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Welcome and Purpose of the Public Hearing

Thank you for attending today’s public hearing for the South Bridge Connector project. This public hearing provides you the opportunity to give testimony on the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that contains information regarding proposed transportation improvements that affect both near-term and long-term changes to the corridor.

The objective of the public hearing and environmental document availability period is to get the most complete expression of public opinion regarding the project aspects listed in this handout on the record. Testimony provided during this public hearing and during the environmental document availability period will be considered along with other judgments and opinions received before further decisions are made on the proposed project alternatives. This public hearing includes a project presentation and opportunities to provide public/private verbal testimony to a court reporter and/or written testimony. All testimony will be entered into the public hearing record along with other public hearing presentations, exhibits and materials.

This public hearing will focus on the following aspects of the proposed South Bridge Connector project:

- The location and design features of the proposed improvements and alternatives being considered.
- The National and Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act public hearing process, as applicable, on projects which include preparation of an environmental document. The final environmental document prepared following this public hearing will be the decision document for the proposed improvements. Copies of the draft environmental document are available for review at this public hearing.
- Project activities that will eventually (after Tier 2 environmental analysis) require authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the Clean Water Act for placing fill into waters of the United States including wetlands, and other approvals from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Wisconsin Historical Society.

More information on the project, along with the Tier 1 Draft EIS can be found on the project website: [https://www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/](https://www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/)
## Public Hearing Agenda

### Virtual Hearing via YouTube Live – July 7, 2020

Participants may also call (920)785-5851, conference ID 91959483# to listen to the virtual hearing via audio only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Sign in, review handout and exhibits on the website. Informal questions about the project may be asked via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Important!</strong> – Determine if you will be providing testimony. If so, determine which option(s) and follow the instructions*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability to provide <strong>Private Verbal Testimony</strong> and <strong>Written Testimony</strong> begins. Private Verbal Testimony is available until the end of the public hearing. Written Testimony will be accepted until August 3, 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome and Opening Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Project presentation and description of exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Public Verbal Testimony</strong> option begins upon completion of project presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to review exhibits on the project website and ability to ask informal questions to the project staff via email or YouTube Live chat continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Public Hearing ends at 8:00 p.m. or after all public verbal testimony has been recorded, whichever is later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Written, mail in, email, and call in testimony</strong> available until August 3, 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In-Person Hearing at Brown County Fairgrounds – July 8, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Sign in, pick up handout, review exhibits, listen to the presentation, visit with project staff and ask questions about the proposed improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Important!</strong> – Determine if you will be providing testimony. If so, determine which option(s) and follow the instructions*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability to provide <strong>Public Verbal Testimony</strong>, <strong>Private Verbal Testimony</strong> and <strong>Written Testimony</strong> begins. All options are available until the end of the public hearing. Written Testimony will continue to be accepted until August 3, 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening Statement, Information for the Record, and Project Statement read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Public Hearing ends at 8 pm or after all public verbal testimony has been recorded, whichever is later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Written, mail in, email, and call in testimony</strong> available until August 3, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See the following “Options and Instructions for Providing Testimony”*
Options and Instructions for Providing Testimony

There are several options for providing testimony as described below. Your testimony will be reviewed and considered by Brown County, Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT), and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (also referred to as the Lead Agencies) as part of the process for identifying the selected alternative. **Testimony should be limited to tonight’s public hearing aspects (see Page 1), and statements or opinions about the project.**

Provide comments on the alternative(s) you support or oppose and your reasons. Questions related to the project can be directed to project staff during the informal discussions but will not be answered during public testimony.

**Private Verbal Testimony**

This option may be preferred if you wish to make your statement privately to the court reporter rather than in front of an audience. This option is available during the entire public hearing.

**Virtual Public Hearing**

To get placed into the call back queue to provide private testimony, please call 920-492-7705 or send an email to south.bridge.connector@browncountywi.gov. A call taker will take your name, address and a call back phone number. If we are experiencing high call volumes, a call taker may not immediately be available to take your information. Please hold on the line and we will answer your call in the order received. If sending an email, please indicate that you are interested in providing private testimony.

Participants will be called back when it is your turn to provide private testimony based on the order in which the request was received. Please be patient when waiting for your call back. Please limit your testimony to approximately 3 minutes to allow time for others to provide their testimony. When you receive the call back, provide your name and address. You may also indicate if you are representing a business or organization. Then proceed with your testimony.

When you get your call back, please turn off the audio on your computer; the YouTube Live presentation audio coming through your speaker will make it difficult for the court reporter to understand your testimony.

**In-Person Public Hearing**

For the in-person public hearing at the Brown County Fairgrounds, follow the signs or ask project team members for directions to the location for providing private verbal testimony. Wait for an opening, provide the court reporter with your completed “Registration Slip for Verbal Testimony” (included in this handout packet or on a table at the in-person hearing), state your name, address, and if applicable, the group, organization or business you are representing. Then give the court reporter your testimony. Please limit your testimony to approximately 3 minutes to allow time for others to provide their testimony.
Public Verbal Testimony

Virtual Public Hearing

To get placed into the call back queue to provide public testimony, please call 920-492-7705 or send an email to south.bridge.connector@browncountywi.gov. A call taker will take your name, address and a call back phone number. If we are experiencing high call volumes, a call taker may not immediately be available to take your information. Please hold on the line and we will answer your call in the order received. If sending an email, please indicate that you are interested in providing public testimony.

Participants will be called back when it is your turn to provide public verbal testimony based on the order in which the request was received. Please be patient when waiting for your call back. Please limit your testimony to approximately 3 minutes to allow time for others to provide their testimony in public. When you receive the call back, provide your name and address. You may also indicate if you are representing a business or organization. Then proceed with your testimony.

When you get your call back, please turn off the audio on your computer. There is up to a 30-second time lag between your phone testimony and what is broadcast over YouTube Live coming back out of your computer audio which will cause confusion for all parties.

In-Person Public Hearing

For the in-person public hearing at the Brown County Fairgrounds, public verbal testimony will be accepted any time during the public hearing from 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., following the Project Opening Statement.

Complete a “Registration Slip for Verbal Testimony” (included in this handout packet or on a table at the in-person hearing). Give it to staff at the verbal testimony table any time. Your name will be called in the order the registration slips are received.

When you are called to the microphone to provide testimony, please state your name, address, and if applicable, the group, organization or business you are representing. Please limit your testimony to approximately 3 minutes to allow time for others to provide their testimony in public. You can testify again as part of the public verbal testimony after others wishing to testify have done so.

Public verbal testimony will continue until everyone interested in providing testimony has had the opportunity to do so or until the public hearing ends at 8:00 p.m., whichever comes later.

Verbal Testimony following the Public Hearings

Following the public hearings, you may provide oral comments on the project by phone until August 3, 2020 by contacting Cole Runge, Interim Planning Director/MPO Director, Brown County, at (920) 448-6480. A summary of the oral comments made by phone, including voicemail, will be written down for inclusion in the public hearing record.
Written Testimony

You may provide written testimony in addition to, or in place of, verbal testimony. Complete the “Written Testimony Form” (included in this handout packet, at the sign-in table at the main entrance, or on tables throughout the room). You may also use your own stationery. Include your name, address, and if applicable, the group, organization or business you are representing. If you prepared written testimony prior to the public hearing, you may submit that also.

There are two options for submitting your written testimony as described below.

1. Submit Tonight: Complete the Written Testimony Form and place the form along with any other supporting documentation in the box located on the table in the hearing room or e-mail to Cole Runge, Interim Planning Director/MPO Director, Brown County, at South.bridge.connector@browncountywi.gov.

   OR

2. Mail In: You may prefer this option if you would like additional time to organize your thoughts/testimony. The Written Testimony Form is pre-addressed. You may also send written testimony via e-mail. Comments can be sent to:

   Cole Runge
   Interim Planning Director/MPO Director, Brown County
   PO Box 23600
   Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
   (920) 448-6480
   South.bridge.connector@browncountywi.gov

   Mailed or e-mailed testimony must be postmarked or received no later than August 3, 2020 to be included in the official public hearing record.

Information for the Public Hearing Record

In addition to the testimony provided at this public hearing, all exhibits, handouts, audio/visual presentations and displays available for viewing at the public hearing will be included in the official public hearing record. Page 16 of this handout contains a complete listing of these materials. Other materials you wish to provide, along with other written testimony received after the public hearing, will be added to the official public hearing record provided they are postmarked or received no later than August 3, 2020.
Environmental Document Process

The environmental document process includes developing a project purpose and need, developing a range of alternatives, evaluating and screening alternatives, identifying a preferred alternative, and selecting and alternative. Numerous factors are considered throughout the environmental document development process including safety, mobility, compatibility with state/regional/local plans, engineering design standards, impacts to the socio-economic, natural and physical environment, cost, and input from the public and state/federal agencies.

The South Bridge Connector is currently at the Tier 1 Draft EIS stage. The Tier 1 Draft EIS documents the project purpose and need for the proposed improvements, describes corridor alternatives considered, identifies the preferred corridor alternative, identifies environmental impacts of the alternatives retained for detailed study, and records public involvement and agency coordination during the development of the purpose and need and refinement of alternatives. The Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision will identify the selected\(^1\) the corridor alternative, document reasons for its selection, and summarize the results of public testimony provided during the public hearing as well as document the availability period along with public and agency comments on the Tier 1 Draft EIS.

---

\(^1\) Although the Draft EIS identifies the Lead Agencies’ preferred corridor alternative, the decision is not final until an alternative is selected in the Record of Decision.
Project Statement

Project Background:

The study area generally comprises the area between I-41 on the west to I-43 on the east, within the City of De Pere and the Towns of Rockland, Lawrence, and Ledgeview.

The need for transportation system improvements was first identified in the 1968 Brown County comprehensive plan. Since that time, the concept of building a new Fox River bridge and connecting street system was included in many local community plans and studies as an important component of future development patterns.

In 2006, Brown County began early public involvement and agency coordination to explore the need for improved east-west travel in the southern Green Bay metropolitan area. In 2008, the Lead Agencies issued a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to explore options to address transportation needs in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area. The purpose of and need for the project were developed, alternatives were analyzed, and extensive public involvement was conducted to gather public input.

In 2012, the NEPA process was paused to conduct additional traffic and engineering studies. During this time, the Lead Agencies determined that since full funding for the project would not be immediately available, the project would likely need to be implemented in phases 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.

On December 30, 2019, the Lead Agencies resumed the NEPA process and published a revised Notice of Intent to prepare a Tier 1 EIS. This Tier 1 EIS evaluates transportation needs in the study area and analyzes broad corridors and conceptual transportation improvements rather than detailed alignments. If the Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision identifies a selected corridor for improvements, then as funding becomes available to construct sections of the project, subsequent Tier 2 environmental documents will be prepared to evaluate the design, cost, and impacts of specific alignment alternatives. No construction will directly result from the completion of the Tier 1 EIS alone, since Tier 2 environmental document(s) will be required before construction occurs.

Project Purpose:

The purpose of the project is to identify the most appropriate improvements for addressing existing east-west transportation demand and demand that will be generated by the planned development in the southern portion of the Green Bay metropolitan area.

Project Need:
The project is needed to:
• **Address congestion in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges**—The limited number of Fox River crossings in the southern Green Bay metropolitan area causes congestion on the Claude Allouez and WIS 172 bridges that is expected to worsen in the future. Downtown De Pere is not suited to carry high volumes of traffic because of the 25-miles per hour (mph) speed limit, on-street parking, pedestrian crossings, and high number of businesses and residences on Main Avenue/Reid Street.

• **Accommodate existing and planned land use and future travel demand generated by planned development**—Population and employment in study area communities are forecast to increase, and communities have adopted land use plans to accommodate growth, designating future development to occur in the study area on both the east and west sides of the river. While it is not a foregone conclusion that a new Fox River crossing will be built, the comprehensive plans of study area communities include constructing a new Fox River bridge to support and accommodate traffic from future growth.

• **Reduce travel time by improving east-west connectivity**—The lack of a river crossing for more than 10 miles between downtown De Pere and downtown Wrightstown hinders east-west connectivity in the study area and causes increased congestion on existing bridges, travel times, travel distances, and travel indirection. Congestion and travel times will continue to increase as population and employment grows. The limited number of river crossings also affects emergency services as responders have to travel farther to get to destinations across the river and can experience longer response times when the bridges are congested.

• **Address higher-than-average crash rates and safety issues in the vicinity of the existing Fox River bridges**—The crash rates on the WIS 172 bridge and on roadways in the vicinity of the Claude Allouez Bridge are higher than the statewide average. In addition, due to the lack of river crossings, drivers must travel out of their way to reach destinations, which provides the opportunity for more crashes.

**Summary of Alternatives:**
The Lead Agencies conducted a three-step alternatives screening process.

**Step 1—Develop and Screen Alternatives.**
In this step, the Lead Agencies identified 15 alternatives within the project boundaries: the No Build Alternative, 12 build alternatives, the Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Alternative. The build alternatives consist of the Improve Existing Roads Alternative and 11 alternative routes (see exhibit below). During Step 1, the 11 alternative routes were analyzed as a collective group (Build New Route) rather than individually. For these 11 routes, the Lead Agencies considered two types of roadways, a freeway and an arterial, and evaluated them relative to the project needs.

The Lead Agencies conducted a preliminary evaluation based on how well the alternatives met the project purpose and need (address congestion, accommodate land use and future travel demand, reduce travel time, and address safety issues near Fox River bridges). This step ultimately eliminated the Improve Existing Roads Alternative, the TDM Alternative and the TSM Alternative as standalone alternatives, and the freeway option for the Build New Route Alternative. Therefore, at the end of
Step 1, the alternatives remaining were the No Build Alternative and the Build New Route Alternative (composed of 11 arterial alternative routes).

**Step 2—Evaluate Alternative Routes.**

In this step, the Lead Agencies assessed the 11 alternative routes retained based on how each route met the needs-based screening criteria and whether major environmental impacts could result. The project screening criteria included transportation considerations, land use and growth management, environmental considerations, and consistency with local and regional plans. As part of this step, the Lead Agencies determined that some routes did not meet the project screening criteria; were inconsistent with land use, planning, and transportation management goals and objectives; or would result in social, environmental, and economic impacts that were too great.

This step ultimately eliminated nine of the routes from further evaluation because they would not meet the screening criteria: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Based on considerations that arose during Step 2 evaluation, the Lead Agencies added two modified alternative routes for consideration in Step 3. Alternative Route 2 was expanded to include an alternative without a new I-41 interchange and the Lead Agencies also added the Alternative Route 5/6 Hybrid to assess whether an alternative route south of Rockland Road-Southbridge Road with a new I-41 interchange could improve the metropolitan area transportation system’s ability to handle future travel demand because of its location in an area planned for development.

At the end of Step 2, four routes remained: Alternative Route 1, Alternative Route 2 with and without an interchange with I-41, and Alternative Route 5/6 Hybrid.
**Step 3—Refine Alternative Routes.**

In the final step, the Lead Agencies conducted additional analysis to further evaluate the four remaining routes (Alternative Route 1, Alternative Route 2 with and without an interchange with I-41, and Alternative Route 5/6 Hybrid) and identify corridors to be evaluated in detail in this Tier 1 EIS. This step provided a more detailed assessment of each of the four routes based on the following measures:

- Is the route consistent with local and county plan updates, and do local governments support it?
- Does the route contribute to problems on nearby existing roads and interchanges?
- What is the extent of land acquisition needed for the route?
- Does the route minimize effects on environmentally sensitive areas?

Step 3 narrowed the routes retained to two: Alternative Route 1 and Alternative Route 2 with an interchange with I-41. These two routes were retained for detailed study in the Tier 1 Draft EIS.

**Corridor Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study:**

Following Step 3 of the alternative identification, screening, and evaluation process, the No Build Alternative and two build route alternatives were retained for detailed evaluation in the EIS. These routes are Corridor Alternative 1: Scheuring Road-Heritage Road (County F-County X) and Corridor Alternative 2: Rockland Road-Red Maple Road with an I-41 Interchange. The Lead Agencies identified a working alignment within 500-foot corridors for each alternative as a basis for estimating the impacts.
Corridor Alternative 1:  
Corridor Alternative 1 is approximately 5.5 miles long. Alternative Route 1 begins at County EB (Packerland Drive) and passes through the existing I-41 interchange at the northern edge of Preserve Park. It continues along County F in the Town of Lawrence, crosses the Fox River, and continues along County X (Heritage Road). The route ends at the previously improved County GV (Monroe Road) in the Town of Ledgeview. Alternative Route 1 would provide a river crossing 1.5 miles south of the Claude Allouez Bridge.

From its western terminus at County EB (Packerland Drive) to west of Mid Valley Drive, the representative cross-section of the South Bridge Connector is a four-lane divided rural roadway. West of the Fox River, between Mid Valley Drive and Lawrence Drive, County F would need additional capacity, likely three lanes in each direction. If it is reconstructed, features such as a sidewalk or shared-use path would likely be added. In addition, the County F intersections with the I-41 interchange ramps would need to be reconstructed to accommodate the increased traffic and the County F bridge over I-41 would need to be widened.

Also, west of Fox River, between Matthew Drive and the Fox River, one lane is expected to be added in each direction, and the existing two-way left-turn lane would remain. A sidewalk or shared-use path would likely be provided. East of the Fox River to County GV (the east terminus) it follows County X, and the road would likely be widened to be a four-lane divided roadway with a median.

Corridor Alternative 1 could impact 18 wetlands, totaling 5 to 8 acres of impacts. Corridor Alternative 1 also has 4 crossings of the 100-year floodplain. The floodway and floodplain crossings would be required where existing roadways would be widened to accommodate the proposed improvements. The one exception is the Fox River, where a new bridge is proposed, and bridge piers would need to be placed in the floodway.

Corridor Alternative 2: Rockland Road-Red Maple Road Arterial with I-41 Interchange  
Corridor Alternative 2 is approximately 6 miles long. It would begin at County EB (Packerland Drive) in the Town of Lawrence and continue along a new alignment to connect to a new full-access interchange on I-41. The route would continue east on Southbridge Road and Red Maple Road, cross the Fox River, and continue along Rockland Road. At the intersection of Rockland Road and County PP (South Broadway), the route would continue northeast along a new alignment and end at the intersection of County X and the previously improved County GV (Monroe Road) in the Town of Ledgeview. Alternative Route 2 would cross the Fox River 2.5 miles south of the Claude Allouez Bridge.

The representative cross-section for Corridor Alternative 2 is anticipated to be a four-lane divided roadway with a median, shared-use path or sidewalk, and ditches from its west terminus at the intersection of County F and County EB (Packerland Drive) to its east terminus at County GV. In addition, the County F interchange with I-41 may need to be reconstructed to accommodate additional traffic. The Lead Agencies are considering a Collector-Distributor (C-D) road along I-41 between the proposed new I-41 interchange and the existing County F interchange 1 mile north as an option for Alternative 2. A C-D road is a limited-access road carrying traffic from local roads to freeways. The purpose of a C-D road is to reduce the number of exit and entrance points on the freeway between two relatively close freeway interchanges. This reduces freeway merging/diverging.
(weaving) intensity, thereby improving traffic flow and safety. The decision on cross sections, including the C-D option, will be evaluated and finalized during Tier 2.

Corridor Alternative 2 could impact 24 to 25 wetlands resulting in 12 to 21 acres of impacts depending on whether the C-D option is included. Corridor Alternative 2 would cross the 100-year floodplain 3 times. There would be an additional 2 crossings with the C-D option. The Ashwaubenon Creek floodway and floodplain crossing would be impacted as part of the widening of Southbridge Road. The floodplain would also be impacted by the proposed interchange (specifically, the northbound exit ramp from I-41 to Southbridge Road).

Identification of a Preferred Corridor Alternative:
The Lead Agencies have identified Corridor Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative.

The No Build Alternative was not selected as the preferred corridor alternative because it would not meet the purpose and need for the project.

The Lead Agencies identified Corridor Alternative 2 rather than Corridor Alternative 1 as their preferred for several reasons:

- **Travel Time.** Corridor Alternative 2 would result in fewer vehicle hours of travel than Corridor Alternative 1. This indicates that Alternative 2 provides a more efficient connection between origins and destinations for travelers.

- **Congestion.** Congestion relief for both alternatives is similar. Although Corridor Alternative 1 would divert more traffic from the Claude Allouez Bridge, the bridge would operate at an acceptable level of service under both alternatives. Corridor Alternative 1 would increase
congestion at the County F interchange with I-41, requiring it to be reconstructed. The new I-41 interchange as part of Corridor Alternative 2 would reduce the additional capacity needed at the County F interchange with I-41 compared to Corridor Alternative 1, however some improvements would be required.

- **Safety.** Due to the development adjacent to it and the existing access control, Corridor Alternative 1 has nearly 5 times more access points than Corridor Alternative 2 with little opportunity to consolidate driveways or side streets, which would make Corridor Alternative 1 a less safe corridor. With fewer access points and the ability to implement stronger access control, Corridor Alternative 2 has the ability to provide safer travel.

- **Land Use Compatibility.** Corridor Alternative 2 is more compatible with existing and planned land use. De Pere, Lawrence, Ledgeview, Rockland, Ashwaubenon, Bellevue, and Hobart all support Corridor Alternative 2, and public support for Corridor Alternative 2 is stronger than support for Corridor Alternative 1. The land uses and development adjacent to Alternative 1 require multiple access points that slow the movement of traffic and sensitive land uses that are inconsistent with an arterial carrying longer and higher-speed trips. These land uses would require that the posted speed be lower on Corridor Alternative 1, thus not serving the need as well. Corridor Alternative 2 allows communities to implement stricter access control, post the route at a speed limit appropriate for carrying longer trips, and continue to plan for adjacent development that is consistent with the type of roadway needed to address the purpose and need.

- **Socioeconomic Impacts.** Due to its greater length, Corridor Alternative 2 could require more right of way (mostly agricultural land) than Alternative 1. While Corridor Alternative 2 has the potential for more residential displacements, Corridor Alternative 1 could impact substantially more property owners in a denser area. The density of development, number of access points, and impacts to parking and other features of these properties has the potential to change the character of the neighborhoods adjacent to Corridor Alternative 1. Due to the lesser development and prevalence of agricultural land uses, Corridor Alternative 2 could introduce less disruption to surrounding land uses.

- **Natural Environment Impacts.** Corridor Alternative 2 has the potential to have greater impacts to wetlands and stream crossings than Corridor Alternative 1. Additionally, as Tier 1 considers a broad corridor for the purposes of comparing a wide range of alternatives, there exists the potential to avoid and minimize impacts within the corridor. With the less dense development present in Corridor Alternative 2, the avoidance and minimization potential are greater than it is in the more developed area of Corridor Alternative 1.

Corridor Alternative 2 is the Lead Agencies’ preferred alternative because it would provide the best solution for addressing long-term mobility needs and safety concerns while most effectively serving existing and planned development and balancing impacts to socioeconomic and environmental resources. It provides a similar level of relief to the Claude Allouez Bridge, requires fewer vehicle hours of travel (provides more direct travel), provides better safety performance, would create less disruption to neighborhoods, and is more consistent with surrounding land uses. The new interchange with I-41 would also reduce the additional capacity needed the I-41/County F interchange. Further, Corridor Alternative 2 is more strongly favored by the public and has been endorsed by all of the adjacent communities because it provides a river crossing in an area aligned with the future growth patterns of the communities.
Alternatives Comparison Matrix

An alternatives comparison matrix between Corridor Alternative 1 and Corridor Alternative 2 is shown below. Under the No Build Alternative, no right-of-way would be acquired and there would be no relocations. In addition, there would be no impacts to agricultural land, cultural resources, parks, or community resources. However, as congestion increases on existing roads, traffic noise may increase for sensitive noise receptors. There would be also be no impacts to surface waters, wetlands, floodplains, stormwater, or protected species under the No Build Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Corridor Alternative 1</th>
<th>Corridor Alternative 2 Without C-D Road</th>
<th>Corridor Alternative 2 With C-D Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential property acquisition</td>
<td>45-75</td>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Relocations</td>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>10-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land (acres)</td>
<td>13-23</td>
<td>47-78</td>
<td>47-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources (archaeological / historic)</td>
<td>2 / 0</td>
<td>5 / 1</td>
<td>5 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (number/acres)</td>
<td>1 / 0.2-0.3</td>
<td>2 / 0.9-1.5</td>
<td>2 / 4.9-9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive Noise Receptors</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stream Crossings (Existing/New)</td>
<td>6 (5/1)</td>
<td>8 (3/5)</td>
<td>10 (5/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Impacts (number/acres)</td>
<td>18 / 5-8</td>
<td>24 / 12-20</td>
<td>25 / 13-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Crossings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Species</td>
<td>One federally-listed species, the northern long-eared bat, may be affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two state-listed threatened species (wood turtle, snow trillium) may be affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One state-listed special concern species (lake sturgeon) may be affected during construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property Acquisition/Relocation Assistance and Benefits

The extent of specific property acquisitions is not known at this time. If a corridor alternative is selected, Tier 2 assessments will quantify residential relocations needed for the project based on the detailed design and right of way requirements that will be available at that time. As part of the Tier 2 analysis, the Lead Agencies will explore ways to minimize the project’s residential relocation impacts.

Property acquisitions and relocations will be completed in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), as amended. In addition to providing for payment of “Just Compensation” for property acquired, additional benefits are available to eligible displaced persons forced to relocate from their business. Some available benefits include relocation advisory services, reimbursement of moving expenses, replacement of business payments. In compliance with state law, no person would be displaced unless a comparable replacement dwelling would be provided.

Compensation is available to all displaced persons without discrimination. Before initiating property acquisition activities, property owners will be contacted and given an explanation of the details of the acquisition process and Wisconsin’s Eminent Domain Law under Section 32.05, Wisconsin Statutes. Any property to be acquired will be inspected by one or more professional appraisers. The property owner will be invited to accompany the appraiser during the inspection to ensure the appraiser is informed of every aspect of the property. Property owners will be given the opportunity to obtain an appraisal by a qualified appraiser that will be considered by WisDOT in establishing just compensation. Reasonable cost of an owner’s appraisal will be reimbursed to the owner if received within 60 days of initiation of negotiations. Based on the appraisal(s) made, the value of the property will be determined, and that amount offered to the owner.

Next Steps

At the end of the document availability period, the project team will review and consider all public hearing testimony and other comments received on the Tier 1 Draft EIS. This input will assist the project team in identifying the selected alternative. Upcoming milestones in completing the engineering and environmental study for the South Bridge Connector project include the following:

- Tier 1 Final EIS and Record of Decision (Anticipated October 2020)
- If a corridor alternative is selected, begin Tier 2 studies; see table below for tentative dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Tier 2 Environmental Document</th>
<th>Tentative Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County EB/ F to Lawrence Drive (including I-41 Interchange)</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>2026-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Drive to County D</td>
<td>2022-2023</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County D to WIS 57 (including Fox River Bridge)</td>
<td>2023-2025</td>
<td>2030-2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIS 57 to County PP</td>
<td>2026-2027</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County PP to County GV/X</td>
<td>2027-2028</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Public Hearing Exhibits

The following exhibits and materials are available for review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit Description</th>
<th>Description of Public Hearing Exhibits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project History and Tier 1 EIS Timeline</td>
<td>Environmental and Community Features for Corridor Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Need of the Project</td>
<td>Residential Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Process Overview</td>
<td>Potential Agricultural Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing and Future Traffic Volumes and Future Level of Service under No Build</td>
<td>Estimated Key Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Segment Crash Rates</td>
<td>Preferred Corridor Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Screening Process Step 1</td>
<td>Proposed Typical Cross Section for Alternative 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Screening Process Step 2</td>
<td>Example South Bridge Connector Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Screening Process Step 3</td>
<td>Approved Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) available via project website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>3 Copies of the approved Tier 1 Draft EIS (in-person hearing only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 Corridor and Working Alignment</td>
<td>Directions for attendees that would like to provide testimony (in-person hearing only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Community Features for Corridor Alternative 1</td>
<td>Social Distancing Measures (in-person hearing only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PowerPoint Presentation

Brown County is providing a brief PowerPoint presentation as part of this public hearing to update the public on the proposed project alternatives and to explain the public hearing process. The PowerPoint presentation also serves the purpose of providing information required as part of the public hearing Project Statement.

Contact Information

Submittal of Written or Oral testimony or general project questions

Additional written or oral public hearing testimony on the Tier 1 Draft EIS after this public hearing should be sent to the Brown County project manager at the address or email address given below. Both written and oral testimony will be recorded and added to the official public hearing record and considered in the final environmental document provided it is postmarked or received no later than August 3, 2020.

Cole Runge
Interim Planning Director/MPO Director, Brown County
PO Box 23600
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
(920) 448-6480
South.bridge.connector@browncountywi.gov
Property acquisition/relocation questions

No relocations or property acquisitions will occur until Tier 2 environmental analysis. Specific property impacts are not known at this time and will be evaluated during Tier 2. Questions specific to property acquisition and/or relocations of homes and businesses can be answered by Cole Runge.

Project website (project information, schedule and updates)

The Tier 1 Draft EIS and other information can be found at https://www.browncountywi.gov/departments/planning-and-land-services/planning/south-bridge-connector/

The Tier 1 Draft EIS is available for inspection and copying by appointment at the following locations:

Brown County
Planning Commission
305 E. Walnut St., Room 320
Green Bay, WI 54305-3600
(920) 448-6480

Brown County
Department of Public Works
2198 Glendale Avenue
Green Bay, WI 54303
(920) 492-4925

Northeast Region Office
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
944 Vanderperren Way
Green Bay, WI 54304
(920) 492-5623
Written Testimony Form

South Bridge Connector (County EB/F in the Town of Lawrence and County GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview)

Public Hearing
Tuesday, July 7, 2020, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. (Virtual Hearing)
Wednesday, July 8, 2020, 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. (Brown County Fairgrounds)

Please place this form in the box on the sign-in table or mail or e-mail by August 3, 2020

Name (please print): ________________________________________________  Date: ____________
Address: _________________________________________________________________________________
Phone Number (optional): __________________       E-mail Address (optional): _________________________

Testimony (use additional pages if necessary):
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
Registration Slip for Verbal Testimony

South Bridge Connector (County EB/F in the Town of Lawrence and County GV/X in the Town of Ledgeview)
In-Person Public Hearing at Brown County Fairgrounds
Wednesday, July 8, 2020, 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

This registration slip may be used for providing public or private verbal testimony. For public verbal testimony, complete this registration slip and submit it to a project team representative. Your name will be called in the order registration slips are received. When you are called to the microphone to provide testimony, please state your name, address, and who you represent if applicable (for example a business). Please speak slowly and clearly. If you do not wish to speak but would like your verbal testimony read aloud to the public to record your position on the project being considered at the public hearing, please check the applicable boxes below.

The same process applies for providing private verbal testimony, but this registration slip should be presented directly to the court reporter when a spot is available to provide your private verbal testimony.

A court reporter will record your testimony. Please limit your testimony to comments and/or opinions regarding the proposed project aspects for which this public hearing is being held. To allow everyone a chance to speak, please limit your testimony to approximately 3 minutes.

Name: __________________________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
If applicable - group, organization, or business you are representing:
______________________________________________________________________

☐ Wishing to speak

☐ Not wishing to speak, but please read aloud and record my position on the preferred corridor alternative or project at the public hearing:

☐ Support the preferred corridor alternative, describe: ______________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

☐ Support the project but Do Not Support the preferred corridor alternative, describe: __________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

☐ Do Not Support the project, describe: __________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________