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**:

 Project #:

 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 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? |  |  |
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| **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 on the Measures to Minimize Harm, and those measures will be incorporated in the project? |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3. For bridges that are to be **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? |  |  |
| 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.) |  |  |
| 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 **rehabilitation** project, check N/A for this question.) |  |  |
| \* 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 of 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\*\* 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. |

**DETERMINATION AND APPROVAL**

 Project #:

 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 the 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 |

c: WISDOT OEA

 WISDOT District

File: route through J. Lawton

File #: District/County/Route #

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; and toggle on the Block Protect button until it is blank.

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