little Rapids.

Supporters indicated that the advantage of connecting to I-41 at County S and crossing the Fox River at Little Rapids is that it would save money by using an existing interchange and cross the Fox River at a narrower point than other alternatives and runs through fewer developed areas.

**Reasons for Elimination from Detailed Analysis**

- Would provide a new east-west road across Fox River but would be 4.5 miles south of the Claude Allouez Bridge. Therefore, would not relieve congestion to the extent of Alternatives 1 or 2.

- Less safety benefit than Alternatives 1 or 2 because this corridor would not divert as much traffic from existing routes.

- Not consistent with local and county planning, which calls for business/industrial development to occur north of Midway Road.

- Cost savings would be offset because:
  - The County S interchange would likely need to be rebuilt and expanded
  - Would require 7 additional miles of roadway east of the river to connect to I-43/WIS 172 or an additional 3 to 4 miles of roadway to connect to County GV, compared to Alternatives 1 and 2.
For a tiered EIS, a range of alternative corridors, rather than specific road alignments, is identified and evaluated at Tier 1 stage. The corridors cover a wider area in which the roadway (alignment) could lie and provide flexibility in positioning a roadway and evaluating potential impacts prior to conducting detailed engineering during Tier 2 studies.

**Corridor Width**
Area all potential Tier 2 alternatives are expected to stay within (500-feet wide)

**Working Alignment**
Average right-of-way width needed for a specific alternative defined by number of lanes, median width, clear zone, etc. (125-150 feet wide)

For this project, the corridor widths are expected to be 500 feet wide, although they may be widened at locations like the I-41 interchange. This width was determined to be appropriate based on resources in the area combined with the planned roadway cross-section (generally 2 lanes in each direction with turn lanes). This width also allows enough area for engineering design flexibility during subsequent Tier 2 studies.

The working alignment is a conceptual roadway alignment inside each Corridor Alternative, used to estimate representative physical impacts that could occur if the South Bridge Connector is constructed within a selected corridor. The working alignment is 125 to 150 feet wide based on the anticipated roadway cross-section (note that this is conceptual and subject to change based on Tier 2 analysis). In some places, the working alignment is wider (e.g., at intersections) to account for the larger footprint of the anticipated transportation facility in these locations.

During the Tier 2 phase, the project team will assess options to refine the roadway alignment within the selected corridor to balance meeting the project purpose and need with avoiding and minimizing impacts to the extent practicable. As a result, the refined alignments evaluated in Tier 2 may differ from the working alignments evaluated in the Tier 1 EIS due to the development of more detailed design and impact information.
Resource Impact Analysis

The Tier 1 EIS is a broad-scale document intended to provide an indication of potential impacts that may be associated with the proposed corridor alternatives.

As specific alignments are developed during Tier 2, actual impacts will be determined and assessed at a more detailed level.

Calculating Impacts

1. Working alignments were developed within 500-foot corridors for each alternative.
2. Resource impacts were then calculated using these working alignments.
3. To account for the uncertainty the calculated impact number was broadened and presented as an impact range.
4. The low end of the impact ranges 0.75 of the calculated impact number, and the high end of the range is 1.25 times.
6. The high end is intended to represent a worst-case scenario, which could account for a potential increase in impacts as a result of more detailed engineering and impact analysis.
6. Impact calculation and analysis is in progress and will be presented in the Tier 1 EIS.

Impact Calculation

- 0.75 times the impact calculation is the low end of the impact range.
- 1.25 times the impact calculation is the high end of the impact range.

Resources or Topics Discussed in the EIS

- Land Use Planning
- Residential Development
- Business Development
- Community Resources
- Socioeconomic Characteristics/Environmental Justice
- Transportation Services
- Agriculture
- Water Resources
- Protected Species
- Traffic Noise
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetics
- Hazardous Materials
- Indirect and Cumulative Impacts
Corridor Alternatives 1 and 2 both met the Steps 1, 2, and 3 screening criteria. The Lead Agencies will evaluate both alternatives to assess which best met the Steps 1, 2, and 3 criteria. Criteria used to differentiate the two alternatives include:

- **Travel Time.** Reduce travel time by improving east-west connectivity.
- **Safety.** Maximize safety on the study area’s transportation system by minimizing traffic congestion and conflicts (Step 2 objective)
- **Land Use Compatibility.** Is the route consistent with local and county plan updates, and does the community support it? (Step 3 criteria)
- **Right of Way Acquisition.** What is the extent of land acquisition needed for the route? (Step 3 criteria)
- **Environmental Effects.** Does the route minimize effects on environmentally sensitive areas? (Step 3 criteria)

A preferred corridor alternative will be identified following impact analysis and public and agency input.

The No Build Alternative was retained as a baseline for comparison to the Corridor Build Alternatives. It is not identified as the preferred corridor alternative because it would not address the project’s purpose and need with respect to traffic operations, compatibility with local plans, or safety concerns. Because the No Build Alternative does not address purpose and need, it is not a reasonable course of action.
Environmental Process Overview

**Agency Coordination Plan**

**Impact Analysis Methodology**

**Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
- Available for Public Review and Comment
- Public Hearing

**Summer 2020**

**Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision**

**Late 2020**

**Tier 2 Environmental and Design Studies**
Project History

1968
South Bridge concept first included in Brown County Plan

1996
Brown County Plan recommends general Southern Bridge corridor location

2008
Public Involvement Meeting #1 (Presentation of the Purpose & Need)

2009
Public Involvement Meeting #2 (Identification of potential build alternatives by the public)

2010
Public Involvement Meeting #3 (presentation of alternatives retained and eliminated)

2019
Resume Environmental Impact Statement as a Tier 1 document

1960s

1990s

2000s

2010s

Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Timeline

Dec 2019
Publication of Notice of Intent Resume Environmental Impact Statement as a Tier 1 document

June 2020
Completion of the Tier 1 Draft EIS

Oct 2020
Completion of Tier 1 Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision

2019

2020

2021

Mar 2020
Public Involvement materials made available to the public Provide input on corridor alternatives retained for detailed study

July 2020
Public Hearing Provide general input on impacts and preferred alternative

Late 2021
WisDOT I-41 Environmental Assessment and potential Finding of No Significant Impact complete
This may serve as the Tier 2 document for the new South Bridge Connector interchange with I-41 (if a new interchange is part of the preferred alternative)