

WISCONSIN DIVISION
 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4 (f) DETERMINATION AND APPROVAL
 UNDER THE
 NATIONWIDE PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4 (f) EVALUATION
 AND APPROVAL FOR FHWA PROJECTS THAT NECESSITATE
 THE USE OF **HISTORIC BRIDGES**
 (JULY 5, 1983)

Description/Location of Historic Bridge:

WISDOT ID:
 Route:
 Location:
 County:
 Name of Bridge:

(Consult the Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation as it relates to the following items. Complete all items. Any response in a shaded box requires additional information prior to approval. This Section 4(f) determination will be attached to the applicable EA, FONSI or Categorical Exclusion.

Eligibility Criteria	Yes	No
1. Will the bridge be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal Funds?	-	
2. Will the project require the "use" of a historic structure which is on, or is eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places?	-	
3. Will the project impair the historic integrity of the bridge either by demolition or rehabilitation?	-	
4. Has the bridge been determined to be a National Historic Landmark?		-
5. Is the environmental documentation an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?		-

(Consult the Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for the generic (not prudent and feasible) reasons that might be addressed. The evaluation of alternatives for the subject project, however, must quantify those reasons as applicable and be supported by the circumstances of the project.)

Alternatives Considered	Yes	No
1. Have all of the following alternatives to avoid any use of the historic bridge been evaluated?	-	
2. Has the "Do Nothing" alternative been studied and been determined, for reasons of maintenance and safety, not to be feasible and prudent?	-	
3. Has the "Build on New Location Without Using the Old Bridge Alternate" been studied and been determined, for reasons of terrain, and/or adverse social, economic or environmental effects, and/or engineering and economy, and/or preservation of the old bridge, not to be feasible and prudent?	-	
4. Has rehabilitation of the existing bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge been studied and has it been determined, for reasons of structural deficiency and/or geometrics, that rehabilitation is not feasible and prudent?	-	

Measures to Minimize Harm When an item does not apply indicate N/A	Yes	N/A
1. The project includes all possible planning to minimize harm for the following reasons.	-	
2. For bridges that are adversely affected ; have the FHWA, SHPO, and ACHP reached agreement [Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)] through the Section 106 process, and this MOA includes Stipulations which amount to Measures to Minimize Harm, and those measures will be incorporated in the project?	-	

<p align="center">Measures to Minimize Harm When an item does not apply indicate N/A</p>	<p align="center">Yes</p>	<p align="center">N/A</p>
<p>3. For bridges that are adversely affected; has the FHWA ensured that records are made of the bridge in accordance with the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) or other suitable means developed through the Section 106 consultation?</p>	-	
<p>4. For bridges that are to be replaced or demolished; has the existing bridge been made available for an alternate use, provided a responsible party agrees to maintain and preserve the bridge? * (If the project is a rehabilitation project, check N/A for this question.)</p>		
<p>5. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated and there is an "Adverse Effect" on the historic integrity of the bridge; is the historic integrity preserved to the greatest extent possible, consistent with unavoidable transportation needs, safety, and load requirements? ** (If the project is a replacement project, check N/A for this question.)</p>		
<p>* Note: This criterion will require the advertisement and marketing of the bridge in accordance with FHWA requirements. Marketing will be addressed in the programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and by appropriate provisions in the Memorandum of Agreement entered into between the State or local agency, FHWA, the SHPO and the ACHP. Refer to Mr. Leathers' July 22, 1987, memorandum on the applicable requirements for preservation and marketing. Copies of the advertisement and results of marketing efforts must be furnished to FHWA prior to replacement of the historic bridge.</p> <p>** Note: When it has been determined by FHWA in consultation with the SHPO and ACHP that the rehabilitation work will result in "No Effect" or "No Adverse Effect" on the historic integrity of the structure, the provisions of Section 4(f) Evaluation do not apply.</p>		

DETERMINATION AND APPROVAL

Project Number:
WISDOT ID:
Route:
Location:
County:
Name of Bridge:

Based on the environmental documentation and analysis, the results of public and agency consultation and coordination as evidenced by the attachments to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's letter (or local unit of government) the FHWA has determined that:

The project meets the applicability criteria set forth in the Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges dated July 5, 1983;

All of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section of the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation have been fully evaluated. Based on those Findings, it is determined there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the Historic Bridge; and

The project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm Section of the Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation; and agreement between FHWA, SHPO and ACHP has been reached.

Accordingly, the FHWA approves the proposed use of the historic bridge for the construction of under the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation issued on July 5, 1983.

Date Approved

Federal Highway Administration

Cc: WISDOT BoE
WISDOT District
File: route through J. Lawton
File #: District/County/Route #

NOTES:

Signature Block is part of a table.

Determination and Approval Section: repeat the project information as a safeguard from the signatures becoming separated from the project and bridge identification.

WISCONSIN
 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(f) DETERMINATION AND APPROVAL
 UNDER THE NATIONWIDE 4(f) EVALUATION FOR
MINOR TAKES OF PUBLIC PARKS,
 RECREATION LANDS AND WILDLIFE AND WATERFOWL REFUGES
 (DECEMBER 23, 1986)

Description/Location of Project:

WISDOT ID:
 Route:
 Termini:
 County:
 Name of Resource:

Consult the Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation as it relates to the following items. Complete all items. Any response in a shaded box requires additional information prior to approval. This determination will be attached to the applicable EA, FONSI or Categorical Exclusion.

Eligibility Criteria	YES	NO
1. Is the 4(f) site adjacent to the existing highway?	-	
2. Does the amount and location of the land to be used impair the use of the remaining Section 4(f) lands, in whole or in part, for its intended purpose?		-
3. a. If the total 4(f) site is less than 4.05 ha (10 acres), is the land to be acquired/used less than 10% of the total area? b. If the total 4(f) site is from 4.05 - 40.5 ha (10-100 acres), is land to be acquired/used less than .405 ha (1 acre)? c. If the total 4(f) site is greater than 40.5 ha (100 acres), is the land to be acquired/used less than 1% of the site?		
4. Are there any proximity impacts which would impair the use of the 4(f) lands for their intended purpose?		-
5. Have the officials with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) lands agreed in writing with the assessment of impacts of the proposed project on, and the proposed mitigation for the Section 4(f) lands?	-	
6. Have Federal funds been used in the acquisition or improvements of the 4(f) site? If yes, has the land conversion/transfer been coordinated with the appropriate Federal agency, and are they in agreement with the land conversion or transfer?		-
7. Does the project require the preparation of an EIS?		-
8. Is the project on a new location?		-
9. The scope of the project is one of the following: (indicate one in Yes-box) a. Improved Traffic Operations b. Safety Improvements c. 4R d. Bridge Replacement on Essentially the Same Alignment e. Addition of Lanes		

Consult the Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for the generic reasons that might be addressed. The evaluation of alternatives for the subject project, however, must quantify those reasons as applicable and be supported by the circumstances of the project.

Alternatives Considered	YES	NO
1. The "Do Nothing" alternative has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent?	-	
2. An alternative has been evaluated which improves the highway without the use of the adjacent 4(f) land and it is considered not the be feasible and prudent?	-	
3. An alternative on new location avoiding the use of the 4(f) land has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent?	-	

Measures to Minimize Harm	YES	NO
1. The proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm?	-	
2. Mitigation measures include one or more of the following: (Check applicable mitigation measures.)		
a. Replacement of lands used with lands of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location, and of at least comparable value?		
b. Replacement of facilities impacted by the project including sidewalks, paths, benches, lights, trees, and other facilities?		
c. Restoration and landscaping of disturbed areas?		
d. Special design features? (Briefly describe.)		
e. Payment of the fair market value of the land and improvements taken?		
f. Improvements to the remaining 4(f) site equal to the fair market value of the lands and improvements taken?		
g. Other measures? (describe briefly)		

Coordination	YES	NO
1. The proposed project has been coordinated with the Federal, State, and/or local officials having jurisdiction over the 4(f) lands?	-	
2. In the case of non-Federal 4(f) lands, the official jurisdiction has been asked to identify any Federal encumbrances and there are none?	-	
3. For bridge projects coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard has been completed (if applicable)?	-	

Determination and Approval:

Description/Location of Project:

Federal Project Number: WISDOT ID:
Route: Termini:
County: Name of Resource:

Based on the environmental documentation, the results of public and agency consultation and coordination as evidenced by the attachments to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's attached letter, the FHWA has determined that:

The project meets all applicable criteria in the Nationwide Section 4(F) Evaluation and Approval for Federally-Aided Highway Projects with Minor Involvements with Public Parks, Recreation Lands, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges approved December 23, 1986.

That alternatives set forth in the Findings section of the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation have been fully evaluated and are clearly applicable to this project. Based on those Findings, it is determined there is no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of lands from the subject resource.

The project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm Section of the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and there are assurances that the measures to minimize harm will be incorporated in the project.

The coordination called for in the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation has been successfully completed.

Accordingly, the FHWA approves the proposed use of the subject lands under the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation issued on December 23, 1986.

Date Approved

Federal Highway Administration

cc: WISDOT BOE
 WISDOT District
File: route through J. Lawton
File #: District/ County/Route #

NOTES:

Signature Block is part of a table.

Determination and Approval Section: repeat the project information as a safeguard from the signatures becoming separated from the project and park identification.

WISCONSIN DIVISION
 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(f) DETERMINATION AND APPROVAL
 UNDER THE
 NATIONWIDE SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION
 AND APPROVAL FOR FEDERALLY-AIDED HIGHWAY PROJECTS WITH
 MINOR INVOLVEMENTS WITH **HISTORIC SITES**
 (DECEMBER 23, 1986)

Description/Location of Project:

WISDOT ID:
 Route:
 Termini:
 County:
 Name of Resource:

Consult the Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation as it relates to the following items. Complete all items. Any response in a shaded box requires additional information prior to approval. This determination will be attached to the applicable EA, FONSI or Categorical exclusion.

Eligibility Criteria	YES	NO
1. Is the historic site adjacent to the existing highway?	3	
2. Does the project require the removal or alteration of historic buildings, structures, or objects on the historic sites?		3
3. Does the project require the disturbance or removal of archeological resources which are important to preserve in place (rather than to recover for archeological research) is based on consultation with the SHPO and if appropriate the ACHP?		3
4. Is the impact on the 4(f) site considered minor (i.e. no effect, no adverse effect) and the ACHP has not objected to a "no adverse effect" determination?	3	
5. Has the SHPO agreed, in writing, with the assessment of impacts and the proposed mitigation for the historic site?	3	
6. Does the project require the preparation of an EIS?		3
7. Is the project on new location?		3
8. The scope of the project is one of the following: (indicate one in Yes-box) a. Improved Traffic Operations b. Safety Improvements c. 4R d. Bridge Replacement on Essentially the Same Alignment e. Addition of Lanes		

Consult the Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for the generic reasons that might be addressed. The evaluation of alternatives for the subject project, however, must quantify those reasons as applicable and be supported by the circumstances of the project.

Alternatives Considered	YES	NO
1. The "Do Nothing" alternative has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent?	3	
2. An alternative has been evaluated which improves the highway without using the adjacent historic site and it is considered not to be feasible and prudent?	3	
3. An alternative on new location without using the historic site has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent?	3	

Measures to Minimize Harm	YES	NO
1. The project includes all possible planning to minimize harm?	3	
2. Measures to minimize harm include the following to preserve the historic integrity of the site (briefly describe):	3	
3. The above measures have been agreed to by the FHWA, SHPO, and as appropriate the ACHP in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800?	3	

Coordination	YES	NO
1. Coordination has satisfactorily been completed as called for in 36 CFR Part 800 with the following (as appropriate):	3	
a. State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	3	
b. Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP)	3	
c. Interested persons (affected local government, property owner, historical society, Indian tribe, other)		
d. Federal agencies (for sites encumbered with Federal interests)		
e. U.S. Coast Guard (for bridges requiring bridge permits)		

Determination and Approval:

Description/Location of Project:

Federal Project Number:

WISDOT ID:

Route:

Termini:

County:

Name of Resource:

Based on the environmental documentation, the results of public and agency consultation and coordination as evidenced by the attachments to the Wisconsin Department of Transportation's attached letter, the FHWA has determined that:

The project meets all applicable criteria in the Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Federally-Aided Highway Projects with Minor Involvements with Historic Sites approved on December 23, 1986.

All of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section of the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation have been fully evaluated and are clearly applicable to this project. Based on those Findings, it is determined there is no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of land or non-historic improvements on the subject resource.

The project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm Section of the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and there are assurances that the measures to minimize harm will be incorporated in the project.

Coordination called for in the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation has been successfully completed.

Accordingly, the FHWA approves the proposed use of land or non-historic improvements on the subject resource for the construction of the subject project under the above Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation issued on December 23, 1986.

Date Approved

Federal Highway Administration

c: WISDOT BOE
WISDOT District
File: route through J. Lawton
File #: District/ County/Route #

NOTES:

Signature Block is part of a table.

Determination and Approval Section: repeat the project information as a safeguard from the signatures becoming separated from the project and historic resource identification.