

INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT SECTION 4(F) EVALUATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The St. Croix River Crossing Project has potential impacts on nine resources that are protected under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. Section 4(f) states that it is in the national interest to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside, public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges and historic sites. The law requires that the Secretary of Transportation approve a project requiring the use¹ of publicly owned parks, recreational areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges of national, state or local significance, or privately owned lands of national historic significance only where it can be shown that: (1) no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land exists and (2) such a project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) land resulting from such use.

This introduction discusses the history of the St. Croix River Crossing Project, including the development of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives B-1, C, D and E). It also discusses the relationship between impacts on the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway (a federally-protected National Wild and Scenic River), cultural resources (including the Lift Bridge, a property listed on the National Register of Historic Places), parklands, and the process used to balance the requirements of three competing federal laws: Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966; Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968; and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Draft Section 4(f) Evaluations for each of the nine resources potentially affected by the project follow this introduction.

Extensive coordination with federal, state, and local agencies has occurred throughout the project history, through the project development process, and throughout this Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) in conjunction with the Stakeholder Resolution Process. Regular Stakeholder Group² meetings including discussion of project impacts and potential mitigation for those impacts have been conducted. A complete list of the Stakeholder Group, including cooperating agencies, is provided in Chapter 15 of the SDEIS. A long history (20+) years of agency coordination exists for this project which includes the 1987 Scoping Decision Document/Final Study Outline, 1990 Draft EIS, the 1995 Final EIS, the Braun Facilitation Process, and a 1999 Amended Scoping Decision Document prior to suspension of the project in 2001.

¹ The term “use” is strictly defined under FHWA guidelines for implementation of Section 4(f). A 4(f) “use” can include acquisition, temporary or permanent occupancy, or proximity impacts which substantially impair the purposes for which the 4(f) resource exists.

² In September 2002, the facilitation firm RESOLVE was selected by a multi-agency and stakeholder panel to proceed with the project through mediation. RESOLVE developed a dispute resolution process that centered on a “Stakeholders Group”, composed of representatives of the diverse interests in the project area. This process, the “Stakeholder Resolution Process,” responded to the need for a new start to the project, and a new approach to address the environmental, historical and transportation concerns surrounding the project.

II. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed action includes the construction of a new bridge over the St. Croix River between Trunk Highway (TH) 36 in Stillwater, Minnesota, and State Trunk Highway (STH) 64 in the Town of St. Joseph, Wisconsin, and reconstruction of the Minnesota and Wisconsin approach roadways to the bridge. The purpose of and need for the project are discussed in Chapter 2 of the SDEIS. The total project length is approximately 6.7 miles. Four alternatives have been identified for analysis (see Chapter 3 of the SDEIS for a graphical depiction of the alternatives):

- Alternative B-1 includes construction of a new four-lane bridge over the St. Croix River and upgrading the Minnesota (TH 36 and TH 95) and the Wisconsin (STH 64 and STH 35) approach roadways. Two sub-alternatives have been identified for Alternative B-1. Alternative B-1_a would remove vehicular traffic on the Lift Bridge and convert the Lift Bridge to a pedestrian/bicycle facility whereas Alternative B-1_b would include continued use of the Lift Bridge for local vehicular traffic;
- Alternative C includes construction of a new four-lane bridge over the St. Croix River and upgrading the Minnesota and the Wisconsin approach roadways. The Wisconsin approach includes two optional alignments. The two options for the Lift Bridge described above for Alternative B-1 (conversion to a pedestrian/bicycle facility or continued use of the Lift Bridge for limited, local traffic) are also equally applicable to Alternative C;
- Alternative D includes the construction of a new four-lane bridge over the St. Croix River near downtown Stillwater and the Lift Bridge. The Lift Bridge would be removed from the state trunk highway system and converted to a bicycle/pedestrian facility. Alternative D also includes upgrades to the Minnesota and Wisconsin approach roadways; and
- Alternative E includes the construction of a new one-way two-lane bridge over the St. Croix River for eastbound traffic into Wisconsin and use of the Lift Bridge for two lanes of one-way westbound traffic into downtown Stillwater. The new bridge is located in the same location as the four-lane bridge for Alternative D. Alternative E also includes upgrades to the approach roadways in Minnesota and Wisconsin.

As shown in Table E-1 and described in the draft Section 4(f) evaluations, construction of the Build Alternatives would result in the “use” of a range of the Section 4(f) resources in the project area. Alternative B-1 or Alternative C would result in the “use” of eight of the Section 4(f) resources, depending upon the disposition of the Lift Bridge. Alternative D, with a closer proximity to downtown Stillwater, would result in the “use” of nine of the Section 4(f) resources in the project area. Alternative E, also close to downtown Stillwater, would result in the “use” of eight of the Section 4(f) resources, with the exception of the Lift Bridge (the Lift Bridge would remain on the state trunk highway system for vehicular traffic). All of the Build Alternatives would, at a minimum, result in the “use” of the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway (also protected under Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968).

**TABLE E-1
SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES AND BUILD ALTERNATIVES – SUMMARY OF 4(f) USE**

Section 4(f) Resource	Additional Federal Law(s)⁽¹⁾	River Crossing Alternative(s)	4(f) Use⁽²⁾ of the Affected Resource
Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway	7(a)	All Build Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build Alternative piers would be placed in river. • Temporary construction occupancy.
Lift Bridge	106	B-1 C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lift Bridge would be removed from the state trunk highway system (potential 4(f) use). • Alternatives B-1 and C may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – conversion of the Lift Bridge and causeway as a pedestrian/bicycle facility and removal/blockage of approach roadways to the Lift Bridge; or – maintaining the Lift Bridge for local vehicular access.
		D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lift Bridge would be removed from the state trunk highway system (potential 4(f) use). • Conversion of the Lift Bridge and causeway as a pedestrian/bicycle facility.
		E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 4(f) use; avoidance alternative (see Section III).
Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility Property (planned Stillwater park)	106	B-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land occupied for park access road and trail.
		C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquired (temporary and permanent) for bridge abutment. • Land occupied for park access road and trail.
		D E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquired (temporary and permanent) for bridge abutment, approach roadways, and related infrastructure (e.g., retaining walls, stormwater ponds). • Land occupied for park access road and trail. • Construction impacts to Hersey & Bean archaeological site.

⁽¹⁾7(a) = Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968; 106 = Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

⁽²⁾The term “use” is strictly defined under FHWA guidelines for implementation of Section 4(f). A 4(f) “use” can include acquisition, temporary or permanent occupancy, or proximity impacts which substantially impair the purposes for which the 4(f) resource exists (constructive use).

TABLE E-1 (continued)
SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES AND BUILD ALTERNATIVES – SUMMARY OF 4(f) USE

Section 4(f) Resource	Additional Federal Law(s) ⁽¹⁾	River Crossing Alternative(s)	4(f) Use ⁽²⁾ of the Affected Resource
Kolliner Park	106	B-1 C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary construction occupancy if the existing land access to the park is changes with conversion of the Lift Bridge to a pedestrian/bicycle facility.
		D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land acquisition (temporary and permanent) from park for bridge abutment, approach roadways and related infrastructure (e.g., retaining walls, stormwater ponds). Land occupied for trail in park from eastern boundary to the Lift Bridge.
		E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land acquisition (temporary and permanent) from park for bridge abutment, approach roadways and related infrastructure (e.g., retaining walls, stormwater ponds). Land occupied for trail in park from the eastern park boundary to the Alternative E bridge and Lift Bridge.
Lowell Park	106	B-1 C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor modification to park (e.g., structures to prevent vehicle use of Lift Bridge) with conversion of the Lift Bridge to a pedestrian/bicycle facility.
		D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor modification to park (e.g., structures to prevent vehicle use of Lift Bridge) with conversion of the Lift Bridge to a pedestrian/bicycle facility.
		E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary construction occupancy during rehabilitation of the Lift Bridge.

⁽¹⁾7(a) = Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968; 106 = Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

⁽²⁾The term “use” is strictly defined under FHWA guidelines for implementation of Section 4(f). A 4(f) “use” can include acquisition, temporary or permanent occupancy, or proximity impacts which substantially impair the purposes for which the 4(f) resource exists.

TABLE E-1 (continued)
SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES AND BUILD ALTERNATIVES – SUMMARY OF 4(f) USE

Section 4(f) Resource	Additional Federal Law(s) ⁽¹⁾	River Crossing Alternative(s)	4(f) Use ⁽²⁾ of the Affected Resource
New Stillwater Park (yet unnamed city park in Stillwater at South 2 nd and Nelson Streets)	None	B-1 C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 4(f) use; avoidance alternative (see Section III).
		D E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential constructive use.
Stillwater Commercial Historic District	106	B-1 C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion of Lift Bridge to pedestrian/bicycle facility would result in minor modifications to Lowell Park – a contributing element of the Commercial Historic District.
		D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversion of Lift Bridge to pedestrian/bicycle facility would result in minor modifications to Lowell Park – a contributing element of the Commercial Historic District.
		E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary construction occupancy from roadway reconstruction in Commercial Historic District and Lowell Park. Temporary construction occupancy during rehabilitation of the Lift Bridge.
Stillwater Cultural Landscape District	106	B-1 C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of Lift Bridge (contributing element to the Cultural Landscape District) from state trunk highway system with conversion to pedestrian/bicycle facility or use for local vehicular traffic (potential 4(f) use).
		D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of Lift Bridge (contributing element to the Cultural Landscape District) from state trunk highway system with conversion to pedestrian/bicycle facility or use for local vehicular traffic (potential 4(f) use). Land acquired (temporary and permanent) for bridge abutment and approach roadways.

⁽¹⁾ 7(a) = Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968; 106 = Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

⁽²⁾ The term “use” is strictly defined under FHWA guidelines for implementation of Section 4(f). A 4(f) “use” can include acquisition, temporary or permanent occupancy, or proximity impacts which substantially impair the purposes for which the 4(f) resource exists.

**TABLE E-1 (continued)
SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES AND BUILD ALTERNATIVES – SUMMARY OF 4(f) USE**

Section 4(f) Resource	Additional Federal Law(s) ⁽¹⁾	River Crossing Alternative(s)	4(f) Use ⁽²⁾ of the Affected Resource
Stillwater Cultural Landscape District – continued	106	D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquired in Kolliner Park – a contributing element to the Cultural Landscape District. • Land acquired in Stillwater Municipal Barge facility at the Hersey & Bean archaeological site – a contributing element to the Cultural Landscape District.
		E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquired (temporary and permanent) for bridge abutment and approach roadways. • Land acquired in Kolliner Park – a contributing element to the Cultural Landscape District. • Land acquired in Stillwater Municipal Barge facility at the Hersey & Bean archaeological site – a contributing element to the Cultural Landscape District. • Temporary construction occupancy.
Fairview Cemetery	106	All Build Alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land acquired (temporary and permanent) for north frontage road.

⁽¹⁾ 7(a) = Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968; 106 = Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

⁽²⁾ The term “use” is strictly defined under FHWA guidelines for implementation of Section 4(f). A 4(f) “use” can include acquisition, temporary or permanent occupancy, or proximity impacts which substantially impair the purposes for which the 4(f) resource exists.

It should be noted that Xcel Energy is considering development of their fly ash landfill, located within the project area in Minnesota, as a park for Oak Park Heights. The landfill, referred to as the A.S. King Ash Disposal Facility, or the “Moelter site”, is bound by TH 36 to the north, Beach Road and the Beach Road overpass to the east, and Valley View Park to the south. The Moelter site was originally a sand and gravel quarry, but has been used by Xcel as a landfill for fly ash storage from the nearby King Power Plant since 1972. A paved trail is currently located on the site surrounding the active portion of the landfill. Xcel Energy has been in discussion with Oak Park Heights in planning a park development on the Moelter site once the landfill has been filled and capped.

The construction of the south frontage road from Osgood Avenue to Stagecoach Trail would require property along the northern boundary of the site for all Build Alternatives. The proposed south frontage road associated with all Build Alternatives has been incorporated into the preliminary park plans, and would not impact any of the proposed park facilities. Section 4(f) only applies to existing resources or planned resources if the agency that owns the resources has formally designated it and determined it to be significant for park purposes. Section 4(f) also only applies to public resources, or in some instances, privately owned land leased to a public agency, depending upon the terms of the lease. The Moelter site property would remain in private ownership (Xcel Energy) and the terms of the lease, if the site is to be developed as a park, have not been determined.

Moreover, the development of the site as a park by Xcel Energy is in negotiation, and the proposed park is not a guaranteed development. The conversion of the site to a park is also subject to Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) review as a condition of the solid waste permit (Permit Number SW-54) for the site. The MPCA has final authority to grant use of the Moelter site as a park facility.

B. PROJECT HISTORY

Alternatives B-1, C, D and E are the remaining alternatives being studied in the SDEIS. However, a number of other river crossing location alternatives have been considered in the EIS process. The earliest consideration of this replacement bridge crossing by Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT occurred in the early 1970s, but was not considered further because of a lack of funding. Current analysis of a replacement bridge crossing began with the FHWA Notice of Intent published in the Federal Register on October 18, 1985 to prepare an EIS for the replacement of a substandard, two-lane bridge in Stillwater, Minnesota. The original Scoping Decision Document/Final Study Outline for the project was developed in 1987. Four broad corridors were studied during the original scoping process, three corridors with multiple alignments were studied in the 1990 Draft EIS, and a preferred alternative was selected in the 1995 Final EIS.

A facilitation process, known as the Braun Facilitation Process (see Chapter 1), was conducted in 1998 after a NPS negative project finding under Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and a federal court ruling upholding that finding, prevented the 1995 Final EIS Preferred

Alternative from proceeding. Following the 1998 facilitation process, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed by FHWA, NPS, Mn/DOT, and Wis/DOT committing to the evaluation of the Braun Facilitation Process recommendations in a supplemental environmental review process. Three river crossing alternatives were considered during the Braun Facilitation Process, and one alternative was formally proposed for environmental review in a 1999 Amended Scoping Decision Document. This process was halted in January 2001 due to the inability of federal, state and local agencies to reach a consensus on the future of the Lift Bridge, insufficient federal funding for the mitigation alternatives, and failure to obtain municipal consent on the project.

In June 2003, discussion regarding scoping alternatives was reinitiated as part of the Stakeholder Resolution Process. At the Stakeholder Group meetings, all alternatives previously studied, as well as new alternatives, were to be reconsidered (see Chapter 15 of the SDEIS). The alternatives that were considered in the 1985 Scoping Document and evaluated in the 1990 Draft EIS as well as the Braun Facilitation Process alternatives were considered by the Stakeholders. Through the Stakeholder Resolution Process, and with guidance from the adopted Operating Agreement, five alternatives were selected by the Stakeholder Group and presented in the 2003 Amended Scoping Document (2003 ASD). The five alternatives were narrowed down to four alternatives; these four alternatives, with modifications, were presented in the 2004 Amended Final Scoping Decision Document (2004 AFSD) and are described below.

Alternative B-1

Alternative B-1 was initially reviewed in the 1990 Draft EIS as part of what was referred to as the South Corridor. Alternative B-1 was then later proposed as the “South Ravine Option” of Alternative B (1995 Final EIS Preferred Alternative) in the 2003 ASD as an alternative alignment to Alternative B³. Further discussion with the NPS indicated that a reversal of a previous negative project finding of the Alternative B alignment with a different bridge type or profile was not likely. Thus, the “South Ravine Option” of Alternative B (renamed Alternative B-1 in the 2004 AFSD) was recommended for inclusion in the SDEIS.

Alternative C

Alternative C was the result of the Braun Facilitation Process. In February 1999, Alternative C, known as the “Consensus Alternative” at the time, was formally proposed for environmental review in an Amended Scoping Decision Document. Evaluation of this “Consensus Alternative” was halted in 2001 for reasons listed above. Alternative C was later selected for evaluation by the Stakeholder Group in the 2003 ASD and recommended for inclusion in the SDEIS.

³ The Alternative B-1 alignment is located at approximately the same location along the Minnesota shoreline of the St. Croix River as Alternative B, and about 1,000 feet south of Alternative B along the Wisconsin shoreline.

Alternative D

Alternative D was one of the three alignments considered during the Braun Facilitation Process, known at the time as “Braun Alternative A.” This alignment is also very similar to a central corridor alignment studied as part of the 1990 Draft EIS.

The Alternative D alignment was reintroduced for evaluation in 2003 with the Stakeholder Resolution Process. In the 2003 ASD, Alternative D included vehicular access to the Lift Bridge at the Wisconsin shore along the existing STH 64 roadway alignment. However, subsequent studies indicated that Alternative D as presented in the 2003 ASD would have substantial impacts to the river bluff in Wisconsin. Thus, Alternative D was revised in the 2004 AFSDD to remove vehicular access to the Lift Bridge in Wisconsin and convert the Lift Bridge to a pedestrian/bicycle facility. Access to and from downtown Stillwater to the new, four-lane bridge of Alternative D would be provided in Minnesota. Following these revisions to Alternative D, it was recommended for inclusion in the SDEIS.

Alternative E

Alternative E was first proposed for evaluation in 2002 following suspension of the “Consensus Alternative” evaluation. Known as the “Three Architects Proposal”, it included a new, two-lane, one-way eastbound bridge near the Lift Bridge, and converting the Lift Bridge to a two-lane, one-way crossing for westbound traffic from Wisconsin. The new, two-lane, one-way bridge for eastbound traffic would follow the alignment of the Alternative D river crossing.

The “Three Architects Proposal” was selected by the Stakeholder Group and presented in the 2003 ASD as Alternative E. Alternative E was refined in the 2004 AFSDD and recommended for inclusion in the SDEIS.

Potential impacts of the Build Alternatives on the St. Croix River are assessed throughout the SDEIS. Particularly relevant chapters include:

- Chapter 4: Transportation Systems and Impacts;
- Chapter 5: Social, Relocation, and Economic Impacts;
- Chapter 7: Visual Impact Analysis;
- Chapter 8: Air Quality, Traffic Noise, and Contaminated Sites;
- Chapter 9: Natural Resource Impacts;
- Chapter 10: Water Resources;
- Chapter 12: Construction Impacts; and,
- Chapter 13: Cumulative Impacts.

Readers should refer to these chapters for full discussions of potential impacts on the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway and other Section 4(f) resources.

III. AVOIDANCE ALTERNATIVES

As listed below and described in the Draft Section 4(f) evaluations, it is not possible to avoid all Section 4(f) resources with any one of the proposed Build Alternatives. There are trade-offs associated with the avoidance of the Section 4(f) resources. Avoidance of one particular Section 4(f) resource could result in the use of another Section 4(f) resource. For example, although Alternative E could avoid use of the Lift Bridge, it could not avoid use of Kolliner Park or the Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility property.

Below is a list of each Section 4(f) resource, the avoidance alternative for that resource, and a brief description of why the Build Alternative would avoid the Section 4(f) resource. Refer to the individual draft Section 4(f) evaluations for additional detail on impacts and avoidance of the Build Alternatives.

- Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway – cannot be avoided by any one of the Build Alternatives;
- Lift Bridge – Alternative E (the Lift Bridge remains on the state trunk highway system for two lanes of one-way westbound traffic);
- Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility property – cannot be avoided by any one of the Build Alternatives;
- Kolliner Park – Alternative B-1 and Alternative C (Alternative B-1 and Alternative C river crossings are located south of Kolliner Park);
- Lowell Park – Alternative B-1, Alternative C and Alternative E (Alternative B-1 and Alternative C could avoid use of Lowell Park if the Lift Bridge is maintained for local traffic; Alternative E would avoid use of Lowell Park by maintaining Lift Bridge and existing Minnesota approach roadway for state trunk highway traffic);
- New Stillwater Park (yet unnamed park) – Alternatives B-1 and C;
- Stillwater Commercial Historic District – Alternative B-1 and Alternative C (Alternatives B-1 and C are located south of the Commercial Historic District and can avoid use of Lowell Park [contributing element of the district] if the Lift Bridge is maintained for local traffic); and
- Stillwater Cultural Landscape District – cannot be avoided by any one of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives B-1 and C from use of the Lift Bridge; Alternatives D and E would be constructed in the Cultural Landscape District).

IV. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

Table E-2 identifies the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed and determined eligible properties within the project area. The table also identifies if there is a Section 4(f) use of the property. If there is not a Section 4(f) use, a brief explanation of why a Section 4(f) evaluation is not needed is also listed. For most historic resources where there is not a

Section 4(f) use, it is because the Build Alternatives are not located within close proximity to the resource and would not require the acquisition of property from the historic resource. Refer to Chapter 11 of the SDEIS for additional information on archaeological and historic resources and figures illustrating the location of the historic resources within the study area.

V. DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY MITIGATION ITEMS

A list of potential mitigation items applicable to all Build Alternatives is summarized below and described in Chapter 14 of the SDEIS. Upon identification of a Preferred Alternative, a mitigation package appropriate to the level of impacts will be identified from the list of mitigation items as well as additional mitigation items identified by agencies or the public during the SDEIS comment period. Those mitigation items which result in the “use” of a Section 4(f) resource will be discussed in the Supplemental Final EIS. The Build Alternatives and potential mitigation items were developed in an attempt to consider the competing requirements of three federal laws (Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966; Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968; and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966) and are listed as follows.

- Bridge type selection;
- Removal of Xcel barge unloading facility and mooring cells;
- Purchase of offsetting bluffslands, including potential restoration of previously developed land;
- Bluffland restoration (e.g., removal of the Buckhorn sign, restoration of the Wisconsin approach to the Lift Bridge);
- Riverway interpretation items;
- Recreation amenities (i.e., sanitation facilities);
- Provision of a public boat access;
- Development of a pedestrian/bicycle loop trail system;
- Assistance with the acquisition of the Aiple Property north of downtown Stillwater;
- Participation with the City of Stillwater in the development of the Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility Property;
- Support for master plans of affected parks;
- Restoration of Kolliner Park lands;
- Covenants on excess property owned by Mn/DOT and Wis/DOT within the riverway;
- Land use items (e.g., land use planning support, funding for local planning assistance, regional infrastructure planning support, educational programs);

**TABLE E-2
SUMMARY OF NRHP-LISTED AND DETERMINED ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES**

Property Name	NRHP-listed or Determined Eligible	Section 4(f) Use	Section 4(f) Use Determination
Log Cabin Restaurant (Club Tara)	Determined Eligible	No	Land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives. ⁽¹⁾
Bergstein Shoddy Mill	Determined Eligible	Yes	A Section 4(f) evaluation was completed with the 1990 DEIS and 1995 FEIS.
Stillwater State Historic Prison	NRHP Listed; 22 contributing properties, 8 non-contributing	No	Located south of the Build Alternatives – land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives.
St. Croix Overlook	Determined Eligible	No	Land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives. ⁽¹⁾
William N. Danforth House	Determined Eligible	No	Located west of the Build Alternatives – land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives.
Fairview Cemetery	Determined Eligible	Yes	Draft Section 4(f) evaluation prepared.
Slab Alley	Recommended Eligible; review pending	Yes	Area included with draft Section 4(f) evaluation of the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District. If found eligible, additional information will be provided in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation.
Hersey and Bean Site	Potentially eligible; undergoing testing to confirm site boundaries	Yes	Site included with draft Section 4(f) evaluation of the Stillwater Cultural Landscape District.
Stillwater & St. Paul Railroad	Recommended Eligible	No	Located north of Build Alternatives – land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives.

⁽¹⁾ These historic resources are located near the Build Alternatives, however, there would be no constructive use because the properties would not be substantially impaired by the construction of the Build Alternatives.

TABLE E-2 (continued)
SUMMARY OF NRHP-LISTED AND DETERMINED ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES

Property Name	NRHP-listed or Determined Eligible	Section 4(f) Use	Section 4(f) Use Determination
St. Croix Boomsite	National Historic Landmark	No	Located north of Build Alternatives – land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives.
Lift Bridge	NRHP Listed; contributing to Stillwater Cultural Landscape District	Yes	Draft Section 4(f) evaluation prepared.
Stillwater Commercial Historic District	NRHP-Listed; 82 properties; Lift Bridge not included	Yes	Draft Section 4(f) evaluation prepared.
Stillwater Cultural Landscape District	Determined Eligible; 247 contributing properties and 187 non-contributing properties;3 contributing archaeological sites; Lift Bridge included	Yes	Draft Section 4(f) evaluation prepared.
Thelen Farmstead	Determined Eligible	No	Land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives. ⁽¹⁾
St. Croix Hilltop Drive-In Theatre	Determined Eligible	No	Land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives. ⁽¹⁾
Kreisel Farmstead	Potentially Eligible; review pending	No	Land from property not acquired for Build Alternatives. ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ These historic resources are located near the Build Alternatives, however, there would be no constructive use because the properties would not be substantially impaired by the construction of the Build Alternatives.

- Land conservation items – primarily focused on western Wisconsin (e.g., protection of sensitive areas vulnerable to development, contribution to a prairie restoration program, contribution to wetland protection areas, purchase of conservation easements);
- Endowment for Lift Bridge operations and maintenance;
- Development and implementation of a Lift Bridge Management Plan; and
- Restoration of the St. Croix Overlook.

The mitigation items will consider the requirements of three federal laws while still allowing the project to proceed. The purpose of the mitigation items will be to provide adequate mitigation for impacts on the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway to allow a positive Section 7(a) determination for the project under the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Without a positive review of the project and its mitigation items under Section 7(a), federal permits for the project will not be granted, and it will not be possible to implement the project. The mitigation items will also address impacts of the Preferred Alternative to cultural resources and parkland.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Potential impacts on Section 4(f) resources from the St. Croix River Crossing Project would result from direct impacts related to the construction of the Build Alternatives. Potential impacts from measures proposed to mitigate the project’s impacts on the Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway and the river valley will be incorporated into the Supplemental Final EIS with the selection of a Preferred Alternative. Table E-3 summarizes the use of Section 4(f) resources in the project area for the Build Alternatives. The nine Draft Section 4(f) Evaluations that follow describe in detail the potentially affected Section 4(f) resources, potential impacts of the No-Build Alternative and Build Alternatives, and measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts on each resource.

**TABLE E-3
SUMMARY OF BUILD ALTERNATIVES SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES**

Section 4(f) Resources	Alternative B-1	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E
Lower St. Croix National Scenic Riverway	x	x	x	x
Lift Bridge	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	
Stillwater Municipal Barge Facility Property	x	x	x	x
Lowell Park	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	x
Kolliner Park	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	x	x
New Stillwater Park			x ⁽²⁾	x ⁽²⁾
Stillwater Commercial Historic District	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	x	x
Stillwater Cultural Landscape District	x ⁽¹⁾	x ⁽¹⁾	x	x
Fairview Cemetery	x	x	x	x

⁽¹⁾There is potential use of these Section 4(f) resources pending disposition of the Lift Bridge.

⁽²⁾Potential constructive use.