

Environmental Report (ER) and Environmental Assessment (EA) Template

2-08-2023

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Project Summary

Project ID 5410-08-01	Project Termini WIS 30 (south end) to I-39/90/94 (north end), approximately 5.5 miles	Funding Sources (check all that apply) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local	
Construction ID 5410-04-70/71/72		Estimated Total Project Cost (design, construction, real estate, etc.) Include delivery cost in Year of Expenditure (YOE). \$218,000,000	
Route Designation (if applicable) US 51		Real Estate Acquisition Portion of Estimated Cost (YOE) \$10,500,000	
National Highway System (NHS) Route <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		Utility Relocation Portion of Estimated Cost (YOE) \$6,800,000	
County Dane	Section / Township / Range T07N R10E S04 T08N R10E S08, 09, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32, 33		
Project Title US 51 (Stoughton Road) North Study		Number of Relocations: Residential 0 Business 3 Other 2 (billboards)	
Bridge Number(s) (if applicable) B-13-389 B-13-390	Environmental process Start Date: For an ER, indicate the date of the first tribal notification letter. For an EA, indicate the date the Process Initiation Letter (PIL) was accepted by FHWA: June 3, 2024 See Appendix A: Process Initiation Letter	Right of Way Acquisition	Acres
		Fee	9.13
		Temporary Limited Easement (TLE)	10.72
		Permanent Limited Easement (PLE)	0
		Highway Easement (HE)	0
Functional Classification of Existing Route (FDM 4-1-10 & 4-1-15)	Urban	Rural	WisDOT Project Improvement Strategy and Type (FDM 3-5 & FDM 11-1 attachment 10.1)
			Improvement Strategy – Improvement Type
Freeway/Expressway	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Perpetuation – Preservation/Restoration <input type="checkbox"/>
Principal Arterial	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Perpetuation – Resurfacing <input type="checkbox"/>
Minor Arterial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Perpetuation – Pavement Replacement <input type="checkbox"/>
Major Collector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Perpetuation – Bridge Rehabilitation <input type="checkbox"/>
Minor Collector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Perpetuation – Bridge Preventative <input type="checkbox"/>
Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rehabilitation – Preservation/Restoration <input type="checkbox"/>
No Functional Class	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rehabilitation – Resurfacing <input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rehabilitation – Pavement Replacement <input type="checkbox"/>
			Rehabilitation – Reconstruction <input type="checkbox"/>
			Rehabilitation – Bridge Rehabilitation <input type="checkbox"/>
			Rehabilitation – Bridge Replacement <input type="checkbox"/>
			Modernization - Expansion <input type="checkbox"/>
			Preventative Maintenance <input type="checkbox"/>
			State Majors <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			Other – Describe: <input type="checkbox"/>

- ☐ FHWA Draft Categorical Exclusion (CE)/WisDOT Draft Environmental Report (ER). **No significant impacts indicated by initial assessment.**
- ☒ FHWA/WisDOT Environmental Assessment (EA). **No significant impacts indicated by initial assessment.**

Signed by:

Dan Schrum, Project Manager

12/6/2024

(Signature – Dan Schrum, Project Manager, SRF Consulting Group) (Date – m/d/yy)

Signed by:

Barry Paye, Director, Bureau of Technical Services

(Signature – Barry Paye, Director, Bureau of Technical Services) (Date – m/d/yy)

Signed by:

Jeff Berens, Project Manager WisDOT

12/6/2024

(Signature, Jeff Berens, Project Manager WisDOT) (Date – m/d/yy)

☒ Region ☐ Aeronautics ☐ Railroads & Harbors

Signed by:

Lisa Hemesath, Environmental Protection Specialist, FHWA

(Signature – Lisa Hemesath, Environmental Protection Specialist, FHWA) (Date – m/d/yy)

☒ FHWA ☐ FAA ☐ FTA ☐ FRA

A Public Hearing was not required. After reviewing and addressing substantive public comments and coordinating with other agencies, it is determined this action:

- ☐ **Will NOT significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. This document is a Final CE/Final ER.
- ☐ **Will NOT significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. This document is a Final EA/Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
- ☐ **Has potential to significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) required.

A Public Hearing was held, and after reviewing and addressing substantive public comments, updating the Draft CE/ER or EA and coordinating with other agencies, it is determined this action*:

- ☐ **Will NOT significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. This document is a Final CE/Final ER.
- ☒ **Will NOT significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. This document is a Final EA/Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
- ☐ **Has potential to significantly affect** the quality of the human environment. Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) required.

Signed by:

Dan Schrum, Project Manager

July 21, 2025

(Print – Dan Schrum, Project Manager, SRF Consulting Group) – (Date – m/d/yy)

DocuSigned by:

Barry Paye

July 21, 2025

(Signature – Barry Paye, Director, Bureau of Technical Services) – (Date – m/d/yy)

Signed by:

Jeff Berens

July 21, 2025

(Signature, Jeff Berens, Project Manager WisDOT) – (Date – m/d/yy)

☒ Region ☐ Aeronautics ☐ Railroads & Harbors

DocuSigned by:

Lisa Hemesath

July 21, 2025

(Signature, Lisa Hemesath, Environmental Protection Specialist, FHWA) (Date – m/d/yy)

☐ FHWA ☐ FAA ☐ FTA ☐ FRA

*Include Environmental Document Availability and Hearing Summary following this page.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY and HEARING SUMMARY

06-11-2019

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Project ID: 5410-08-01

This Environmental Document Availability and Hearing Summary is completed if the project required publication of a Notice of Public Hearing and Notice of Availability of an Environmental Document or a Notice of Opportunity to Request a Public Hearing and Notice of Availability of an Environmental Document. When completed, attach this summary to the environmental document following the signatory page with the updated Environmental Document Template including all changes highlighted.

1. **Type(s) and Date(s) of Public Notice(s):** A legal notice was published on Feb. 13, 2025, and again on March 10, 2025.
2. **Published in (name of newspaper):** Wisconsin State Journal
3. **Dates environmental document was available to the public and agencies for review and comment:**
From: Feb. 12, 2025
To: April 17, 2025
4. **Public Hearing:**
☐ A Notice of Opportunity to Request a Public Hearing and Notice of Availability of an Environmental Document was published.
☐ No requests for a public hearing were received.
☐ Hearing request(s) received, then later rescinded in writing, documentation attached as:
☒ Hearing was held on: March 18, 2025
5. **Summarize comments from the Public Hearing and environmental document availability period or additional public involvement following the approval of the environmental document. Characterize public support or opposition to the project. Include responses to all substantive comments. (Note: Alternatives proposed by the public and subsequently rejected should be identified and the reasons for rejecting them):**

In addition to the Public Hearing, study staff conducted correspondence with multiple business and property owners through email about access changes, parking impacts, and potential relocations. In addition to email correspondence, study staff held the following meetings (in-person or via phone) with stakeholders during the availability period:

Date	Stakeholder	Meeting Purpose
4/17/25	John Skillrud	Phone conversation with property owner about access changes and details of the preferred alternative.
4/14/25	Scott Faust	Phone conversation discussed potential relocation and access changes with the landowner.
4/11/25	Ralph Adams - Valvoline	Phone conversation with a representative from a business about potential access changes and parking stall impacts at that location.
4/10/25	Stanley Otis – Club LaMark	Meeting with business/property owner to discuss proposed access changes.

4/4/25	Dupaco Community Credit Union Klein's Floral and Greenhouses	Meeting with two businesses to discuss possibility of shared access.
4/2/25	Valvoline	Phone conversation provided update on potential access changes and parking stall impacts at this business.
3/26/25	Dupaco Community Credit Union	Meeting with business to discuss potential access changes.
3/25/25	Bill Gerrits	Phone conversation provided update on potential right-of-way acquisition and parking stall impacts to the landowner.
3/21/25	Trajan Perleberger - NAPA	Phone conversation provided update on potential right-of-way acquisition and parking stall impacts at this business.
3/17/25	Bill Gerrits	Phone conversation provided update on potential right-of-way acquisition and parking stall impacts to the landowner.
3/17/25	Chad Ellett	Phone conversation provided update on potential access and parking stall impacts to the landowner.
3/13/25	Robin Loger – Yahara Materials	Meeting with business owner to discuss proposed access changes.
2/20/25	Scott Faust	Phone conversation provided update on potential relocation and access changes to the landowner.

The majority of comments received from the Public Hearing and availability period consisted of questions or comments about specific elements of the preferred alternative and were neutral about the project as a whole. Of the comments that voiced a general opinion on the project, more than twice as many voiced support for the project compared to opposition. The substantive comments included:

Comment	Response
The Hanson Road intersection should be signalized.	<p>The Hanson Road intersection does not meet traffic signal warrants, meaning there is not enough traffic to warrant putting in a signal. In addition, the Dane County Regional Airport owns land on both sides of US 51 in that area. The airport has indicated they would not agree to a land transfer to install a signal at the intersection. The primary reason for this is that the intersection is located in a Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), which is an area of protection at the end of airport runways. It is desirable to clear the RPZ of all above-ground objects, including lighting, that would interfere with a plane approaching or leaving the runway.</p> <p>The preferred alternative includes acceleration and deceleration lanes on US 51 and a right-turn</p>

	<p>lane on US 51 and on Hanson Road. These improvements should improve safety and operations at the intersection. In addition, the preferred alternative of the I-39/90/94 Study includes a new interchange at Hoepker Road and I-39/90/94. That proposed interchange would likely reduce the number of vehicles using the US 51/Hanson Road intersection by providing a more direct route to the UW East Madison Hospital from the interstate.</p>
<p>Access should not be restricted at Schmedeman Avenue.</p>	<p>With the preferred alternative, a new local road connection on the south leg of the East Washington Avenue/Schmedeman Avenue intersection would be added and access would be restricted. The intersection would remain unsignalized. Due to the close proximity of the US 51/East Washington Avenue intersection (~800 ft to the east) there are anticipated to be safety/operational concerns in the future if the East Washington Avenue/Schmedeman Avenue intersection were to remain full access. A signal was not considered because the intersection does not currently meet traffic warrants. This intersection would be reevaluated if development occurs in the area to determine what changes, if any, could be made to access or traffic control.</p> <p>The access restrictions at the Schmedeman Avenue intersection shown on the public hearing exhibits have been modified to now allow vehicles travelling westbound on East Washington Avenue to make a left turn onto the new local road connection across from Schmedeman Avenue; however, vehicles on Schmedeman Avenue and the new local road connection would still not be able to make a left turn onto East Washington Avenue or travel straight across the intersection.</p>
<p>Concerned about access changes in the East Washington Avenue area of the corridor.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative includes access closures and access consolidations in the area of the US</p>

	<p>51/US 151 intersection to improve safety. WisDOT has notified all potentially affected property and business owners about these access changes. WisDOT has also worked with businesses in this area to coordinate potential shared access between their businesses.</p>
<p>Why is the median closed on US 51 north of US 151 (East Washington Ave.)? It will restrict access to some businesses.</p>	<p>The US 51 preferred alternative includes a median closure just north of US 151 (East Washington Ave.) due to a larger footprint at this intersection. The proposed design includes an additional northbound US 51 through lane north of US 151 and an additional southbound US 51 to eastbound US 151 left-turn lane. Traffic modeling indicates the need for those additional lanes to reach acceptable operations at this intersection. Allowing a median opening at this location would create unsafe conditions given the length of the southbound US 51 left-turn bays needed to support traffic numbers.</p>
<p>What are you doing to improve bicycle and pedestrian accommodations (at various locations)?</p>	<p>Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations include a shared-use path along the east side of US 51 that would extend from WIS 30 to Kinsman Boulevard and from Hoepker Road through County CV. In addition, a shared-use path is included from East Washington Avenue to Anderson Street on the west side of US 51. In the area where no path is proposed, there are paved shoulders that can accommodate bicycles. In addition to the path, two bicycle and pedestrian bridges would be constructed; one south of WIS 30 that would connect into the city of Madison's Marsh View Path and another that would cross East Washington Avenue east of US 51. Crosswalks would also be added to all legs of the signalized intersections from Commercial Avenue through Hoepker Road. The project would also reduce the speed limit between WIS 30 and East Washington Avenue from 45 mph to 40 mph. In order to promote lower speeds in this area, the existing rural shoulder would be removed, and curb and gutter would be extended the length of the section. This would make the corridor safer for all users.</p>
<p>What effect will the shared-use path have on the proposed noise wall location?</p>	<p>The preferred alternative identified one location where a noise wall is feasible and reasonable. That noise wall would be located on the east side of US 51 between Commercial Avenue and Larson</p>

	<p>Court. The preferred alternative also includes a proposed shared-use path connection to MacArthur Road that would create a gap in the noise wall. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are a primary need of the corridor. Providing a connection to the path at this location was important to address that need for the members of the adjacent neighborhood who had requested a connection to the shared-use path. That gap created by the shared-use path connection would slightly reduce the wall's noise reduction effectiveness by an estimated 2.6 dBA at the nearest receptor. The minimum change in sound level that an average human ear can detect is approximately 3 dBA. So, the change in noise wall effectiveness is not expected to be noticeable. The design of the noise wall and the shared-use path will be finalized in the final design phase of the project.</p>
Can Leo Circle be relocated further away from US 51?	<p>In the preferred alternative, Leo Circle would generally be moving further way from US 51. Currently, the minimum distance between Leo Circle and US 51 is 23 feet. In the preferred alternative, the minimum distance would be 39 feet with the majority of Leo Circle at least 40 feet away from US 51.</p>
The bicycle/pedestrian bridge at East Washington Avenue may block the view of the business located at my property.	<p>The preferred alternative includes a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over East Washington Avenue east of US 51. The bicycle/pedestrian bridge improves safety at the US 51/East Washington Avenue intersection by providing a grade separated crossing that ties directly into the shared-use path on the east side of US 51. The addition of the bicycle/pedestrian bridge at this location is supported by the city of Madison. WisDOT has been in contact with the property owner at this location. WisDOT will continue coordination with the property and business owners as the project moves into final design.</p>
Can anything be done to mitigate noise concerns for the properties on Leo Circle?	<p>Modern construction methods include a different process for texturing the concrete than previously used. This new method of texturing typically reduces noise levels 3-5 decibels. In addition, trees could potentially be planted in the area to assist in noise reduction. Those considerations will be evaluated during the final design process.</p>

Noise analysis determined that a noise wall is not considered feasible and reasonable in this area.

6. Summarize comments from agencies or local units of government from the Public Hearing and document availability period or additional public involvement following the completion of the Draft ER or EA:

The study staff has held the following meetings with agencies and local units of government during the availability period:

Date	Stakeholder	Meeting Purpose
4/8/25	FHWA, City of Madison	Study progress meeting providing public hearing recap, and design and outreach updates.
3/25/25	FHWA	Monthly meeting to discuss study and public hearing updates.
3/25/25	FHWA, City of Madison	Design meeting providing study updates.
3/10/25	City of Madison	Drainage discussion regarding Commercial Avenue area.
2/25/25	City of Madison	Meeting to discuss drainage, bus access, shared-use path and Schmedeman Avenue access.
2/25/25	FHWA	Monthly meeting to discuss design, outreach, and public hearing updates.

The following comments have been submitted by agencies and local units of government during the availability period:

Stakeholder	Comments	Response
City of Madison	The city of Madison voiced their support for the incorporation of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. They specifically voiced support for the grade separated crossings located just south of WIS 30 and at East Washington Avenue. They also voiced support for the shared-use path on the east side of US 51 from WIS 30 to Pierstorff Street.	WisDOT will continue coordination with the city of Madison regarding the cost-share for the bicycle/pedestrian accommodations along the corridor. These improvements will require a cost-share agreement between WisDOT and the city of Madison.
	The city voiced funding concerns about the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. They asked WisDOT to review their cost-sharing policy.	The preferred alternative has been modified to allow for vehicles travelling westbound on US 151 to make a left turn onto the new local road

	<p>The Madison Common Council also adopted a resolution (RES-25-00221) opposing the elimination of the westbound left turn from East Washington Avenue on to Schmedeman Avenue. See Appendix J City of Madison Coordination.</p>	<p>connection across from Schmedeman Avenue. The preferred alternative will also retain the existing marked crosswalk and RRFB. If redevelopment plans move forward in this area in the future, access at the Schmedeman Avenue intersection will need to be revisited to determine if access changes would be necessary based on the projected changes in traffic volumes at the intersection, with the understanding that future traffic conditions may require improvements such as partial signalization of the left turns in this intersection.</p>
Dane County Highway Department	<p>The Dane County Highway Department submitted a comment that they prefer to keep two lanes in the northbound/eastbound direction southwest of Daentl Road. The preferred alternative indicates only a single lane at that location.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative would maintain the existing width and number of lanes at this location. The original exhibit that led to this comment did not show the striping needed to indicate two lanes at this location. In the current configuration, the single lane opens up into two lanes without a designated lane for the left turn onto Daentl Road without using the median open, while in the proposed configuration that left lane is a proposed left-turn lane that becomes a second lane after the left turn onto Daentl Road. The exhibit has been updated to reflect that two lanes will be maintained at this location.</p>

7. Summarize changes to the environmental document and project resulting from comments or feedback from the public, agencies or local units of government:

The following is a summary of changes to the environmental document resulting from comments or feedback from the public, agencies or local units of government.

Environmental Justice changes to the document:

On January 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order (E.O.) 14148 --Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions and E.O. 14154 – Unleashing American Energy. The E.O.s revoked E.O. 14096 – Revitalizing Our Nation’s Commitment to Environmental Justice for All (April 21, 2023). Subsequently on January 21, 2025, President Trump signed E.O. 14173 – Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity. This E.O. revoked E.O. 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994). On February 25, 2025, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) published an Interim Final Rule removing the CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) implementing regulations, effective April 11, 2025 (90 Fed. Reg. 10610). As a result of these actions, all federal environmental justice requirements are revoked and no longer apply to the federal environmental review process. FHWA, FTA and FRA’s Joint NEPA regulations (23 CFR part 771) and the agencies Interim Final Guidance on “Section 139 Environmental Review Process: Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decisionmaking and One Federal Decision” (12/17/2024) do not require an environmental justice analysis. Accordingly, no analysis of environmental justice is included in this Environmental Assessment. Any purported environmental justice impacts will not be considered in the federal decision. Social, economic, and community impacts will continue to be disclosed where applicable in accordance with 23 CFR 771.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change Impacts changes to the document:

On January 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order (E.O.) 14148 --Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions and E.O. 14154 – Unleashing American Energy. The E.O.s revoked E.O. 13990 – Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis (January 20, 2021) and E.O. 14008 – Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad (January 27, 2021). Subsequently on January 29, 2025, Secretary Duffy signed a Memorandum for Secretarial Offices and Heads of Operating Administrations – Implementation of Executive Orders Addressing Energy, Climate Change, Diversity, and Gender. On February 25, 2025, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) published an Interim Final Rule removing the CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) implementing regulations, effective April 11, 2025 (90 Fed. Reg. 10610). As a result of these actions, FHWA will not include greenhouse gas emissions and climate change analyses in the federal environmental review process. Any purported greenhouse gas emissions and climate change impacts will not be considered in the federal decision. Accordingly, no greenhouse gas emissions or climate change analyses are included in this Environmental Assessment.

Public Comments Disclaimer:

As a result of E.O. 14148, E.O. 14154, E.O. 14173, and the removal of the Council on Environmental Quality’s regulations, all federal environmental justice requirements are revoked and no longer applicable to the federal environmental review process. Accordingly, this Environmental Assessment does not consider public comments regarding environmental justice.

Starkweather Creek – East Branch drainage design modifications to achieve the 100-year No Rise condition through coordination with the city of Madison:

- The existing box culvert (B-13-389) that conveys the East Branch of Starkweather Creek under Commercial Avenue was extended both upstream and downstream and will now only be extended upstream
- For additional capacity, a 42-inch culvert pipe will be constructed alongside the existing box culvert (B-13-390) under US 51.
- The total encroachment of this floodplain decreased from 3.04 acres to 2.51 acres

Lexington Avenue west of US 51/Commercial Avenue cross section modifications through coordination with the city of Madison:

- Revised lane widths west of the Commercial Avenue/North Stoughton Service Road intersection to 11-foot lanes
- Revised median on north side to a 6-foot terrace and 10-foot shared use path
- Revised the eastbound lanes to a single lane with a 5-foot shoulder that widens to a two-lane section east of the Commercial Avenue /North Stoughton Service Road intersection
- Proposed sidewalk on the south side remains for a future connection by city of Madison

Schmedeman Avenue access modifications based on feedback received from stakeholders, including the city of Madison.

- Allowing vehicles travelling westbound on US 151 to make a left turn to the new local road connection across from Schmedeman Avenue

The shared-use path crossing at the southwest corner of the US 51/Anderson Street intersection through design refinement:

- Add protected bicycle/pedestrian crossing of free-flow right turn lane for eastbound Anderson Street to southbound US 51

Business impacts and access modifications through coordination with the business/property owner located on the east side of US 51 north of the US 51 and US 151 intersection:

- Revised from two potential driveway closures and one shared driveway to one potential driveway closure
- Previously relocated billboard to remain (reduced billboard relocations from three to two)

Northeast corner of US 51 and Kinsman Boulevard intersection modifications to existing parking lot through design refinement:

- Reduced right of way acquisition impacts to retain existing parking stalls
- Added temporary limited easement

8. Describe the preferred alternative:

☒ The preferred alternative is the same as that described in the environmental document.

Minor changes to the preferred alternative have occurred and are summarized in question 7 above.

☐ The preferred alternative is different from that described in the environmental document. Explain changes and why another alternative was selected: