**PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION**

**FOR STATE AND FEDERALLY FUNDED ACTIONS**

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Revised May 2019

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WisDOT Design and Construction IDs1161-00-36 (Design)1161-00-66 (Construction) | Federal Project IDs (if available)      | Legal Description (Township, Range, Section)Range 9 East Township 13 North: sections 18, 19, 30, 31Township 12 North: sections 6, 7Range 8 EastTownship 12 North: Sections 12, 13, 24, 25, 36 Township 11 North:sections 1 | CountyColumbia |
| Project NameMadison - Packwaukee | Project Termini/ LocationWIS 78 to Marquette County Line, NB |
| Name of Route or Facility to be ImprovedInterstate Highway (I)39 | Facility ClassificationFreeway/Expressway | Improvement TypeRehabilitation |
| Estimated Project Cost in Year of Expenditure $ (include R/W Cost) | Funding Source(s) (check all that apply) |
| $2,000,000 - $2,500,000 | [x]  State | [x]  Federal | [ ]  Local |
| 23 CFR 771.117(d) Project Type Number and Text (see Table 1 below)(13) Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (including parking, weaving, turning, and climbing lanes), if the action meets the constraints in 23 CFR 771.117(e) - Conditions for (c) (26-28) |
| Section 4(f)[x]  None | [ ]  *De Minimis* | [ ]  Bikeway/ Walkway | [ ]  Minor Park/ Rec | [ ]  Minor Historic | [ ]  Net Benefit | [ ]  Exception |
| Right of Way Acquisition |
| 0.0 Total Acres |       Fee Simple Acres |       Permanent Easement Acres |       Temporary Easement Acres |
| Number of Buildings Acquired |
| [x]  None |       Vacant Buildings |       Occupied Buildings |  |
| Name of Individual/ Firm Preparing this FormJames Rinzel | CE Preparation Date6/13/19 | Project Start Date7/18/18 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **WisDOT Region Environmental Coordinator or****Local Program Management Consultant** |  | **WisDOT Region, Central Office, or Local Program****Project Manager** |
| I certify that I meet the requirements for staff who review and recommend approval of Categorical Exclusion (CE) actions, specified in the FHWA – WisDOT CE Agreement. I further certify that I have reviewed this document, and agree with the determination that the proposed project and resultant impacts meet the definition of a CE as described in 23 CFR 771.117(a) & (b), and will not result in significant environmental impacts. I recommend this CE for approval. |  | I certify that I am familiar with this proposed project and its impacts and that the information contained in this document is accurate and can be relied upon for documentation decisions. I further certify that the mitigation measures and commitments proposed herein will be incorporated into the project plans and contract documents. I approve this CE. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| (Signature) |  | (Signature) |
|       |  |       |
| (Print Name) |  | (Print Name) |
|       |  |       |
| (Date) |  | (Date) |

**Section One: Introduction & Regulatory Requirements**

## 1.1 Purpose and Eligibility

The FHWA – WisDOT Categorical Exclusion Programmatic Agreement (Agreement) allows WisDOT to make categorical exclusion (CE) determinations on FHWA’s behalf for certain projects listed in 23 CFR 771.117(d) when the projects do not exceed the environmental impact criteria specified in the Agreement. The Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) is the acceptable form of documentation for these projects. While the PCE is based on the Agreement with FHWA, it may also be used to document certain projects that require only state and/or local funding and approvals.

The actions described in Table 1 are eligible for PCE consideration if (1) they meet the definitions of an action, (2) they do not include significant impacts, (3) they do not include unusual circumstances that warrant the preparation of an Environmental Report (ER), Environmental Assessment (EA), or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and (4) they do not exceed the environmental impact thresholds specified in the Agreement. Any project that does not meet these criteria or that has been determined to have substantial controversy based on environmental grounds is not eligible for PCE consideration.

A determination that this project satisfies the criteria for a PCE does not relieve the applicant of the requirement to comply with other laws and regulations including, but not limited to, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act. Coordination to comply with these other laws may require FHWA involvement. Furthermore, designation of this project as a PCE does not relieve the requirement for WisDOT to coordinate with WDNR under the Cooperative Agreement. Any correspondence or documentation used to comply with federal, state, or local laws or regulations should be maintained in the project file and provided with this checklist upon request.

23 CFR 771.117(d)(13) allows the actions described in 23 CFR 771.117(c)(26-28) to be processed as (d)-list actions if they do not meet the criteria in 23 CFR 771.117(e). An action that does not meet the criteria in paragraph (e) may be documented with a PCE *unless* it is disqualified by the environmental impact criteria of Section VII.A. of the Agreement, which are reflected on this PCE form. If an action fails to meet both sets of criteria, it must be documented with an ER, EA, or EIS, as applicable.

**Table 1: Eligible Categorical Exclusion Project Types**

|  |
| --- |
| **23 CFR 771.117(d)**(1-3) Reserved(4) Transportation corridor fringe parking facilities.(5) Construction of new truck weigh stations or rest areas.(6) Approvals for disposal of excess right-of-way or for joint or limited use of right-of-way, where the proposed use does not have significant adverse impacts.(7) Approvals for changes in access control.(8) Construction of new bus storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and located on or near a street with adequate capacity to handle anticipated bus and support vehicle traffic.(9) Rehabilitation or reconstruction of existing rail and bus buildings and ancillary facilities where only minor amounts of additional land are required and there is not a substantial increase in the number of users.(10) Construction of bus transfer facilities (an open area consisting of passenger shelters, boarding areas, kiosks and related street improvements) when located in a commercial area or other high activity center in which there is adequate street capacity for projected bus traffic.(11) Construction of rail storage and maintenance facilities in areas used predominantly for industrial or transportation purposes where such construction is not inconsistent with existing zoning and where there is no significant noise impact on the surrounding community.[Note: 23 CFR 771.117(d)(12) “Acquisition for hardship or protective purposes” may not be processed with a PCE](13) Actions described in paragraphs (c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28) of this section that do not meet the constraints in paragraph (e) of this section.\**\*23 CFR 771.117(c)(26-28) appear below. If processing a project of this type with the PCE, use number (d)(13) and the appropriate CE type description where necessary.*(26) Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (including parking, weaving, turning, and climbing lanes).(27) Highway safety or traffic operations improvement projects, including the installation of ramp metering control devices and lighting.(28) Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings. |

**1.2 Project is a Complete FHWA Action**

Check all boxes that apply to the proposed project. To process your project with this checklist, you must be able to check all boxes.

23 CFR 771.111(f) In order to ensure meaningful evaluation of alternatives and to avoid commitments to transportation improvements before they are fully evaluated, the action evaluated shall:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | (1) Connect logical termini and be of sufficient length to address environmental matters on a broad scope |
|  | [x]  | (2) Have independent utility or independent significance, i.e., be usable and be a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made |
|  | [x]  | (3) Not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements |

**1.3 Unusual Circumstances**

Check all boxes that apply to the proposed project. If any boxes in this section are checked, evaluate the scope of the project and coordinate with FHWA regarding the completion of more detailed environmental documentation.

23 CFR 771.117(b) Any action which normally would be classified as a CE but could involve unusual circumstances will require the FHWA, in cooperation with the applicant, to conduct appropriate environmental studies to determine if the CE classification is proper. Such unusual circumstances include:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | (1) Significant environmental impacts |
|  | [ ]  | (2) Substantial controversy on environmental grounds – project is ineligible for PCE |
|  | [ ]  | (3) Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act |
|  | [ ]  | (4) Inconsistencies with any federal, state, or local law, requirement or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the action |
|  | [ ]  | Other unusual circumstances not listed in FHWA regulations (describe below)(*In Wisconsin, auxiliary lane and capacity expansion projects that are proposed for processing with this checklist are examples of unique or unusual circumstances and will require consultation with FHWA before proceeding with the project*.) |

Describe any unique or unusual circumstances and subsequent coordination with FHWA:

**1.4 Tribal Lands**

For projects, regardless of project type, located partially or entirely on Tribal lands in trust, allotted, or reservation status, WisDOT Region and Local Program staff shall consult with WisDOT Central Office Environmental Staff prior to preparing PCE documentation. In certain cases, the involvement of Tribal land may warrant preparing higher level environmental documentation (e.g. ER instead of PCE) than what is normally required by the FHWA – WisDOT CE Agreement. WisDOT Central Office Environmental Staff will ensure adequate Tribal consultation by WisDOT and engage FHWA in consultation when necessary.

Describe any Tribal coordination:

Project notification letters were sent to applicable American Indian Tribes on July 19, 2018. No comments were received within the 30-day comment period. See Exhibit 3a for an example notification letter and Exhibit 3b for the distribution list.

**1.5 Preparing the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion**

Once eligibility has been determined for a project, the PCE and associated documentation can be assembled. Each PCE document must include the following:

* Project Map (with title, cardinal directions, legend, scale, and state locator)
	+ Aerial photograph (preferred)
	+ Project boundaries/limits
	+ Identify any public lands, waterways, and water bodies within or adjacent to the project boundary
	+ Identify existing and new conditions if the project includes additional right of way (ROW)
	+ Additional maps as needed to demonstrate project eligibility
* Appendices
	+ Studies
	+ Reports
	+ *De Minimis* or Programmatic Section 4(f) documentation
	+ Agency coordination/documentation
* Other documentation as necessary

**Section Two: Description of the Project and Alternatives**

**2.1 Project Description**

Provide a brief description of the proposed action. Include a discussion of the purpose and need (e.g. system linkage(s), transportation demand, legislation, social demands or economic development, modal interrelationships, safety, and roadway deficiencies as applicable).

## The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) is evaluating alternatives to rehabilitate a section of Interstate Highway (I)39 between Wisconsin State Highway (WIS) 78 and the Marquette County Line in Columbia County. The project is approximately 11.13 miles in length. See Exhibits 1a and 1b for project location maps.

## I39 is a four-lane divided rural interstate with numerous roadways crossing over and under it. I39 is functionally classified as a Freeway/Expressway. This section of I39 is classified as a Long Truck route, an Over Size Over Weight (OSOW) route, and is listed on the National Highway System (NHS). This section of I39 is also a Corridor 2020 backbone and connector route. The project is not a high clearance and wind tower route.

## The existing roadway consists of two 12-foot driving lanes, with varying median widths. See Exhibits 2a - 2h for existing and proposed typical sections.

Since an extreme flooding event of the Baraboo River in June 2008, I39 at the Cascade Mountain Road interchange experiences almost yearly flooding of the southbound inside paved shoulder as well as the paved shoulder of the southbound entrance ramps. Most recently another extreme event in August 2018 resulted in the in a massive sandbagging effort by WisDOT and the Wisconsin National Guard to keep the interstate open at this interchange and three other interchanges as with no sandbagging efforts, the interstate would have been shut down.

Purpose:

The purpose of the proposed I39 project is to address the deteriorating pavement to extend the service life of the highway pavement. The purpose of the project will also address repeat flooding of the southbound inside lane and southbound interchange exit ramps at the Cascade Mountain Road interchange.

Need:

The purpose of the proposed action is supported by the following elements of need:

Deteriorating Pavement

The existing I39 concrete pavement from WIS 78 to Unites States Highway (US) 51 was replaced in 1998 with the asphalt shoulders replaced in 2017. Pavement from US 51 to the Marquette County line was replaced in 2004.

The pavement has developed many fine longitudinal cracks (cracks parallel to the travels lanes) and a higher than normal amount of traverse cracks (cracks running across the travel lanes). The condition of the pavement needs to be addressed to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the roadway.

Drainage Deficiencies

From WIS 78 to US 51 the typical pavement section includes open graded base with edge drains and outfalls. Various edge drains and outfalls are plugged and preventing the pavement structure to drain properly and is contributing to the accelerated deterioration of the pavement and roadway substructure.

Flooding

As stated in the project description, since an extreme flooding event of the Baraboo River in June 2008, WisDOT in conjunction with multiple state and local units of government has been analyzing flood abatement solutions ~~as~~ since 2008, I39 at the Cascade Mountain Road interchange experiences almost yearly flooding of the southbound inside paved shoulder as well as the paved shoulder of the southbound entrance ramps.

Most recently another extreme event in August 2018 resulted in the in a massive sandbagging effort by WisDOT and the Wisconsin National Guard to keep the interstate open at this interchange and three other interchanges. Since that 2018 event, WisDOT is analyzing temporary solutions to the Cascade Mountain Road interchange until a long-term fix can be financially realized. Solutions for other interchanges will not be addressed in this document.

**2.2 Improvement Type**

Identify the number and text of the 23 CFR 771.117 (d)-List project type (see Table 1) and provide a brief description of how the project fits this CE.

(13) Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (including parking, weaving, turning, and climbing lanes), if the action meets the constraints in 23 CFR 771.117(e) - Conditions for (c) (26-28)

## 2.3 Alternatives

Provide a brief description of any alternatives considered for this project, if multiple alternatives were considered.

Alternatives for this project are separated into addressing the deteriorated pavement and drainage; (2) addressing the frequent flooding by proposing Flood Abatement Measures at Cascade Mountain Road Interchange.

**Deteriorated Pavement/Pavement Alternatives**

No Build

The No Action alternative is a no build scenario and would consist of no improvements other than continuing routine

maintenance on the project corridor. The No Action alternative would consist of maintaining the existing Interstate

through patching, pothole repair, and crack filling. As a result, the pavement condition would continue to deteriorate,

ultimately resulting in a pavement that can no longer be maintained.

The “do nothing” alternative does not provide safety and operational improvements and does not meet the purpose

and need of the proposed project. It is not the preferred alternative and has been removed from further

consideration.

Patching and Repair Alternative #2 (Preferred)

This alternative addresses the pavement by patching and repairing small sections of the pavement structure. French drains will be installed at the low points to assist with pavement structure drainage.

Additional evaluation of the drainage issues identified by WisDOT will be evaluated after further information is gathered. The estimated cost of implementing this alternative is $2.5 million. This alternative meets the purpose and needs of the project and is selected as the preferred alternative.

Pavement Replacement Alternative #3

This alternative consists of removing and replacing the existing pavement structure. The concrete driving lanes and asphalt shoulders would be completely removed. New pavement would be placed along with a subgrade improvement layer. The new pavement would be placed at a profile and grade similar to the existing pavement. Drainage improvements would be completed to alleviate current issues.

Pavement replacement costs is estimated to cost approximately $1.5 million per mile. This project is 11 miles in length, resulting in a pavement replacement cost of approximately $16.5 million. While this alternative meets the purpose and need of the project, due to the higher cost involved, it is not selected as the preferred alternative.

 **Flood Abatement Measures at Cascade Mountain Road Interchange**

 No Build

The “do nothing” alternative does not address any flood abatement measures and additional maintenance and possible military forces will have to be utilized in an effort to keep the interstate open. Therefore, the No Build does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed project. It is not the preferred alternative and has been removed from further consideration.

**Build Alternatives**

All the build alternatives for flood abatement described below include replacing/remove culvert pipes in the Cascade Mountain Road interchange southbound on and off ramps. The culverts will be fitted with “duck valves”. The “duck valves” prevent flooding waters from entering the culvert but still facilitate drainage. In addition, as stated in the project description, options to abate flood waters has been extensively studied since 2004 or 2008 and as such all the build alternatives discussed below will not result in the increase of backwaters in 50-year flood event. See Attachment ??.

Alternative 1 –Vinyl Sheeting

This alternative would install vinyl sheeting to a depth of as much as 30-feet below ground surface (bgs) outside the clear zone of the interstate extending 700 feet north from the existing concrete barrier wall at the southwest bridge abutment of the Cascade Mountain Road bridge. The vinyl sheeting would abate an observed 50-year flood preventing flood waters from extending onto the southbound lanes as well as prevent the over saturation of the roadway subgrade. Roadway runoff would be treated through grass storm water swales.

Although feasible, it is not a prudent option. This alternative would have the greatest amount of impacts to the surrounding environment resulting in the filling of over 2 acres of adjacent wetlands further reducing the effectiveness of a wetland to abate flood waters which defeats the purpose of this action. Although not modeled, subsurface flow would certainly be altered with this alternative and it is unknown the affect the vinyl sheeting would have without an extensive long-term study. Therefore, this not the preferred alternative.

Alternative 2 – Barrier Wall with Vinyl Sheeting

This alternative would construct a standard 42” single slope reinforced concrete barrier wall anchored to a reinforced concrete base just off the gravel shoulder as well as place vinyl sheet piling behind the wall to a depth of as much as 30-feet below ground surface (bgs) extending 700 feet north from the existing concrete barrier wall at the southwest bridge abutment of the Cascade Mountain bridge. Roadway drainage would be accomplished by installing storm water drains equipped with “duck valves” to prevent flood waters from entering the roadway while facilitating roadway drainage and upgrading existing shoulder edge drains. Constructing the concrete barrier wall at the edge of the gravel shoulder would eliminate impacts to the surrounding environment with no wetland impacts. The purpose of the vinyl barrier behind the wall would eliminate flood water pressure (head) on the back of the reinforced concrete barrier wall and roadway substructure to prevent.

Although feasible, it is not a prudent option. As stated in Alternative 1, although not modeled, subsurface flow would certainly be altered with this alternative (vinyl barrier) and it is unknown the affect the vinyl sheeting would have without an extensive long-term study. In addition, the barrier wall “tipping moment” has been calculated and given the proposed construction of the reinforced concrete barrier wall, the tipping moment would not occur during a flooding event and vinyl sheeting would not be needed. Therefore, this not the preferred alternative.

Alternative 3 - Barrier Wall – Preferred Alternative

This alternative would construct a standard 42” reinforced single slope concrete barrier wall to protect I39 southbound lanes from a 50-year observed flood event. The barrier wall would begin at the existing concrete barrier wall at the southwest bridge abutment extending north for 700-feet.

Roadway drainage would be accomplished by installing storm water drains equipped with “duck valves” to prevent flood waters from entering the roadway while facilitating roadway drainage. In addition, existing shoulder edge drains will be upgraded.

Constructing the concrete barrier wall at the edge of the gravel shoulder would eliminate impacts to the surrounding environment with no wetland impacts. The barrier wall “tipping moment” has been calculated and given the proposed construction of the reinforced concrete barrier wall, the tipping moment would not occur during a flooding event. This alternative is the most cost effective temporary solution to abating flood waters with little to no environmental impacts. Therefore, this is the preferred alternative. See Attachment??.

Alternative 4 – Reconstruct Cascade Mountain Road and Raise Elevation of the Interchange

This alternative would reconstruct the Cascade Mountain Road interchange and raise the elevation to prevent any future flooding events. Although this meets the flood abatement purpose and need it is not a prudent alternative at this time as costs would exceed a conservative estimate of 30 million dollars as raising the interchange would require significant modifications to the I39/90/~~0~~94/WIS 78 interchange as well and result in significant environmental impacts.

**Proposed Action - Pavement**

Proposed Scope of Work:

• Mill and repave existing northbound median shoulder from US 51 to Marquette County Line

• Mill and repave existing northbound outside shoulder from US 51 to Marquette County Line

• Mill and repave northbound median shoulders from 188+00 to 195+00

• Route & seal and joint between asphalt shoulder and concrete pavement

• Install shoulder rumble strips

• Repair and replace sections of existing concrete pavement along the northbound lanes of I39 between WIS 78 and the Marquette County Line

• Repair and replace sections of existing concrete pavement along the southbound off ramp of USH 51 and I~~H~~ 39, the southbound on ramp of US 51 and I39 and the northbound off ramp of US 51 and I39

• Additional incidental work includes, removing and filling all raised pavement marker locations along northbound lanes, installing missing delineator posts and delineators, various spot locations of concrete barrier wall repair along the NB lanes, pavement marking at patch locations, various locations of fence repair

The proposed action will include grading at the proposed French drain locations at various points in the roadway profile along the NB lanes. French drain ground disturbance will not extend beyond the existing roadway sub grade shoulder points.

**Proposed Action – Flood Abatement**

The proposed action will construct a standard 42” reinforced single slope concrete barrier wall to protect I39 southbound lanes from a 50-year observed flood event. The barrier wall would begin at the existing concrete barrier wall at the southwest bridge abutment at the Cascade Mountain Road interchange extending north for 700-feet.

Storm water drains equipped with “duck valves” will be installed to prevent flood waters from entering the roadway while facilitating roadway drainage. In addition, existing shoulder edge drains will be upgraded. If in the event the storm water drains become inundated during an extreme precipitation event (100-year event or greater), county forces will be utilized to pump water from the inlets. See Attachment ??.

The proposed actions will not impact to any threatened or endangered species, will not result in wetland impacts and with no need for right-of-way acquisition.

The proposed actions will be built under a staged operation with minor delays to the travelling public. The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is anticipated as Type 2, which is for projects that cause minimal traffic delays and may include: lane closures, delays exceeding criteria for short time periods, ramp closures.

## 2.4 Agency/Local Unit of Government Coordination and Public Involvement

Provide a brief description of coordination conducted with agencies and local unit(s) of government. Describe any unresolved issues and how they will be resolved. Attach evidence of agency and local unit of government coordination as applicable.

• State History Preservation Office (SHPO): The proposed action was coordinated with WisDOT Cultural Resources Unit, and the project was placed on the Screening List for History and Archaeology on March 30, 2018, see Exhibit 4.

• Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR): Coordination is ongoing with the WDNR. An initial review was completed by the WDNR on January 3, 2019, see Exhibit 5.

• U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): A list of threatened and endangered species was obtained from the USFWS website on February 12, 2019. The list includes seven species. Details regarding the potential impacts to the Northern Long-eared Bat and Rusty Patch Bumble Bee were detailed in the WDNR correspondence, see Exhibit 6.

• Columbia County Zoning: The proposed action was submitted to Columbia County Planning & Zoning via email on February 18, 2019, see Exhibit ~~8~~7. No response was received within 30 days of notification

Provide a brief discussion of public involvement efforts. Describe any concerns expressed, how those concerns were resolved and how any unresolved concerns will be resolved.



**Section Three: WisDOT Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Criteria**

**3.1 Right~~-~~of~~-~~Way Acquisition**

Right of way (ROW) for the proposed action may be acquired by fee simple purchase, permanent or temporary easement, right of entry, gift, or other means.

Will additional ROW be acquired?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

If yes, provide the number of ROW acres to be acquired below and identify the acquisition(s) on the project map.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | Fee simple purchase -       acres |
|  | [ ]  | Permanent easement -       acres |
|  | [ ]  | Temporary easement -       acres |
|  | [ ]  | Right of Entry -       acres |
|  | [ ]  | Gift -       acres |
|  | [ ]  | Other, additional description:       |

**3.2 Displacement or Relocation**

A project is ineligible to use the PCE if any displacements or relocations occur as a result of the project. Vacant buildings that are not significant historic resources may be acquired.

Does the project require any displacements?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE unless building is vacant |

**3.3 Burial Sites**

A project is ineligible to use the PCE if it adversely affects burial sites.

Does the project adversely affect a burial site?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No burial sites are affected by proposed actions. |
|  | [ ]  | Proposed actions occur within a burial site without adverse effects. Wisconsin Statute 157.70 burial authorization is required prior to commencing proposed project actions. |
|  | [ ]  | Proposed actions adversely affect a burial site – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.4 Historic Properties (cultural resources) [Note: For projects with no federal participation, complete this section. For projects with federal participation, skip this section and complete Section 4.5 of this form.]**

The state register of historic places includes districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects which are significant in national, state, or local history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture. A project is ineligible to use the PCE if it will affect a property listed on the state register.

Does the project affect any historic properties on the state register?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | There is, or will be, federal participation in this proposed project and this section does not apply. Section 4.5 will be completed. |
|  | [ ]  | WisDOT has determined the proposed action will not affect a property that is listed on the state register or on the list of locally designated historic places under Wisconsin Statute~~s~~ 44.45. |
|  | [ ]  | WisDOT has determined its proposed action will affect a historic property – project is ineligible for PCE. |

**3.5 Wetlands, Streams, Lakes and other Water Bodies**

When a project results in placement of fill into a wetland, stream, lake, or other water of the United States below the ordinary high water mark (OHWM), a permit is required from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The USACE may issue a General Permit if specific criteria are met.

Will fill be added to the waters of the United States, including below the OHWM?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

If yes, begin WDNR and USACE coordination and indicate type of permit under consideration for the action.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | General Permit |
|  | [ ]  | Individual Permit – project is ineligible for PCE |

If a Section 404 permit is required, include the WDNR letter with the specified Section 401 action and status of Section 401 Water Quality Certification in the appendix.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | Waived |
|  | [ ]  | Section 401 Action pending final plan and/or erosion control plan |
|  | [ ]  | Granted |
|  | [ ]  | Granted with conditions – include a copy of the permit with the PCE |
|  | [ ]  | Denied – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.6 Agriculture**

The Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) should be notified of any project which may involve the acquisition of land from a farm operation (see FDM 20-45-35).

Do land acquisitions from farm operations require preparation of an Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | Does not apply – no acquisitions from farm operations |
|  | [ ]  | No – DATCP has been notified of non-significant farmland acquisitions |
|  | [ ]  | No – Form DT1999, Agricultural Impact Notice has been sent to DATCP and DATCP has determined an AIS WILL NOT be prepared. |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – Form DT1999 has been sent to DATCP and DATCP has determined an AIS WILL be prepared – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.7 Air Quality**

Projects must be consistent with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality. Projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas must be demonstrated to conform to the SIP. Check the appropriate box and proceed accordingly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ ]  | The project is in an area designated as attainment for all transportation-related criteria air pollutants. The project is not subject to transportation conformity requirements. No further analysis is required. |
| [ ]  | The project is in an area designated as nonattainment or maintenance for one or more transportation-related criteria air pollutants. Proceed with the following analyses for regional and project level transportation conformity. |

**Regional Conformity**

Regional conformity is required for projects in counties designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone or PM2.5. If the project occurs in a nonattainment/maintenance county or area, check the appropriate box and include appropriate documentation in the appendix (if needed).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [ ]  | The project is exempt from conformity per 40 CFR 93.126 or is a traffic signal synchronization project under 40 CFR 93.128. No further analysis is needed. |
| [ ]  | The project is exempt from regional emissions analysis requirements per 40 CFR 93.127. |
| [ ]  | The project is located within a Metropolitan Planning Area and included in the current approved Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The RTP and TIP were determined to conform by FHWA and FTA. Provide the MPO name, RTP name, TIP name and TIP number. The MPO name, RTP name, TIP name and TIP number should be provided in the box below and must be included if this box is checked:       |
| [ ]  | The project is located outside of a Metropolitan Planning Organization’s boundaries and has received a conformity determination by FHWA per the rural conformity section of the WisDOT/WDNR Memorandum of Agreement. Provide conformity finding dates:             |
| [ ]  | The project is non-conforming – project is ineligible for a PCE. |

**Project Level Conformity**

Projects in fine particulate matter (PM2.5) nonattainment and maintenance areas are also subject to PM2.5 project hot spot conformity requirements. A PM2.5 hot spot analysis is required to support a project level conformity determination for projects of local air quality concern. A determination of local air quality concern is made by the Wisconsin Transportation Conformity Working Group (WTCWG).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [x]  | The project is not located in a PM2.5 nonattainment or maintenance area. No further analysis is required. |
| [ ]  | The project is exempt from conformity per 40 CFR 93.126 or is a traffic signal synchronization project under 40 CFR 93.128. No further analysis is needed. |
| [ ]  | The project has been screened in accordance with the WisDOT Project Level Conformity PM2.5 Screening Checklist and (check one of the following as applicable): |
|  | [ ]  | Determined not to be a project of local air quality concern. Include the screening checklist in the appendix. |
|  | [ ]  | Referred to interagency consultation with the WTCWG resulting in a determination that the action **is not** a project of local air quality concern. Include the project analysis and WTCWG determination in the appendix. |
|  | [ ]  | Referred to interagency consultation with the WTCWG resulting in a determination that the action **is** a project of local air quality concern – project is ineligible for a PCE. |

**3.8 Noise**

Is this a Type I project (see FDM 23-10-1.1) for noise, thus requiring a noise analysis?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No – the project does not meet the Type I project criteria |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – a noise analysis has been performed and no impacts have been identified (attach Factor Sheet D-3, Traffic Noise Evaluation) |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – a noise analysis has been performed and impacts will occur – project is ineligible for PCE |

Sections 107.8 (6) and 108.7.1 of the WisDOT Standard Specifications for Highway and Structure Construction provide standard specifications for construction noise including hours of operation and equipment requirements. Will any Special Provisions, not including changes to the hours of operation, be required for mitigating construction noise impacts?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.9 Contaminated Sites**

Acquisition of contaminated sites with hazardous materials or waste is the responsibility of the acquiring agency.

Will properties with hazardous materials or wastes be acquired for this project? If yes, contact the regional environmental coordinator for guidance on how to proceed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

Will a utility or other infrastructure be installed in, or adjacent to a contaminated property?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

Are there conflicts with project construction according to the Utility Accommodation Policy (UAP)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

If yes, describe how conflicts with the UAP be managed.

Will the project include rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement of an existing bridge structure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

Is asbestos present? If yes, include any required special provisions in the appendix.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |

Include any special provisions in the appendix to address contamination that may be encountered within the right of way during construction, e.g., contaminated soil disposal, installation of contaminant migration barriers, or management of contaminated groundwater during construction dewatering.

**3.10 Threatened and Endangered Species**

Threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat are protected by both state and federal laws. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) can provide information on these species. Include a copy of the WDNR coordination in the appendix. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is responsible for federally listed threatened and endangered species. Include any coordination with USFWS in the appendix.

Will the project result in a determination of “may affect, likely to adversely affect” for any threatened or endangered species or critical habitat?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

Describe species considered and coordination with WDNR and USFWS:

**3.11 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA)**

The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d) prohibits anyone, without a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior, from "taking" bald eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. WisDOT will coordinate with WDNR to identify known eagle nesting areas near the project prior to commencing construction. More information can be found at <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/midwestbird/eaglepermits/bagepa.html>

Has eagle habitat and a nesting site(s) been identified in the project area?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – Coordination with WDNR and USFWS has indicated their concurrence that the proposed project **WILL NOT** result in a take or disturbance of the habitat or nest(s) |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – Coordination with WDNR and USFWS has indicated their concurrence that the proposed project **WILL** result in a take or disturbance of the habitat or nest(s) – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.12 Access Control**

Access controls are used to maintain traffic operations, facilitate orderly development, and promote safety along a highway system. Under the PCE, minor adjustments in access for individual parcels are acceptable, but may require additional consultation prior to proceeding with the PCE.

Does the project include any access modifications?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – check all boxes that apply and provide a brief description of the access changes below. Attach an aerial photograph of the project clearly showing access modifications. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | Existing access will be changed through minor regrading or minor longitudinal shifts along the same alignment. The number of access points will not change. |
|  | [ ]  | Existing access points will be consolidated or relocated to a different road, but access to all parcels will be provided. Requires consultation with FHWA before proceeding with PCE if the project is federally-funded and the access modification is controversial (document below).  |
|  | [ ]  | New access will be provided where none currently exists. Requires consultation with FHWA before proceeding with PCE if the project is federally-funded or with the REC, LPMC or EPDS liaison is the project is state-funded only (document below). |
|  | [ ]  | The access modification will occur on the Interstate Highway System – project is ineligible for PCE. |
|  | [ ]  | All access to a parcel will be removed and will not be replaced – project is ineligible for PCE. |

Describe project access changes and required consultation:

**3.13 Consistency with Existing Plans**

Projects must be included in and consistent with the most recent version of Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) if the project is located within the boundaries of one of Wisconsin’s fourteen Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO). Projects must also be compatible with other plans approved at the region, county and local level.

Describe the applicable plans (e.g. State Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), local land use plan, bike/ walkway plan, etc.) for the area in which the action is proposed. Include the plan name, approval date(s), TIP number and other plan information as applicable. Identify whether or not the proposed action is consistent with the identified plan. If the proposed action is not consistent with an identified plan, the project is ineligible for PCE.

The project is listed on the 2017-2020 Final STIP Project Listing for the SW Region.

**3.14 Coastal Zone**

The Coastal Zone Management Plan guides development in the counties that have coastline on Lake Michigan or Lake Superior. Consistency with the Coastal Zone Management Plan requires project coordination and agreement from WDNR.

Is the proposed action consistent with the goals of the Coastal Zone Management Program?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | Does not apply – project is not in a county with coastline on Lake Michigan or Lake Superior |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |
|  | [ ]  | No – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.15 Flood Plains**

Projects that require work encroaching on a regulatory floodway or any work affecting the base floodplain (100-year flood) elevations of a water course or lake are ineligible to use the PCE.

Will the proposed action cause changes to the floodplain?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.16 Public Lands**

Special protections exist for public lands, including, parks, fishing access areas, and wildlife management areas purchased or improved using federal funding sources under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 (LAWCON or LWCF), Dingle/Johnson funds (Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act), or Pittman/Robertson funds (Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act). Special protections may also apply to other uniquely-funded lands such as those purchased under the Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Program, Wetland Reserve Program and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. The Regional WDNR Liaison can determine if these funding sources were used to acquire the property. Projects that acquire property from Pittman/Robertson, Dingle/Johnson, LWCF or other uniquely-funded lands are not eligible for a PCE.

Will the project acquire any lands purchased or improved with LWCF, Dingle/Johnson, or Pittman/Robertson funds or other uniquely-funded lands?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

**3.17 Groundwater, Wells, and Springs**

Is there potential for the project to have an impact on groundwater (including dewatering), springs, or wells (including groundwater monitoring wells from remediation projects) located in the project area?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – Contact the region environmental coordinator, local program management consultant, or EPDS liaison to determine if the level of impact results in the project being ineligible for PCE. |

Description of impacts:

**3.18 Environmental Justice**

The President’s Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice requires each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, to achieve environmental justice as part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects or economic effects, of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

Will this project result in a disproportionately high adverse effect to a low-income population or a minority population?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

Describe steps taken to identify minority and low-income populations:

**Section Four: Federal-Aid Criteria**

**4.1 Federal-Aid Criteria**

Projects that receive funding or require an approval from FHWA must meet additional federal-aid criteria. In certain circumstances, projects with no FHWA funding or approvals, may still need to meet selected criteria below depending on whether another federal agency is involved and the scope of its involvement.

Will the project require funding and/or an approval from FHWA?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No – checklist is complete |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – proceed with Section 4 |

**4.2 Section 4(f)**

Section 4(f) of the US DOT Act of 1966 protects significant historic sites, parks and recreation areas, and waterfowl and wildlife refuges. Section 4(f) prohibits the “use” of these resources by a transportation project unless there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative and the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm, or FHWA determines that the use will have a *de minimis* (minor) impact. Use of Section 4(f) property occurs when: (1) land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility; (2) there is a temporary occupancy that is adverse; or (3) there is a constructive use of the Section 4(f) property. Projects may include a use of Section 4(f) property only if it is *de minimis* or meets the criteria of one of the Section 4(f) programmatic evaluations (except the Programmatic Evaluation for Historic Bridges).

Does this project result in a use of Section 4(f) property?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | No – Section 4(f) resources are not present in the project area. |
|  | [x]  | No – Section 4(f) resources are present, but the project does not result in use of Section 4(f) resources. |
|  | [ ]  | No – a Section 4(f) exception applies (see 23 CFR 774.13). Provide a description of the exception below. |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – type of Section 4(f) documentation is indicated below. |

Description of Section 4(f) exception:

If a Section 4(f) use will occur, indicate the type of Section 4(f) evaluation or determination that applies. Include the Section 4(f) documentation in the appendix. The Section 4(f) evaluation or determination will require review and approval by FHWA prior to the WisDOT approval of the PCE. A draft of the PCE should be sent to FHWA as supporting documentation for their Section 4(f) review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [ ]  | *De Minimis* impact determination |
|  | [ ]  | Programmatic for Independent Walkway and Bikeway Construction Projects |
|  | [ ]  | Programmatic for Minor Involvement with Historic Sites |
|  | [ ]  | Programmatic for Minor Involvement with Parks, Recreation Areas, and Waterfowl and Wildlife Refuges |
|  | [ ]  | Programmatic for Net Benefits to a Section 4(f) Property |
|  | [ ]  | An Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation is required – project is ineligible for PCE |

**4.3 FHWA Statewide Wetland Finding**

The FHWA Statewide Wetland Finding applies to bridge replacement or highway reconstruction projects which meet the following standards:

(1) on existing location (i.e. within 0.3 mi of the existing),

(2) affect a total of less than 7.4 acres of wetlands, and

(3) have been coordinated with WDNR and WDNR has expressed no significant concerns over the proposed use of the wetlands.

Does the project meet the above standards for FHWA Statewide Wetland Finding? If no, include the FHWA wetland finding in the appendix.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | Does Not Apply – no wetlands impacted |
|  | [ ]  | Yes |
|  | [ ]  | No – FHWA individual wetland finding required – project is ineligible for PCE |

**4.4 Farmland**

The U.S. Farmland Protection Policy Act requires coordination with the U.S. Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) whenever a project receives a score 60 or more points in Part VI of form AD‑1006, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating or form NRCS-CPA-106, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects. If additional coordination with NRCS and final completion of either form results in a score of more than 160 points, there is potential for adverse impacts to farmland

Does the completion of either NRCS form identified above result in a score greater than 160 points?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | Does not apply – the project does not impact farmland |
|  | [ ]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

**4.5 Historic Properties (cultural resources)**

Historic properties (cultural resources) are any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the National Park Service.

Does the project affect any historic properties?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | There are no historic properties in the area of potential effect (APE). |
|  | [ ]  | A determination of “no potential to effect historic properties” or “no adverse effects to historic properties” has been reached. Documentation may include WisDOT form DT1635 or a “screening list” decision and commitments. |
|  | [ ]  | The proposed project will have adverse effects to historic properties – project is ineligible for PCE. |

**4.6 Wild and Scenic Rivers**

Lands and waters of rivers designated as Wild and Scenic Rivers by the U.S. Government have special protections.

Does the project require construction in, across, or adjacent to a river designated as a component of or proposed for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers published by the U.S. Department of the Interior/ U.S. Department of Agriculture?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

**4.7 U.S. Coast Guard Permits**

Under Section 9 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the United States Coast Guard requires permits be obtained for bridge projects over navigable waters which are generally tributary to the Great Lakes or the Mississippi River. See Procedure 20-50-1.3 and 20-50-1.4 of the WisDOT Facilities Development Manual for a list of waters covered by Section 9.

Will the project require a permit from the United States Coast Guard (USCG)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [x]  | No |
|  | [ ]  | Yes – project is ineligible for PCE |

Exhibit 1a & 1b - Project Location and US 51 Ramp Map

Exhibit 2a & 2b - Existing and Proposed Typical Sections

Exhibit 3a & 3b - Native American Notification Letter and Distribution List

Exhibit 4 – Section 106 Screening List

Exhibit 5 - Wisconsin DNR Correspondence

Exhibit 6 - USFWS Species List/Section 7 Consultation

Exhibit 7 - Columbia County Zoning Correspondence

Exhibit 8 – Public Involvement Meeting (PIM)

Exhibit 9 – Flood Modeling Determination of No Back Water

**Section Five: Environmental Commitments**

List any environmental mitigation measures or commitments that will be incorporated into the project. Any items listed below must be incorporated into the project plans and contract documents. *Attach a copy of this page to the design study report (DSR) and the plans, specifications, and estimate (PS&E) submittal package.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Environmental Factor** | Commitment (If none, include ‘No special or supplemental commitments required.’) |
| General Economics | The proposed action will be built under a staged operation with minor delays to the travelling public. The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is anticipated as Type 2, which is for projects that cause minimal traffic delays and may include: lane closures, delays exceeding criteria for short time periods, ramp closures. Message boards will be used to inform the public of lane or ramp closures 1 week prior to. The construction engineer will ensure the commitment is fulfilled.  |
| Business  | The proposed action will be built under a staged operation with minor delays to the travelling public. The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is anticipated as Type 2, which is for projects that cause minimal traffic delays and may include: lane closures, delays exceeding criteria for short time periods, ramp closures. Message boards will be used to inform the public of lane or ramp closures 1 week prior to. The construction engineer will ensure the commitment is fulfilled.  |
| Agriculture | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Community or Residential | The proposed action will be built under a staged operation with minor delays to the travelling public. The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is anticipated as Type 2, which is for projects that cause minimal traffic delays and may include: lane closures, delays exceeding criteria for short time periods, ramp closures. Message boards will be used to inform the public of lane or ramp closures 1 week prior to and local emergency services will be informed of the closures and if additional accommodations need to be made. The construction engineer will ensure the commitment is fulfilled.  |
| Indirect Effects | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Cumulative Effects | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Environmental Justice | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Historic Resources | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Archaeological/Burial Sites | One Archaeological Site extends into the project limits. Design Project Manager will ensure the Archaeological site is denoted as an "environmentally sensitive" area on the plan set. Design Project Manager will also include a Special Provision into the contract documents to address the cultural sites on the project. Special Provision will include:Environmentally sensitive sites shall not be used for borrow or waste disposal, or used for the staging of personnel, equipment, and/or supplies.The construction project engineer will assure fulfillment of these requirements during construction |
| Tribal Coordination/Consultation | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Section 4(f) and 6(f) or Other Unique Areas | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Aesthetics | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Wetlands | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Rivers, Streams and Floodplains | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Lakes or other Open Water | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Groundwater, Wells and Springs | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Upland Wildlife and Habitat | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Coastal Zones | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Threatened and Endangered Species | Design Project Manager will include a Special Provision into the contract documents to address the threatened and/or endangered species (Eastern Massasauga Rattlesnake and Blanding's Turtle) on the project. Special Provision will include installing exclusion fencing according to the Amphibian and Reptile Exclusion Protocols in non-overwintering areas (uplands) during the turtles’ and snakes' inactive season. Work can then be conducted within the fenced area at any time of year if the fencing is maintained. The construction project engineer will assure fulfillment of these requirements during construction. |
| Air Quality | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Construction Stage Sound Quality | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Traffic Noise | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Hazardous Substances or Contamination | No special or supplemental commitments required. |
| Storm Water | Projects disturbing less than an acre of land do not require a Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Transportation Construction General Permit (TCGP) for storm water discharges. The department will apply for a permit coverage just before the project goes to PS&E, if necessary. The construction project engineer will assure fulfillment of these requirements during construction. |
| Erosion Control | Erosion Control Implementation Plan is required and must comply with the TCGP, if applicable, to receive "permit-coverage" from the department. The construction project engineer will assure fulfillment of these requirements during construction. An ECIP must be submitted for review to SWEC and WDNR at least 14 days prior to construction |
| Other       |       |