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**:

Federal Project Number:

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 environmental document.

| **Eligibility Criteria** | **YES** | **NO** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Is the historic site adjacent to the existing highway? |  |  |
| 2. Does the project require the removal or alteration of historic buildings, structures, or objects on the historic sites? |  |  |
| 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 based on consultation with the SHPO and if appropriate the ACHP? |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |
| 5. Has the SHPO agreed, in writing, with the assessment of impacts and the proposed mitigation for the historic site? |  |  |
| 6. Does the project require the preparation of an EIS? |  |  |
| 7. Is the project on new location? |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |
| 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. An alternative on new location without using the historic site has been evaluated and is considered not to be feasible and prudent? |  |  |

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

| **Coordination** | **YES** | **NO** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Coordination has satisfactorily been completed as called for in 36 CFR Par 800 with the following (as appropriate): |  |  |
| a. State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) |  |  |
| b. Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP) |  |  |
| 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 OEA

WISDOT District

File: route through J. Lawton

File #: District/ County/Route #

L:\mis\environm\4fhist95

NOTES:

Signature Block is part of a table.

Comment and Alternatives Considered Table are selected to stay together on the same page. To release them, in WordPerfect 6.1, Format; Page; Keep Text Together; undo the Block protect.

Determination and Approval Section, including the signature block has been selected to stay together on the same page. To release them, in WordPerfect 6.1, Format; Page; Keep Text Together; undo the Block protect.

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