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THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PROCEDURE

The Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act (WEPA), Section 1.11, Wisconsin Statutes, became effective on April 29, 1972. This law requires that all state agencies prepare an environmental impact statement for every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and that a public hearing be held on those proposals other than for legislation. The Department of Natural Resources, therefore, is required to prepare environmental impact statements on Department proposals and proposals over which it has permitting authority, if the proposal is determined to be a major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Governor's Executive Order Number 69 established guidelines to be used by state agencies for implementing WEPA. The guidelines require that the agency prepare a preliminary environmental report, followed by an environmental impact statement and a public hearing. Under these guidelines, the preliminary environmental report (PER) is circulated for a 45-day review to state, federal, and local agencies with expertise or concerns related to the project, and it is also made available to the public. Comments and questions submitted to the Department on the PER are used to develop an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS is circulated to the commenting agencies and the public for a 30-day review. A hearing is then held to receive the views of the public on the Department's environmental impact statement. Following the public hearing, the Department formulates a conclusion on its decision for the proposed action. This decision is circulated to commenting agencies and the public.

Both the PER and the EIS are full-disclosure documents which provide a full description of the proposed project, the existing environment and an analysis of the anticipated environmental effects.

The review schedule for the proposed acquisition, development and management of Lake Mendota State Park, Dane County is as follows:

Date PER released: January 30, 1975
Review Deadline on PER: March 17, 1975
Date EIS released: May 10, 1975
Review Deadline on EIS: June 20, 1975
Hearing Date: June 20, 1975

Comments should be addressed to:
Mr. C. D. Beadley
Department of Natural Resources
Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701
1. **Type of Action:**

   (X) Administrative Action
   ( ) Legislative Action

2. **Description of the Action:**

   The Department of Natural Resources proposes to acquire 446 acres of property, including 2,600 feet of frontage on the northwest shore of 7,700-acre Lake Mendota, Dane County. The acquisition will involve sixteen parcels including three farm units and three private recreation camp facilities. Seven of these parcels will involve residential relocation.

   The Department also proposes to develop the park as a multi-season day use and resource protection area. Use areas will include a 300-foot beach and boat access ramp, and two day use areas with picnic shelters, toilets, facilities and open space for field sports. A group day use facility is proposed for the former Camp Wakanida site. Parking lots will accommodate 650 cars, with an additional car/trailer stalls at the boat launch.

   Approximately 52 acres of the proposed park will be developed into park roads, parking lots, picnic areas, beach and boat launch. A private establishment project and hiking trails are also proposed. Wetlands within the project boundary would not be developed.

   A state park sticker will be required for entrance to the park.

3. **Summary of Environmental Impacts:**

   The proposed state park will initiate a more toward urban-oriented state park development. Its accessibility and day use designation will encourage visits by Middleton residents and capital visitors with minimal expenditures of financial and energy resources.

   Construction impacts will be largely limited to the disturbance of 52 acres of mainly agricultural and recreational land and the effects of construction vehicle emissions.

   Road rerouting may cause some inconvenience to subdivision residents.

   The water quality of Lake Mendota and the lower tributary creeks will be maintained by controlled preservation of sediment and nutrient trapping wetlands and by elimination of some rural runoff problem sources. Existing high nutrient levels and expected occasional high bacterial counts may be a problem affecting both swimming use and aesthetics of the Lake Mendota State Park beach.

   The acquisition and development of Lake Mendota State Park will take 299 acres of farmland out of agricultural production and preclude alternative land uses for the total site area. State park use will in effect, eliminate population growth and residential development within the site.

   Regional development pressures, residential development on adjacent lands and population may increase at a slightly higher rate. However, Lake Mendota State Park will act as an open space buffer along the lakeshore.

   The proposed development will slightly reduce the local tax base, while enhancing private investment and sales activity of the area. Economic benefits will accrue in recreational, food and beverage and accommodations businesses.

4. **Alternatives Considered:**

   a. No action
   b. Less intensive development
   c. Reduction of park boundaries
   d. Expansion of park boundaries
   e. More intensive development
   f. No beach
   g. Road route alternatives
   h. Alternate sites
   i. Action by other agencies
   j. Use of Lake Mendota State Park by private organizations
5. List of Federal, State and Local Agencies from which Comments have been Requested:

a. Federal Agencies
   - Environmental Protection Agency
   - U.S. Department of the Interior - National Park Service
   - Soil Conservation Service
   - U.S. Department of Agriculture - Forest Service
   - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

b. State Agencies
   - Department of Administration
   - Department of Justice
   - Department of Health and Social Services
   - Department of Transportation
   - Department of Local Affairs and Development
   - Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations
   - Department of Agriculture
   - State Historical Society
   - Public Service Commission
   - Department of Public Instruction
   - Department of Revenue

c. Local Agencies
   - Dane County Clerk
   - Chairman, Town of Westport
   - Chairman, Town of Middleton
   - President, Village of Waunakee
   - Mayor, City of Middleton
   - Dane County Regional Planning Commission
   - Dane County Parks Commission
   - Dane County Highway Commission
   - City of Madison - Parks Division
   - City of Madison - Department of Public Health
   - Mayor, City of Madison
   - President, Village of Shorewood Hills
   - President, Village of Maple Bluff

d. Other
   - Scientific Areas Preservation Council

* Indicates agencies which commented on the preliminary environmental report. These comments are attached to the Environmental Impact Statement as Appendix B.
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DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT
AND PROPOSED ACTION

INTRODUCTION
The Department of Natural Resources proposes to acquire, develop and manage a state park on the northwest shore of Lake Mendota in Dane County. The site of the proposed park is located in sections 28 and 33, T5N, R9E, Town of Westport, Dane County (see Figure 1). The site encompasses approximately 441 acres of agricultural land, lowland marsh and upland hardwoods and includes 2,100 feet of lake frontage. Lake Mendota State Park would be operated as a multiuse facility with emphasis on water-based recreation and day use activities. Development proposals include a 300 foot beach with parking for 200 cars and a boat access ramp on the lakeshore. Two areas totaling 40 acres will accommodate picnicking, with parking for 350 cars. The southern part of the site would be utilized for group day use activities. A state park admission sticker would be required.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The proposed park site was influenced by the Green Bay lobe of the Continental glacier. The lower lands are part of the glacial Yahara River basin while the higher ground has deposits of glacial till and drumlin field hills. Lake Mendota itself was formed by ice damming of glacial meltwater.

All of Dane County is underlain by Eocene Cambrian sandstone of the Potosi association, which serves as a primary water reservoir. Resistive lower Pleistocene tills cap low hills. At the proposed park site, the sandstone bedrock lies fairly near the surface.

ELEVATIONS

The landscape of the proposed Lake Mendota State Park site varies from lowland marsh to rolling hills, with the point of greatest elevation at 660 feet above sea level. Contrasting with Lake Mendota's elevation of 609 feet, the high point provides a panoramic view of the City of Madison, the surrounding agricultural lands and Lake Mendota.

About half of the site has a slope gradient of 5 to 5 percent, one-fourth of the site slopes from 5 to 10 percent and one-fourth has slopes exceeding 10 percent. Figure 10 shows slopes and design guidelines for the park site (see Figure 2).

SOILS

The soils found within the proposed park site are generally of the loam and till loam types, with organic silt loam type soils in the wetlands (see Figure 3). The Dane County Interim Soil Survey Reports 1991 classifies these soils in the Wisconsin-Region-Palm association. These soils range from poorly drained mineral and organic types to well-drained benthic types. Minor association constituents include Marshan, Fox, Hatfield, Wacouta, Adrian, Colwood, Mashon and Houghton soils. These soils pose moderate limitations for cropping when drained and slight to very severe limitations for on-site sewage disposal.

An analysis of soil suitability is presented in the following table:

**Table 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reclamation Soil Suitability Analysis - Lake Mendota State Park Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well drained loam, Fox loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well drained silt, Kepomac, Bacaiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly drained silt, loams and organic soils, Hayfield silt loam, Palm silt, Wacouta silt clay, Marshan-organic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Suitability
Mineral Resources

Geology of the site indicates that mineral resources in the form of sand, gravel, and sandstone may be present as a part of the park site substructure. Dane County has widely available sources of all of these materials. No other mineral deposits are known on the site in commercially feasible concentrations.

Surface Water Features

Surface water features of the proposed park site are Six-Mile Creek, Spring Creek and Lake Mendota.

Lake Mendota

Lake Mendota is a hard water lake formed by morainic damming of the preglacial Yahara River. Lake levels are presently augmented by a lock and dam which create an additional 3-foot head. Mendota is the largest of four Madison lakes which form a chain along the Yahara River valley. The lake's drainage area is about 250 square miles, currently under both agricultural and urban land uses. Figure 4 indicates surface water features in the Lake Mendota State Park area.

Lake Mendota has a surface area of 9,700 acres, a total volume of approximately 400,000 acre feet and a maximum depth of 86 feet. Tributary waters flowing into the lake, including the Yahara River, contribute approximately 100 cubic feet per second of flow or approximately 200 acre feet per day.

The lake bottom in the vicinity of the proposed park site is firm and sandy with a very low gradient near shore. The water depth near the northern extremity of the site is shallow. Further south, along the southern boundary of the former Camp Indiandia, water is much deeper. Bottom materials consist of sand and gravel, with silt concentrations farther from shore.

Water Quality

Water quality data for Lake Mendota has been summarized by the State Lab of Hygiene (see Table 2). November, 1970, data show an average pH of 8.1, hardness of 180 and alkalinity of 149. Lake Mendota ranges in surface water temperature from 32°F in the month of January to approximately 77°F in the month of July. Dissolved oxygen measurements at the middle of the hypolimnion vary from 0.0 in September to 13.1 in March (see Table 3). Hypolimnetic waters of the lake become devoid of oxygen during summer stratification and during late winter oxygen depletion occurs in bottom waters. The lake is classified as eutrophic with relatively high nutrient levels and a warmwater fishery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>WATER QUALITY - LAKE MENDEOTA</th>
<th>State Lab of Hygiene 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Mendota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Dane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Acres)</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Depth (Feet)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH (Nov.)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardness (Nov.)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalinity (Nov.)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plankton Nuisance</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chara Nuisance</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Nuisance</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lake Mendota State Park
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Slope Design Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Suggested Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park roads</td>
<td>2-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lots</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawns and seeded areas</td>
<td>1:3 Slope maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach sunning areas</td>
<td>2-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach sand blanket</td>
<td>2-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking trails</td>
<td>0-15% Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ski touring trails</td>
<td>0-15% Maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
### TABLE 3. TEMPERATURE AND DISSOLVED OXYGEN - LAKE MENDOTA - 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Middle of Hypolimnion</th>
<th>1 m above bottom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historically, Lake Mendota has been plagued with rather extensive algal blooms. Poor land use practices in the upper part of the Yahara watershed, coupled with recent shoreline development, have increased this eutrophication process.**

Recent estimates by the Water Chemistry Department of the University of Wisconsin of nutrient sources to Lake Mendota attribute 63 percent of the total phosphorous and 43.5 percent of the total nitrogen to rural runoff (see Table 4). The nonpoint source nature of these inputs makes their elimination a difficult land use problem.

### TABLE 4. ESTIMATED NUTRIENT SOURCES FOR LAKE MENDOTA FOLLOWING ELIMINATION OF TREATED WASTE WATER DISCHARGES FROM WAUNAKEE, DEFOREST AND WINEGAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Phosphorus</th>
<th>Nitrogen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste water discharges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban runoff</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural runoff</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric precipitation on lake surface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry fallout on lake surface</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater seepage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base flow</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen fixation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland runoff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh drainage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Negligible
Lake Mendota State Park
Soil Types

FIG. 3
Occasional sanitary system accidents and rural runoff in the form of animal manure wastes contribute to periodic beach closings on the lake. According to the City of Madison Department of Public Health, four separate instances of beach closings occurred during the summer of 1974. Marshall Park beach was closed from May 17 to May 28 after sewage was accidentally discharged to the beach area due to sewerage facilities with insufficient capacity. This condition has since been corrected by the construction of an additional sewage pumping station and transmission line. Shorewood Hills beach was closed from June 29 to July 2 and Warner Park beach was closed from July 6 to August 2. Positive sources of contamination for these closings are undetermined.

Pollution

High fecal coliform counts are related to periods of greater than average runoff as well as to accidental spillage, emergency overflow and dumping of small volumes of sanitary wastes. The sanitary wastes problem has become less critical since the diversion of sewage effluent from three rural communities in 1977. Although Lake Mendota is subject to these intermittent water quality problems, the sanitary water quality for the lake and beaches as a whole remains high.

Six-Mile Creek

Six-Mile Creek is 8.9 miles in length with a gradient of 13.5 feet per mile. It is a marsh drainage stream tributary to the Yahara River by way of Lake Mendota. Its tributary, Spring (Sorel) Creek is 6.0 miles in length with a gradient of 4.2 feet per mile. Together, Six-Mile and Dorn Creeks contribute approximately 22 cfs of flow to Lake Mendota. This represents about 20 percent of the total daily inflow to the lake.

GROUNDWATER

The groundwater table in the vicinity of the proposed park site is primarily controlled by the water level of Lake Mendota. Cambrian sandstone bedrock is the primary aquifer. High levels of iron, up to 3 ppm, have been reported in groundwater samples in the surrounding area. There has been no groundwater supply problem in the area in the past.

CLIMATE

Madison has the typical semi-humid continental climate of Interior North America with a large annual temperature range and with frequent short period temperature changes. Winter temperatures (December-February) average 20°F and the annual average (June-August) is 70°F. Daily mean temperatures average below 32°F for 108 days and above 45°F for 210 days of the year.

There are no dry and wet seasons, but 58 percent of the average annual 30 inches of precipitation falls in the five months of May through September.

March and November are the windiest months. The most frequent air masses are of polar origin, causing occasional low winter temperatures. Northerly moving tropical air masses contribute cloudiness and precipitation. The summers are pleasant with only occasional extreme heat or high humidity.

AIR QUALITY

The nearest air quality monitoring station to the site is in the City of Madison at the Oribich Park. Average annual concentrations of sulfur dioxide and particulates can be found in Table 5.

**Table 5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Average Annual Concentration in μg/m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulates</td>
<td>20-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural practices may be responsible for additional particulates from fugitive dust due to plowing and harvesting operations. Data regarding nitrogen oxide, hydrogen sulfide and oxidant levels are presently unavailable from the Oribich Park station.

Local Sources

Local air emission sources for the City of Madison are relatively few. Industrial type sources in the area of the proposed park site include a large meat packing facility, a Cannery, an asphalt plant and gravel pit, a cement plant, an oil storage facility, a municipal power plant and various coal-fired boilers and power facilities associated with the University of Wisconsin and other institutions.
In addition to the above sources, CTH 'M' is a source of auto
emissions.

Odors

The area experiences intermittent odor problems due to decomposition of algal
blooms and aerated aquatic plumes from Lake Mendota. This odor problem is a
direct function of lake eutrophication and is influenced by wind direction,
temperature changes and nutrient loads in the lake system. Agricultural
activities in the area, including a dairy herd presently located within the
proposed park boundary, contribute a limited amount of farm odors.

Noise

Currently, noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed park are low,
reflecting the primarily agricultural nature of the area. However, there is
some existing use of interior trails by trail bikes and snowmobiles, and
motorized boats are allowed on Lake Mendota, creating occasional disturbances.
County Trunk Highway 'M' along the west and north boundary of the proposed park
is the primary source of background noise. C10 noise levels associated with
CTH 'M' generally fall in the range between 70 and 75 dB at 100 feet from
the center line of the highway. C10 values refer to that noise level which
is exceeded, ten percent of the time. Sensitive receptors have not been located
along Highway 'M'.

BIOLOGICAL
ENVIRONMENT

The aquatic vegetation of Lake Mendota consists of phytolankton species, a wide
variety of submerged rooted aquatics and some floating aquatic species. The lake
has experienced increasing numbers of planktonic algae blooms, especially of the
blue green type, as a result of the increased levels of available nutrients.

FLORA
Aquatic

Adjacent to the agriculture land In the north is a wetland area through which
Six-Mile Creek flows. Cattails, sedge, cattley grass, willow and dogwood are
the predominate wetland species. Due to decreased streamflow velocity, this
marshland acts as a sediment and nutrient trap, improving the quality of the
tlower stream and Lake Mendota.

TERRITORIAL

Terrestrial vegetation on the site is diverse, including woodland, wetland
and active and abandoned agricultural fields (See Figure 5). The wooded
areas are composed of mixed hardwoods of the oak-hickory association. Tree
cover along the shoreline includes some hardwoods and a number of cottonwoods,
soft maples, elm, willow, and box elder. Various ornamental plantings are
present in isolated areas of the site.

Approximately 60 percent of the total proposed site acreage is devoted to
agriculture, including woods and cropland. The soils are predominantly
alfalfa-brone hay fields with loam and silt loam fringes of pasture/grass. Much of
the surrounding countryside is cropped for corn. Agricultural practices have
disturbed the natural plant succession of the area.

No unique or rare plant species were observed during site inspections.

FAUNA

Animal and fish species currently found on the park site reflect the area's
human influence. In many cases, the surviving species are adapted to agricultural
field or eutrophic lake conditions.

Aquatic

Lake Mendota is presently managed for bass, ganderfish, northern pike and
walleye, with yellow perch and white bass providing the major pelagic (deep
water) fishery. Largemouth bass populations appear to be stable and yellow
bass populations are increasing. Both ganderfish and white bass numbers are
decreasing due to competitive pressures. Supplemental stocking to the small
native walleye population was initiated on a biennial basis in 1980. Increasing
lake eutrophication accounts for the elimination of the cisco and several other
historically native species.

Six-Mile Creek

The Six-Mile and Dorn Creek fisheries consist primarily of forage and rough
fish species, though some ganderfish are found in limited numbers near the lakes.
These streams also provide optimum spawning habitat for northern pike in the
area. Substantial numbers of northern and walleyes have been captured by
deptment fish managers during spring fry net surveys.
TERRESTRIAL

Terrestrial wildlife habitat is limited primarily to small patches of upland woods, softwood shoreline and the relatively untouched wetland area. Primary species of wildlife include small rodents, raccoons, cotton-tail rabbits, white-tailed deer, muskrat, skunk, gray squirrel and moles. Many species of waterfowl utilizing Lake Mendota and nearby wetlands are found at the proposed park site. Ring-necked pheasant is the primary upland game species. Because of the semi-arid nature of the area, a limited number of other species of reptiles and amphibians utilize the site for nesting or cover. A more complete species list may be found in Appendix A.

Mammals

A moderate number of bird species utilize the proposed park site. Because of the extensive water frontage on Lake Mendota and Six-Mile Creek, a number of waterfowl and shore bird species are found in the area. A list of birds known to utilize or nest on the site is provided in Appendix A.

Birds

Before the coming of white settlers, Indians inhabited the site area. The whole Madison area, and in particular the lake close to the lakes, contains many mounds, burial grounds and encampment sites. The proposed park site has several Indian mounds, the most notable of which is a 202-foot long paragonshaped effigy mound. The paragon mound, a bird effigy and several conical mounds form a group on the Camp Waconda property. The majority of other encampments have been desecrated.

State Historical Preservation Officer

An early Indian trail passed through the area but is now obliterated and partially submerged. Also, a section of old military road route from Green Bay to Prairie du Chien once passed near the park site.

Archaeology

Contact with the State Historical Preservation officer has been established and an evaluation of the proposed project is being made. When the evaluation is finalized and returned to the DNR, its results will become a part of final site planning. Furthermore, specific site investigations will be made for each use area prior to actual excavation and construction.

Population

The population of Dane County was 290,272 in 1970. The Town of Westport had a 1972 population of 2,552. Table 6 shows the populations of incorporated areas in proximity to the proposed state park location according to the census of 1970.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison (city)</td>
<td>171,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton (city)</td>
<td>8,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waunakee (village)</td>
<td>2,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Prairie (city)</td>
<td>9,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deforest (village)</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Plains (village)</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth

The population of Dane County increased by 30.7 percent between 1960 and 1970 as compared with an average state growth of 11.8 percent. Much of this growth can be attributed to the expansion of University of Wisconsin and state government employment. The Town of Westport showed an even more accelerated growth rate of 57.4 percent for the same time period. The 1970 population density of Dane County was 242.4 people per square mile. Thirty-six percent of the Town of Westport’s population was under the age of fourteen. This figure indicates the area’s attraction for family residential development.

Minimum population projections for Dane County for 1990 are estimated between 410,187 and 517,979 (see Table 7).
# TABLE 7. POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR DANE COUNTY

**Dane County Regional Planning Commission Land Use Plan 1973**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>% Increase from 1970</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>% Increase from 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>347,513</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>410,187</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census 1-E</td>
<td>356,933</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>410,963</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCRPC</td>
<td>368,300</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>455,112</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL</td>
<td>376,148</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>476,318</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census III-C</td>
<td>592,707</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>517,929</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If growth rates from the 1960's for the Town of Westport are extrapolated, the 1990 population will approach 6,500.

## LAND USE

There are two major land uses evident in and around the proposed park site (see Figure 6). The largest area of land is utilized for agriculture. Approximately 299 acres or about 60 percent of the total project area is farmland.

Two of the three agricultural landowners are farm management cooperators with the Soil Conservation Service. Approximately two-thirds of the total agricultural lands are cropped. Agricultural yields for the various soil types within these agricultural holdings are shown in Table 8. Depending upon criteria used, according to the Soil Conservation Service, one-half to two-thirds of the site area can be classified as prime agricultural land.

## Residential Use

For the most part, residential land uses are outside the park boundaries. However, seven dwellings are located within the proposed park site.

The three residential subdivisions adjacent to the proposed park boundary, Morris Park, Borchers Beach and Second Ward Beach, are all strip plats that include frontage on Lake Mendota. These subdivisions were platted around the turn of the century as second home recreational lots. Most back lots platted as part of the subdivision are quite small and were never sold. Approximately 60 homes are located in these subdivisions and vary substantially in size, age and upkeep. In most cases the economic value of the subdivision is in the land value rather than the value of the homes and outbuildings. Frontage along this shore of Lake Mendota ranges in value from $300-$500 per front foot.

## Zoning

According to the Dane County Zoning Ordinance, the land within the proposed park boundary is zoned Residential-1, 2, 3 or 4, and Recreational-1 (see Figure 6 and Appendix B). Current uses are also subject to floodplain zoning and shoreland area provisions of the ordinance.

## TRANSPORTATION

Access to the proposed park site is via County Trunk Highway "M". Access to CTH "M" is under control of Dane County’s Controlled Access Ordinance and subject to review and approval of the County Highway and Transportation Committee. Major highway routes with ready access to Highway "M" include State 133, State 19, State 30, U.S. 51, U.S. 181, U.S. 12, U.S. 14, U.S. 18 and Interstate 90-94. Highway "M" now carries daily commercial truck, residential and commuter traffic. Average daily traffic counts for 1972 ranged from 6,440 to 7,870 vehicles per day. The Madison Area Transportation Plan 1970 designates CTH "M" as a standard arterial roadway. Plans to upgrade or widen CTH "M" will be determined by design studies prior to actual improvements. Long-range plans for a north beltline encircling Lake Mendota are as yet very tentative. Access time to the proposed park from any point in Madison is currently one-half hour or less by car.

# Section 4(f)

One of the most important requirements imposed on highway development receiving Federal funds is Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, now Section 1555(f), 49 U.S.C. Section 4(f) applies to lands that are publicly owned, such as parks, including Lake Mendota State Park, recreation areas, wildlife areas and refuges and historical sites.

Before the Federal Highway Administration approves funding for a highway project involving 4(f) lands, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation must determine that there are no prudent and feasible
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FIG. 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Corn (Bu/A)</th>
<th>Silage (T.)</th>
<th>Oats (Bu/A)</th>
<th>Alfalfa Hay (T.)</th>
<th>Bluegrass (AUD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plano silt loam</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia silt loam</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>130-140</td>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>80-85</td>
<td>5.5-6.5</td>
<td>140-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gravelly subsoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer silt loam</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regoda silt loam</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>110-120</td>
<td>14-18</td>
<td>75-95</td>
<td>4.0-5.5</td>
<td>115-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton silt loam</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>110-120</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>70-90</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayfield silt loam</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70-90</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshland silt loam</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox silt loam</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waccota silt loam</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellan sandy loam</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Present agricultural acreage within site boundary
2AUD - Animal Unit Days

TABLE B. AGRICULTURAL YIELDS
Dane County Interim Soil Survey Report 1971

Average Yields Per Acre With High Level Management
alternatives and prepare a statement documenting early consultation, inspection of alternatives and plans to minimize environmental damage. The Section 4(f) statement is usually incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Statement prepared by a sponsor for the proposed highway project. The 4(f) process is further explained in Appendix C, which is taken from "An Overview of the Environmental Activities Process" prepared by the Facilities Development Section of the Wisconsin Division of Highways.

Bus service has recently been extended to the City of Middleton under contract with the City of Madison. Mass transit service may eventually encircle Lake Mendota to include the park site. Prospects are favorable for special transit at peak visitor time periods to recreational areas now outside the service radius.

PUBLIC UTILITIES
Water Supply

The proposed park area does not have a public water supply system. Water is supplied to individual residences and the camps by private wells.

Sanitary Disposal

At this time individual septic tank systems provide sewage disposal to most residences in the area. An extension of the Waunakee interceptor of the City of Madison Nine Springs Treatment Plant serves the Second Ward Beach area and Westport Utility District #2. The extension's design capacity of 750,000 gpd could accommodate residential wastes of approximately 7,000 persons daily.

A 14-inch outlet sewer runs as far as the pumping station at Mendota County Park near the junction of CTHs "M" and "O" about two miles southwest of the proposed park site.

The Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District has no current plans to service the Norris Park and Borcher's Beach subdivisions. According to a 1968 survey of 97 private sewage systems on Lake Mendota waterfront properties, many of these systems are located on soils with poor permeability, high groundwater tables or steep slopes. About 5 percent of the properties surveyed showed evidence of a discharge of sewage onto the ground surface or into the lake. Despite these unfavorable conditions, property owners were maintaining septic tank systems in good operating condition. This survey included parts of the subdivisions adjacent to the Lake Mendota State Park proposed site, and specifies interview by property owners located south of Camp Indiana.

Solid Waste Disposal

Solid wastes generated in the area are transported to disposal sites operated by either the Town of Westport or a landfill operated by the Metropolitan Refuse District. Westport's facility provides open dumping with monthly coverage. The Metropolitan Refuse District, consisting of the municipalities of Shorewood, Waunakee and Middleton, operates a licensed 99-acre sanitary landfill currently serving 12,000 people. This landfill is located in section 30, T38N, R9E, approximately three miles from the proposed park site. Conveyance is by contracted haulers or by personal vehicle.

 Dane County
Solid Waste
Management

In addition, Dane County is currently proposing to establish a 110-acre sanitary landfill in the Town of Verona, about ten miles from the proposed site. This sanitary landfill proposal is presently under review by the Department of Natural Resources.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Except for local clinics, the nearest hospital facilities to the park site are located in Madison. Dane County Sheriff's Department or private ambulance provides conveyance. Police protection is provided by Dane County and assisted by neighboring communities, including Madison, in cases of emergency.

First Protection

Fire protection is from Waunakee and neighboring communities as needed.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Recreational land use is devoted mainly to summer camps. Camp Lincoln was once owned and operated by the YMCA. Camp Honiloch is owned and operated by the YWCA. Camp Indianola, a privately owned facility, is no longer open since the owners occupy the premises. Camp Indianola fronts on 1,500 feet of shoreline while the other two camps have smaller lake accesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lake</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Approximate Acreage</th>
<th>Parking (cars)</th>
<th>Camping</th>
<th>Boat Launch</th>
<th>Swimming</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Picnic Area</th>
<th>Group Camp</th>
<th>Undeveloped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Token Creek Co. Park</td>
<td>Yahara River</td>
<td>382.0</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendota Co. Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25 units</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahara Heights Co. Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Maurice City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison City Park*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horshall City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport East</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Park (Middleton)</td>
<td></td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake St. Boat Ramp (Middleton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Clark City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittingham City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilson Street Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefront City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbrich City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olm City Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wioora County Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin County Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Farm County Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Resort St. Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>343.0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>60 units planned</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop Co. Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parking lot to be removed and beach relocated in 1978.
** 47 car and trailer parking stalls to be added in 1978.
*** Master planning and new facility development in process.
Water Oriented Recreation

More than 24 water-oriented recreational facilities operated by the City of Madison, Dane County and the State of Wisconsin front on the five Madison area lakes. Table 9 provides acreages, approximate lake frontage feet and development information on these facilities. Unfortunately, recreational use data is unavailable at the present time for these specific facilities. Dane County has recently undertaken a county-wide recreational survey, but results and conclusions are incomplete.

Area Parks

Five recreational and park facilities are located within a few miles of the proposed park site, three of which provide water-based recreation. Marshall Park, operated by the City of Madison, is located on the west shore of Lake Mendota near Middleton. Lakeside Park is only a half-mile from Marshall Park and is operated by the City of Middleton, The northwest corner of the lake is the site of Mendota County Park, complete with lake access, picnicking facilities and camping sites. Token Creek County Park is a land-oriented park facility operated by Dane County. The City of Middleton operates and maintains a public boat ramp on the west side of Lake Mendota. Other Madison area parks and recreational facilities are described in Appendix D and located on Figure 7.

Cherokee Marsh

Cherokee Marsh Outdoor Education Area is a nearby wetland preserve and nature study area located northwest of Lake Mendota on the Yahara River, a Mandota tributary. It is owned and operated by the City of Madison Parks Department and utilized by the Madison Board of Education. The Department of Natural Resources owns and manages a Fishery and Wetlands Protection area on Dorn Creek, just upstream and to the northwest of the proposed park site. This wetlands preservation provides habitat for native and scattered pheasants. There is a significant movement of some fish species, northern pike and crappies and occasional walleye, catfish and perch, up Dorn Creek in the spring. Present Department acreage totals 114 acres. The acquisition goal is 300 acres but high land prices have limited realization of this goal.

Dorn Creek

The Department of Natural Resources currently owns and manages a Fishery and Wetlands Protection area on Dorn Creek, just upstream and to the northwest of the proposed park site. This wetlands preservation provides habitat for native and scattered pheasants. There is a significant movement of some fish species, northern pike and crappies and occasional walleye, catfish and perch, up Dorn Creek in the spring. Present Department acreage totals 114 acres. The acquisition goal is 300 acres but high land prices have limited realization of this goal.

Eighty Park

A 20-acre parcel of land, Eighty Park, is located on Six-Mile Creek within the proposed park boundary. It has a small picnic shelter, pit toilets and a landing suitable for canoes and rowboats.

Marinas

Two commercial marina facilities are located along the Yahara River in the North Bay area. Together they accommodate dry land docking for approximately 100 boats and in water facilities for more than 200 boats. Both facilities handle marine sales and service and private boat launch ramps. In addition, one marina provides camping trailer service while the other has canoe and power boat rentals and a snack bar.

Aesthetics

The proposed state park site is primarily rolling agricultural land with wooded shoreline areas. The view from a single high topographical point near CTH "H" and the appeal of Lake Mendota itself provide scenic and aesthetic interest. Wetlands and wooded areas have additional scenic and nature observation values.

Economic

Information about the town of Westport which is near the proposed location of the recreation area. It provides data on the total gross tax rate for the full valuation of the town of Westport.

The total gross tax rate for the full valuation of the Town of Westport was .3040 in 1973 and of that, the school tax rate was .01569. Tax rates for assessed valuation of the township were .00591 for the town tax rate and .04717 for the school tax rate.

School Districts & Tax Burden

The land proposed for state park acquisition is located entirely within the Waunakee School District. Villages and towns within the Waunakee School District and their 1974 equalized valuations are listed in Table 10. Equalized valuations are used in determining tax levy burdens for the various tax assessment districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Assesment District</th>
<th>1974 Equalized Valuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Waunakee</td>
<td>$31,690,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Dane</td>
<td>2,836,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Springfield</td>
<td>7,756,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Vienna</td>
<td>10,588,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Westport</td>
<td>37,620,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL - Waunakee School District</td>
<td>$56,688,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10

TAX ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS AND 1974 EQUALIZED VALUATIONS
WAUNAKEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, 1975
Table 11 specifies the recipients of Westport township tax monies for 1973. Taxes levied in the township totaled $864,616 for 1973. The 1973 assessed value for the Town of Westport was $1,056,620.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11. RECIPIENTS OF TAX MONIES - TOWN OF WESTPORT (1973)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTAL**        | 100.0%

**Assessed Valuation:**
The assessed land valuation for properties located within the proposed park boundary totaled $193,775 in 1973. Improvements on six of these lands were assessed at $42,706. Personal property, primarily livestock, was assessed at $6,071. Three of the sixier parcels, the YMCA and YMCA properties, and Lily Pike, were tax exempt. The total assessed value of the proposed acquisition package is $286,620. 1973 tax revenues generated within the site boundaries were $16,720. This tax revenue figure includes state tax credits on livestock.

**Dane County's economy depends mainly upon service occupations associated with state and federal government and the University of Wisconsin. Manufacturing and agriculture also make major contributions to the county's economy.**

**Business Activity:**
Business activity in the immediate site area fails generally into the categories of agriculture and development for housing purposes. A trend toward urban development is currently building in the Westports area, as increasing land values have made farming less economically attractive compared to use of the same land for residential development.

See also Appendix E, Economic Profile for Dane County.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION:**
It is proposed to establish and develop Lake Mendota State Park under the provisions of Section 27.36, Laws of Wisconsin, which states:

"It is declared to be the policy of the legislature to acquire, improve, preserve and administer a system of areas to be known as the state parks of Wisconsin."

The park would be managed under the provisions of Wisconsin Administrative Code 45, rules of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, pertaining to the conduct of visitors to state parks, state forests and other properties under the jurisdiction of the Department.

**HISTORY OF THE PROPOSAL:**
Lake Mendota State Park was conceived during the summer of 1973 when an 18-acre parcel of land, then operated as Camp Klenk, became available for purchase. A preliminary investigation and park feasibility study by the Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Parks and Recreation followed, at the request of the State Natural Resources Board.

The study found a number of favorable factors including a recreational need stated in several regional plans, potential for lake oriented and land oriented recreation, and an opportunity for preserving virtually the last undeveloped shoreline on Lake Mendota. The conclusion of the study was that the DNR should pursue acquisition and development of the proposed park site. Governmental units which were contacted during the initial stages of discussion of the Lake Mendota State Park proposal included Dane County, Town of Westport, City of Middleton and the City of Madison. Park and recreation personnel from all of these agencies indicated support for the proposal.

**INFORMATIONAL MEETING:**
On April 8, 1974, a public informational meeting was held near the proposed park site in the Town of Westport. The purpose of the meeting was to inform the general public of our proposal, and to receive citizen input and criticism. After the background and general park concept had been presented, twenty-one people took the floor to express their views and to ask questions. None of these people expressed disinterest and several presented supporting resolutions. Favorable resolutions were received from the League of Women Voters, the Dane County Park Commission and the Joint City-County Parks Liaison Committee. At
the conclusion of the meeting, a show-of-hands poll was taken. Of approximately
190 people attending, 100 were in favor, five voted against the proposal and
seven indicated they were undecided. The remainder did not register an
opinion.

Recent Action

On March 20, 1975 the Natural Resources Board of the Department of Natural
Resources gave approval for the establishment of Lake Mendota State Park
concurrent on three conditions:

1. That $200,000 proposed for donation to the project be approved
   by the Dane County Board.

2. That the County Board donate Eichem Park as a part of the state
   park.

3. That the Town of Westport donate the two-acre “Treantin Road”
   property to the state park.

The Dane County Board voted on March 3, 1975 to approve the donation of
both the $200,000 and the Eichem Park parcel. On April 5, 1975 the Town
of Westport took action to donate the two-acre parcel for state park
purposes. Park development is tentatively programmed for the 1979-80
planning.

CONFORMANCE WITH
REGIONAL PLANS

RECREATIONAL
PLANS

Dane County

There are, on the northwestern shore of Lake Mendota, parcels of land
relatively undeveloped. These are probably the last parcels of any
size that will be available for public ownership. The lakeshore
area has a naturally firm, gently sloping sand bottom. This
would provide for excellent swimming, boating and most other water
oriented activities.

Wisconsin Plan

The high recreational potential of the area, especially for day use, is
further emphasized in the Wisconsin Outdoor Recreation Plan, 1972 and in
the City of Madison Parks and Open Spaces Plan, 1975. This site’s use as an
open space area also coordinates with the Dane County Regional Planning
Commission’s 1973 Land Use Plan.

OTHER AREA PLANS

In addition to review of recreational and land use plans, contact was made
with various other state and local agencies associated with transportation,
utility services, school districts and taxation and township planning.
The proposed Lake Mendota State Park is in conformance with these agencies’
plans.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

The park site is generally triangular in shape, bounded on the east by Lake
Mendota, on the west by CTH “M” and on the north by the north bank of
Six-Mile Creek. This boundary encompasses about 441 acres (see Figure 8).

PROPOSED PARK
BOUNDARIES

Nearly 2,600 feet of shoreline within the proposed boundary will provide
opportunities for public lake access and recreational development. Of this,
approximately 2,100 feet would be contiguous shoreline.

SUBDIVISIONS

Three lakeshore subdivisions known as Second Ward Beach, Berner’s Beach
and Merriweather Park line the shore adjacent to the proposed park site. These
lakeshore developments have been excluded from the park.

Some lots with homes along Highway “M” and several lots along the north bank
of Six-Mile Creek have been excluded due to cost and the substantial nature of
the improvements. Road access to all excluded subdivisions and isolated homes
will be continued.

Eichem Park

A two-acre parcel of land, Eichem Park, is located on Six-Mile
Creek within the proposed park boundary. It has a small picnic shelter, pit
colleter and a landing suitable for canoes and rowboats.

Existing Structures

Structures on the 194-acre farm tract include three houses, three sties, several
outbuildings and a barn. All of the farm structures except the sties are
relatively old. No buildings exist on the site of the 90-acre farm tract.
The improvements on Camp Indiana include a large frame barracks, a meeting hall, a large frame boathouse, several small cabins and storage buildings, a three-car garage and a large frame house. All structures except the house and garage are in a state of deterioration.

Camp Maria Obriich

Camp Maria Obriich’s improvements include a main lodge building, storage buildings, two open shelters, five bunkhouses and several miscellaneous outbuildings. These frame buildings are simply constructed and kept in operational condition.

Camp Wakanda

Camp Wakanda’s main lodge building is a modern structure of stone, wood and glass. Other buildings include a caretaker’s residence, seven bunkhouses, a storage building and three craft shops. A concrete boathouse is situated on the lakeshore directly across the road from the main building. All buildings are in relatively good condition although camp operations have ceased.

Goals of Park Management

According to Chapter 27.01 Wisconsin Statutes, "... the purpose of the state parks is to provide areas for public recreation and for public education in conservation and nature study."

Resource Reservation

In addition to the recreational objective the park will protect Lake Mendota, Six-Mile Creek, Spring Creek and their adjoining wetlands by minimizing shoreline encroachment. While the shoreline may be utilized for various recreational activities, the roads and parking lots will be kept back from the lakeshore as far as practicable. A more natural appearing shoreline with normal amounts of runoff and erosion is sought.

Day Use Recreation

Multiseason day use recreation is proposed as the park’s management concept. The activities anticipated include picnicking, swimming, sun bathing, fishing, pleasure boating, ice fishing, ski touring, snowshoeing, bicycling, hiking, nature study and open field sports. Overnight camping facilities will not be provided. No facilities for snowmobiling will be provided as local clubs have extensive trails in the area. Winter activities of a more pedestrian nature will be emphasized.

Proposed Development

The Department proposes to acquire 16 individual ownerships totaling 441 acres within the park boundary (see Figure 9). Of the 16 ownerships, seven involve ownerships where some relocation assistance would be provided.

Fee Title

The Department must pay fair market value to obtain fee title in all land negotiations. All involved lands will be privately appraised and individual values will be dependent upon the “highest and best use” principle. It is not the intent of the Department to condemn lands for the park. The alternative of exercising the power of eminent domain will remain open to the Department, however, if it is determined that such action would best serve the public interest.

Relocation Assistance

Approximately seven ownerships would involve relocation assistance pursuant to P.L. 85-646 and Chapter 103, Laws of 1977, Wis. Stats. Under these provisions, each family to be relocated will be fully informed of the rights, benefits and type of assistance available. Efforts are made to match individual requirements with available, decent, safe and sanitary housing, at economically feasible rents or purchase prices in areas of personal request. Ninety days notice of relocation is required. Relocation assistance includes moving payments, supplemental housing payments, and informational assistance.

A summary of probable relocation costs is provided in Table 12.
### Table 12: Estimated Relocation Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Moving Expense</th>
<th>Farm Relocation</th>
<th>Tenant Replacement</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Moving</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Wakanda</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Maria Church</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Indianola</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds (2 tenants)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquis</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruff</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>$420,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$446,910</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acreage Areas

The proposed development will be concentrated in specific use areas and their support facilities (see Figure 8). The use areas include the beach, boat landing, and picnic areas. Support facilities include roads, parking lots and utility systems.

### Development Range

Of the 441 acres proposed for designation as state park approximately 52 acres will be intensively developed (see Table 13). This figure comprises about 12 percent of the total park acreage. Vegetation to be removed consists mainly of grasses.

### Table 13: Acreage of Proposed Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Area Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>245,000 sq. ft. (91,311 linear feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots</td>
<td>201,020 sq. ft. (850 stalls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Sand Blanked</td>
<td>30,400 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Summing Area</td>
<td>40,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Launch Parking</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>356,250 sq. ft. = 12 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picnic Areas (2)</strong></td>
<td>40 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>52 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Park Entrance

As proposed, there would be only one access to the interior of the proposed park, thus enabling entrance office personnel to monitor all park traffic during operating hours. The park entrance will be designed in co-operation with the Department of Transportation engineers according to standard design specifications and will provide adequate capacity to meet peak hour traffic volumes. The entrance area would also be the main station for sale of park admission stickers. Entrance roads would be divided into one way lanes for ease of traffic control. Several parking spaces would accommodate park employees and visitors with business at the main office.

### Picnic Area

A 10 to 15-acre picnic area with an average picnic table density of 15-20 tables per acre would be located in the northern section of the park on a site now partially shaded by large open grown oak trees. Plans include road access and parking space for 150 cars. A picnic shelter and toilet facilities would also be provided. Additional trees of suitable size and type will be planted to increase shade and provide visual relief. This picnic area may incorporate the existing picnic area at deputies Park.

A second picnic area will be located further to the south on a 20- to 25-acre site. This would incorporate the highest topographical point in the park and thus provide a far-reaching view. Access and parking for 200 cars and a picnic shelter would be provided. Shade and windbreak needs would dictate additional tree plantings in this area also.
Launching ramp and two piers would constitute the proposed boat access to the lake. Parking facilities for 40 cars with boat trailers will be provided. The boat landing will be the only point in the park where motor vehicles directly contact the shoreline.

Swimming Beach

The proposed swimming beach would be built at the site of the former Camp Indomitable. Road access, parking for 300 and a bathhouse will be provided. A pea gravel beach bed and a sunning area of at least 300 feet in length would also be established. The gravel blanket will extend underfoot to form a smooth floor for the swimming area. Pea gravel has been selected for use as a blanket material to prevent wave transport and to cause the least amount of degradation to fish spawning beds. The blanket will be at least 300 feet long, at least 100 feet wide and 3-6 inches thick. At least 300 cubic yards of material will be added to the lake bed. It is expected that dredging will not be required to establish or maintain the beach. Field studies indicate that the lake bottom is firm at the proposed beach site.

Pond and roads will be kept back away from the lakeshore to maximize pedestrian use of the area. These proposed changes necessitate the removal of a number of dead and damaged willow, cottonwood, elm, and box elder trees and the grading and construction of a curb separating the sand beach from the grass area. Several concrete building foundations and at least three frame buildings will be removed since they are in an advanced stage of deterioration and cannot be salvaged. Bathhouse facilities will include showers, changing stalls and toilets. Seasonal employees will serve as lifeguards in the swimming area.

Use Control

The conventional rope and buoy system will demarcate actual swimming areas. Beyond these limits, a floating slick boom device will be employed to prevent algae and floating aquatic weeds from drifting into the swimming area. Chemical treatment of the lake will be limited to the control of swimmer's itch. Mechanical weed removal will be employed as needs arise to keep the swimming area clean of rooted aquatic plants.

Open Field Sports

Recreational day use will probably include provisions for open field sports such as baseball and football. A specific location will be chosen during detailed site planning. Open field areas will be located near the picnic or beach facilities.

Bicycle Routes

Dane County is currently contemplating a bicycle route encircling Lake Mendota which would ideally run through the proposed Lake Mendota State Park. Hopes are for coordination of bicycle route planning with the various involved municipalities for inclusion of bike paths in detailed park planning.

Multiuse Recreation

The park objective of day use recreation also incorporates multiuse seasonal use of Lake Mendota State Park. Intensive summer uses will consist of the water-oriented activities: pleasure boating, fishing and swimming. Lake-oriented winter activities include ice fishing, ice skating and iceboat sailing, all currently popular activities. Lake access for ice fishing has caused parking and trespassing problems for landowners on the north shore of Lake Mendota in the past. It is intended that roads and parking lots be maintained during the winter, thus relieving the winter parking problem. Hiking trails and open fields would also provide activity areas for cross-country skiing, sledding and snowshoeing in the winter months. Park personnel would be responsible for snow removal from roads within the park boundaries.

Group Day Use Facility

The present Camp Wakanda site, isolated from the mainstream of park activity and containing usable structures, holds potential for an organized group day use facility. The wooded setting lends itself to nature study and interpretation and could serve a wide variety of organized groups. Although no specific operation schedule has been designated, this group camp would follow procedures similar to other DNR group facilities. The facility would be rented in advance at a nominal fee for designated groups for competitive day use activities.

Support Facilities

The proposed road system would be two-way, blacktop paved and follow routes minimizing disturbance to vegetation and topography.
Parking

Parking stalls in the beach and picnic area will be of dimensions 12 feet by 20 feet and will be blacktopped. Beach parking will be located several hundred feet back from the shoreline and will accommodate 200 cars. This parking area will probably receive the heaviest winter use as a lake access point for ice fishermen. In addition to the automobile parking, racks for at least 100 bicycles will be provided.

Parking facilities for 40 cars with boat trailers will be provided at the boat landing. The parking pattern will be diagonal, with extra deep stalls to accommodate car-trailer units. Surfacing will be blacktop paving. Several single-car stalls will be included.

The parking lot at Camp Macada is currently gravel paved. The proposed plan calls for expansion, paving with blacktop and accommodations for several school buses.

Other Structures

Other structures which are necessary to park operation, such as wash houses, garages and storage buildings, are usually located in remote or concealed areas. These buildings will be of a functional nature and will be of frame construction. Final site planning will determine their exact locations. Existing buildings could be used as temporary service facilities.

Waste supply for the proposed park will be obtained by drilling an on-site well. All major park buildings will be supplied with water from either an existing well or from a distribution system with a central well.

Wastewater and sewage from the various park buildings will be carried to the Waunakee interceptor system, through which the latrines are eventually piped to the Nine Springs plant of the Madison Metropolitan Sewage District for treatment.

Solid wastes would be disposed of at the DNR approved Metropolitan Refuse District landfill. Collection and transport would be by DNR personnel, unless economic feasibility dictates contracting with a private trash removal company. Large metal bins with closing lids and centralized collection will be utilized.

Electrical service will be distributed to major park buildings. All shelters, offices, the boat house and the boat landing will be illuminated. The park will be serviced with public telephones. All telephone and electrical lines will be buried underground.

Medical services, fire and police protection will be provided by nearby communities, the town of Westport and Dane County. The City of Madison is accessible for emergency hospital service.

Other Development

Eventually, numerous trees and shrubs will be planted in the park. These plantings will generally be deciduous and limited to species occurring or associated within the site. Specific species types and planting plans will be determined in final site planning.
An open area will be designated as a prairie establishment project in an attempt to propagate a plant community type which once existed on the site. This prairie project will be on an upland site on the west side of the proposed park (see Figure 8). Propagation of native prairie species will be from pure strain Wisconsin grama grass and prairie forbs in both seed and planting stock. Special planting equipment is available to the Department on loan. Prairie establishment involves seeding with an annual grass and planting of prairie grasses and forbs in the oat field double the following year. Since individual prairie establishment situations differ, specific prairie development and management plans will be determined in final site planning.

Hiking trails through the proposed park site would encompass four distinct ecological communities: oak-hickory woodland, upland grassland, and restored prairie and lowland marsh.

Existing road routes to the three subdivisions are shown on Figure 10. Road access to the private homes of Second Ward Beach, Borchers Beach and Morris Park will be continued. Access to Second Ward Beach will be from the intersection of Highways "M" and "N", southward through the park boundary to the existing access road to Second Ward Beach. Remaining roads surrounding Eagle Park would be closed. The new park entrance road would then be located near the intersection of Highway "M" and Ocken Road.

In order to eliminate through-traffic in the park, it is proposed that Indiana Drive, which runs between Highway "M" and Borchers Beach Road, be permanently closed to traffic. This closing will be followed by removal of pavement and reseeding. Access to the homes in the Borchers Beach subdivision would then be limited to travel on Oak Avenue which connects Borchers Beach Road to County Highway "M" at a point further south, or to travel on Morris Park Road.

Oak Avenue is a two-way blacktop road with a nine percent grade at one point. This steep grade, coupled with slippery winter driving conditions, currently limits its use. An alternate route has been chosen, as a result of Department of Transportation studies, which will compensate for the closing of Indiana Drive (see Figure 11). A 200-foot section of two-way blacktop road will be constructed as a connecting link between Morris Park Road and Borchers Beach Road.

This road would pass through the former YMS property. Oak Avenue would be left unsurfaced for fair-weather and emergency access. In a preliminary investigative report, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation estimated costs for the proposed roadway change at approximately $2,000. A discussion of road route alternatives can be found in Section 14.

Actual road work would consist of excavation of the roadbed and balancing of materials to attain the desired gradient, followed by establishment of a new pavement and pavement application. Main work includes deepening of the existing road cut to achieve lower overall gradient.

Department of Natural Resources employes will administer and manage the proposed lake Mendota State Park. The Madison area of the Southern District of the Department itself has primary jurisdiction.

Admission fees will probably require year-round at the park except the third Sunday in May each year which is "open house" at state parks and forest recreation areas.

An admission sticker, either daily or annual will be required on all vehicles entering the park. The following rates will apply:

- Resident $5.00 Annually
- Nonresident 30.00 Annually
- $1.50 Daily

A daily sticker is valid only on the date of purchase.
Fee collection and management for the Camp Wakanda group day camp is not yet decided, but it is anticipated that advance registration and a nominal user fee will be required.

Use of the boat launch and swimming facilities will involve no fee other than the regular admission sticker fee for automobile entry.

Estimated total costs for acquisition of the Lake Mendota State Park land package is $2.3 million. Total acquisition and development costs are estimated at $1.6 million.

Under the Land and Water Conservation Fund program, which is administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, federal funds are available for state and local recreational developments and support facilities. LAUCON allocations to the State of Wisconsin for 1975 total $1,387,000. Of this $1,416,017 is allocated to state agencies. The current LAUCON allocation to the Bureau of Parks and Recreation of the Department of Natural Resources is $818,214. However, individual allocations to various state agency programs are subject to reallocation as a result of changing priority needs during a given year. Table 14 provides a detailed breakdown of LAUCON allocations to the State of Wisconsin for 1975. The Department of Natural Resources is the designated state liaison agency to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and all monies allocated to the State of Wisconsin under the LAUCON program are dispensed by the Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 14. LAUCON FUNDING ALLOCATIONS TO WISCONSIN - 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Aid Programs, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Local Units of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% Contingency Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% State Agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State agency allocation $1,416,017

Rebate to local units for 1974 $1,283

1975 State agency balance $1,387,000

Breakdown of State Agency Allocations:

| University of Wisconsin System | $50,000 |
| Department of Transportation   | 50,000  |
| DNR - Fish & Wildlife Management | 200,000 |
| DNR - Forestry                 | 400,000 |
| DNR - Parks and Recreation     | 810,214 |
| Total                         | $1,387,000 |

*Wisconsin contingency reserve funds are administered by the Department of Natural Resources and should not be confused with the federal Secretary of Interior's contingency reserve.

Funding Management section 6(f) of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 states that funds acquired with LAUCON funds cannot be converted to uses other than for public outdoor recreation without a substitution of other properties of at least fair market value and of reasonable equivalent usefulness and location. The law applies to any lands that have been purchased in part or in whole with LAUCON funds, and has been interpreted to include construction and maintenance
of utility lines, sewer extensions and roads. The authority to make a final determination as to whether a potential DEF conflict exists rests with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Should a change in land use become desirable in the future, approval to sell, lease, trade or give extinguishment must be obtained from the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Section 6(f) restrictions will apply to Lake Mendota State Park. Appendix F is an excerpt from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Grant-in-Aid Manual dealing with Section 6(f).

Local Funding

As an additional aid to the park project, contacts are being made with all local governmental bodies to explore the potential for donations. Donations would not necessarily take the form of monetary contribution. In specific dollar amount or quantity has been proposed. Contributions, if any, would be completely at the discretion of the governing organization.

PARK ATTENDANCE PROJECTIONS

The parking lot capacity of the proposed state park is 650 cars, not counting the 50 stalls for the boat landing or the small parking area at the group camp. In estimating park attendance, a factor of 3.5 persons per automobile is used. This means that if the park is filled to capacity, there would be 2,270 people present. Due to the all-season recreation theme of the proposed park, it is anticipated that when the park is fully developed and operating, there will be an average of three filled-to-capacity days each week. Of course, some days the park would be sparsely used, but natural turnover would still account for moderate attendance. It is anticipated that park attendance will easily exceed 300,000 people in an annual basis.

PROBABLE ADVERSE AND BENEFICIAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED ACTION ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The topography of the proposed park site would remain generally unchanged. Construction of roads and parking lots will cause a small amount of erosion, but will be modified wherever possible to conform to the topography. The construction of the 200-foot section of new road connecting Borchers’ Beach Road and Norris Park Road will call for a minimum amount of earth moving, probably less than 500 cubic yards.

The construction of the beach and swimming area will necessitate grading and filling of certain land areas to obtain acceptable gradient. In addition, excavation is anticipated at the beach or boat ramp. Placement of approximately 300 yards of sand or pea gravel would constitute a minor lake fill.

Soils

Bedrock geology of the proposed area will remain unchanged. Changes in site area soils will mainly occur in former agricultural areas, as fields will no longer be plowed and cultivated. Soil aeration and nutrient concentrations will revert to more natural stable levels.

SURFACE WATERS

Surface water quality in the site area would be maintained by adoption of the proposed state park. Much of the turbidity and sedimentation of Six Mile and Dorn Creeks in the park vicinity is a result of agricultural erosion and runoff from fertilizers and animal wastes in the watershed. Changes in land use would, to a slight degree, reduce these sources to the extent that a small fraction of the watershed would be withdrawn from agriculture. Some initial turbidity may result from the activity of swimmers using the beach.

Wellheads

Preservation of the wetlands north of Six Mile Creek would maintain this sediment and nutrient trap for Dorn and Six-Mile Creeks. Since the two Creeks contribute one-fifth of the daily inflow to Lake Mendota, the water quality of the lake will be partially maintained. However, lake water quality will most probably not be significantly affected by the proposed park.

Groundwater

Since groundwater withdrawal would not be significantly changed by the proposed park, it is not expected that groundwater levels would be significantly altered. The increase of acreage under permanent vegetative cover is areas formerly under crop cultivation would increase water deepness and retention. Paved areas may offset such water absorption to a slight extent.
The proposed development will affect only the micro-climate of the park site. Plantings of large numbers of trees may alter wind patterns. Surface heat reflectivity might decrease slightly as this is a result of improved ground cover. The relatively high ambient air quality of the area around the proposed park site will be affected by park operations. Levels of sulfur oxides should remain relatively unchanged. However, particulate count levels may decrease due to permanent soil cover and discontinuance of dust-producing agricultural uses.

**Machinery**

Controlled burning, a recognized prairie management technique for rejuvenation and species stabilization, would introduce some localized smoke emissions. Burning would probably take place every two or three years.

**Engine Emissions**

Increased numbers of auto tourists and motorboat enthusiasts would generate additional engine emissions. The north end of Lake Mendota already experiences fairly heavy boat use due to the popularity of fishing and the availability of two commercial marinas. A state park boat landing would increase lake traffic.

**Indirect Sources**

CTH "M", which will be upgraded in the future, will probably be classed as a complex air pollution source. As such, it will be required to meet air quality standards as prescribed by proposed rules concerning indirect sources of air pollution. The development of parking lots and internal park roads may also be considered "complex sources". Air quality impacts of these indirect sources will be reduced over time due to enforcement of air quality regulations.

**Odors**

Odors will continue to be a periodic problem along the lakeshore. Removal of floating organic material and mechanical harvesting of rooted aquatics will help reduce the problem. Algal blooms will not be affected or controlled as a result of the park and will continue to be an unabated source of odor.

**Noise**

Calculations by the Facilities Development Section of the State Division of Highways indicate that the project's 16 percent increase in traffic volumes will have little effect on sound levels at a distance of 100 feet from CTH "M". Big report levels would vary between 75 and 76 dBA for hourly means between 60 and 95 cars.

**Impact on the Biological Environment**

The placement of a sand blanket on the lake bed will severely reduce the biological productivity of benthic organisms in the immediate beach location. This will likely reduce feeding potential and cover for certain fish species and other forms of aquatic life. It will also change fish spawning habitats in the immediate beach area by reducing success of free-spawning species such as northern pike, and increasing the success of nest-spawning species such as bluegill. The presence and activity of swimmers will probably disturb or eliminate the bottom-feeding species. Therefore, the proposed beach will probably reduce the overall fish reproduction potential along this particular stretch of shoreline. No measurable change in the overall fishery of Lake Mendota should occur, however, the presence and activity of swimmers and bathers may also cause some amount of localized water turbidity during times of heavy beach and boat launch utilization.

**Wetlands**

Marsh vegetation will be protected. In addition, low and wet marginal areas now cropped will probably revert to their natural wetland vegetation. Since wetlands are at a premium in the Lake Mendota region, this addition would maintain and slightly increase this dwindling type of plant community and its associated fishery and wildlife.

**Road and Building Construction**

Road and building construction involves the removal of some terrestrial vegetation. Most of the construction will take place in open areas of the proposed park site currently used for agricultural row crops. Impacts on vegetation due to increased pedestrian traffic will be minimized by routing trails to avoid congestion and other problems.
The construction of the 200-foot section of new road connecting Sorcher's Beach Road and Norris Park Road will necessitate the removal of a number of trees. Clearing for the roadway will be kept to a maximum width of 30 feet. The cleared area will total no more than 0.15 acres. Earth movement would be 500 cubic yards maximum.

Beach and Running Area

The development of a swimming beach and running area will necessitate the removal of a number of damaged and diseased trees. The removal of these willow, cottonwood, box elder and elm trees will increase the amount of sunlight reaching the understory plants and in some instances stimulate more vigorous growth and perhaps change the species composition of the understory community.

Vegetative Diversity

Overall vegetative diversity will be increased through park management and planting. Indigenous trees, shrubs and prairie grassland species will replace those of former agricultural and abandoned fields. Designated use areas will be planted with grass species for turf establishment. Exotics planted as ornamentals will eventually be replaced by native species as they die.

Fauna

The proposed park will help assure continued availability of Six Mile Creek, Dorn Creek and most of the lake frontage as protected spawning habitat. The Lake Mendota fishery, should not change significantly, however, as a result of any activity associated with the park.

Terrestrial Habitat

Exclusion of grazing cattle and elimination of cropped lands will protect and upgrade the habitats of upland and shoreland songbirds. The reestablishment of grassland communities would also enhance upland wildlife habitat. The upland wooded areas are not anticipated to change in botanical composition and character as a direct result of the proposed park and should continue to support small mammals and birds.

Impact on the Subcultural Environment

Operation of a proposed state park in the site area will have noticeable effects on area population. Park development would preclude the use of the lands in question for high density residential, recreational or private development. Thus population growth in the park site would not exhibit the overall growth rate anticipated without state park development. However, if residential preferences continue to shift toward the north shore areas, the overall area population will increase at a rate that would not be affected by the proposed park.

Land Use Trends

The primary impact of the proposed park on land use would be the conversion of agricultural lands to park use and a regional reduction of agricultural production. By maintaining the area as a park, however, the agricultural potential of the area would be preserved if agricultural production would ever be considered more important than recreational use in this area. Camps Wakanda, Matie Olberich and Indians are of a recreational character and would continue to be classified as recreation lands.

Development Pressures

Since both population growth trends and land use shifts indicate that area development pressures are great, the acquisition of land for park purposes is of immediate consideration. If the park is not implemented the site will likely be developed for residential use. The main determining factor for subdivision development in the area is the availability of sewer and water service. The Waunakee Interceptor has been completed, making sewage disposal available for a large area on Lake Mendota's northwest shore.

Utility Availability

The establishment and operation of a state park would essentially insulate and buffer the shoreline residential subdivisions. Existing town roads leading to these subdivisions are dead ends, thus reinforcing this isolating effect. The overall impact of the park on these subdivisions would be to increase the value of these lands as homesites.

Zoning Subdivisions

While state agencies are not subject to local zoning regulations, present zoning classifications would pose no limitations on possible state park development. Public parks are permitted uses under the rural and agricultural classifications and the recreational category allows camps and parks.
Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act and section 6(f) of the LCACON Act are designed to discourage incompatible use of public recreational and wildlife areas and to minimize the loss of these lands. Since both restrictions will apply to the proposed Lake Mendota State Park, it would be a difficult and time consuming process for the Department of Natural Resources to permit use of any part of the park for any non-recreation use. These restrictions do not necessarily prohibit construction of necessary public utilities of roads, but they assure that park lands will be utilized only if it is absolutely necessary and when no other prudent and feasible alternative exists. The effects of both Section 6(f) and Section 4(f) would be to discourage extension of CTP "M" toward the proposed park and, possibly, to delay the extension of sewage facilities through private lands.

Present landowners within site boundaries will be displaced from their property should the state park concept become a reality. The social and psychological repercussions of such relocation are significant to the various individuals but of less impact to the larger social system. Economic compensation serves to mitigate these individual losses. Of the eleven land transactions involved in this acquisition, seven will necessitate relocation compensation. The financial assistance is designed to protect the individuals' financial status and way of life if a move is necessitated by a state or federal project.

Purchase of the proposed park will result in an increase in the total number of recreational facilities in Wisconsin, particularly in the Madison area and provide additional public access to Lake Mendota. Pressures presently experienced by the city and county parks and access on the lake will be somewhat reduced and economic life of the facilities extended. Lake Mendota State Park would satisfy the need for additional recreational facilities identified by Dane County, the Dane County Regional Planning Commission and the Department of Natural Resources.

Because of expected future limitations on gasoline the proposed state park would fill a serious need for more local park facilities as an alternative to more distant parks.

Acquisition and development of Lake Mendota State Park initiates a reversion in the traditional trend of state park acquisition from the more remote, relatively untouched lands to less unique sites closer to metropolitan areas. This indicates a greater commitment by the Department of Natural Resources to provide adequate recreational opportunities close to major population centers thus making state parks more accessible to larger portions of the state's population.

Swimmers using the proposed beach may be exposed to periodic occurrences of high bacterial counts as experienced at other Madison beaches. The water at the proposed park will be sampled on a regular basis. According to Environmental Protection Agency guidelines, if the geometric mean of five samples taken over a 30-day period exceeds 200 coliforms per 100 ml. of sample, the beach would be closed. A single sample reading in excess of 400 coliforms per 100 ml. of samples would also necessitate closing. If such high levels were encountered at the Lake Mendota State Park beach, as they have at other Lake Mendota beaches, closing would result in some inconvenience to park visitors anticipating use of the beach for swimming.

The use of the beach for swimming may also be periodically curtailed due to the presence of high concentrations of planktonic algae. Unpleasant swimming conditions resulting from the presence of large numbers of planktonic algae may cause a voluntary reduction of beach use.

Beach in the Madison area are sometimes closed due to swimmer's itch. Swimmer's itch can be controlled with several commercial chemicals available and approved for that use by the Department. However, the potential for beach closing at this site as a result of swimmer's itch does exist.
Boating

The proposed boat launch will somewhat increase boat traffic in the northshore area of Lake Mendota. The primary effect on boating access and traffic will be a transfer of launch use from congested city and county private launch facilities. The state park launch may prove appealing to families who are interested in other onshore activities as well as boating.

TRAFFIC SYSTEM

Traffic loads generated by state park use, at maximum operation, will increase the annual daily traffic count on Highway "M" by about 16 percent. The additional traffic load will occur mainly during nonpeak weekday hours and during weekends.

County Highway "M"

Present highway systems are probably sufficient to handle the increased traffic load a state park would generate. Upgrading of County Trunk "M" is proposed for near future, but new construction before 1980. However, the presence of a state park could accelerate consideration of improvements to CIT "M" and feeder roads.

Section 6(f) and 6(f) Conflicts

Eventually upgrading of CIT "M" may involve the proposed use of lands within the boundary of Lake Mendota State Park. If park lands are required for highway purposes, provisions of Section 6(f) of the Department of Transportation Act and Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act would have to be met. This would require that the Division of Highways prove that there is no prudent and feasible alternative to the use of park lands. Under the current interpretation of Section 6(f), this could result in an increase in the cost of proposed improvements to the highway if there is an alternative to the use of park lands. Even if the alternative would be more costly, the use of park lands would also require that replacement lands of equal or greater value and utility be provided pursuant to Section 6(f). Finding suitable replacement lands may be difficult. If use of park lands is necessary to make highway improvements to CIT "M", considerable delay may be encountered while provisions of Sections 6(f) and 6(f) are being met.

Nearby Communities

Because most users of the park would be coming from Madison through communities nearby the park including Middleton, these communities may experience a slight increase in traffic. Most routes to the park permit a motorist to bypass these communities, thus traffic increases are not expected to be significant.

Subdivision Access

Since park visitors will not be using the town roads leading to the three residential subdivisions, town road traffic volumes should remain unaltered. Establishment of a section of road linking Borcher's Bluffs Road with Morris Park Road may cause temporary inconvenience and a change in accustomed access habits of some residents, especially in the Borcher's Beach and Morris Park areas (see Figure 11). The closure of Indiana Drive will necessitate the use of either the existing Oak Avenue or the new link. In the latter case the traffic originating in Borcher's Beach would continue on to Morris Park and exit to CIT "M" via Camp Wakanda Drive. The road through the Naper Park subdivision would be changed from a dead end road to a loop system formed by Oak Avenue, Borcher's Bluffs Road and Camp Wakanda Road. Closing of Indiana Drive would change the Borcher's Beach access pattern from a loop to a dead end.

Mass Transit

Future bus service could provide mass transit access to Lake Mendota State Park, although no firm plans exist now. Since the planned park is distant oriented and large urban and suburban populations are nearby, a demand for this service may be expected.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Police protection for the proposed park area will be supplied locally with severe emergency situations handled by the Dane County Sheriff's Department. Self-inspection and supervision of prairie land burns will comprise intermittent involvement of local fire protection agencies.

Emergency Services

When in full operation, the proposed park will generate approximately 1,500 cubic yards of solid waste per year. This volume of waste will be an added increment to the annual volume local landfill sites are structured to handle. The Metropolitan Refuse District 95-acre sanitary landfill is of substantial capacity to handle this additional volume and is considered to be the proposed park site. The proposed county landfill near Verona should adequately handle solid waste generated in the park for the foreseeable future.
Disposal of wastewater and sewage will be handled through the WaukeshaInterceptor system, as previously described, and treated at the Nine-Springs Plant of the Madison Metropolitan Sewage District. A park visitor uses about five gallons of water per day. At maximum anticipated park operation, it is estimated that about 1,500,000 gallons of sewage would be disposed of annually. The Madison Metropolitan District processed over 13 billion gallons of sewage in 1993. The estimated increase due to proposed park use is approximately 0.00012 percent. The WaukeshaInterceptor branch serving Second Ward Beach is of design capacity much more than sufficient to handle proposed park sewage demands.

Electricity

If the WaukeshaInterceptor or Fox Bluff sewer are extended through the proposed park to serve Morris Park, Borchers's Beach and other residences to the south of the park, the approval of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and replacement of lands utilized for the sewer line may be required to comply with Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Replacement lands, if required, would be difficult to provide and a delay in the construction of any utility line may be encountered. Other proposed uses of the park land, including construction of electric transmission lines, highways, etc., would also be delayed and perhaps prohibited, by provisions of Section 6(f).

Energy Use

Energy consumption associated with Lake Mendota State Park includes motor fuels and electricity used during construction and gasoline use by park visitors. Because the park is near the metropolitan area it intends to serve, substantial savings in park users gasoline consumption should occur.

HISTORICAL / ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

The state park proposal would serve to preserve the existing archeological features of the site, including various burial mounds and effigy mounds in the Camp Wakanda and Indianola areas. Archeological survey will take place prior to any type of land alteration, according to State Historical Society guidelines.

AESTHETICS & VISUAL INTEREST

Park roads, parking lots, shelters, and other man-made structures will intrude on the visual aesthetics of the existing site area. Elimination of agricultural practices will return some land to natural conditions. The development of the lakeshore and hillside areas will make available areas of scenic and aesthetic value for public use. Tree plantings and prairie restoration will provide added visual interest.

IMPACT ON THE ECONOMIC PRODUCT

The assessed value of land and property proposed for removal from Town of Westport tax rolls would be $244,400. This tax base accounts for 74.892 or 1.69 percent of the $14,015,000 tax dollars generated in the Town of Westport annually. This decrease in tax base may mean an increase in property tax burdens which each local taxpaying shares. The Department will reimburse the town for the losses for a period of ten years and in decreasing basis. The first year after acquisition of any property 10 percent of the property tax will be paid. 90 percent the next year, and so on for ten years. For the tenth year and every year thereafter the payment will be ten percent of the first year payment, in no year shall the amount paid under the ten-year schedule fall below 50 cents per acre. In addition to the ten year reimbursement, state monies will be paid locally in lieu of property taxes. These payments in lieu of taxes are made to the tax assessment district in which the state land is located and are not deeded for specific uses.

TAX EFFECTS

State tax monies will be expended on public utilities such as sewer, water, electric and telephone service. Parks require trash removal and expendable supplies for continuing maintenance and repairs. These services and supplies will be drawn from the local business community.

Property Taxes

State land acquisition for the proposed Lake Mendota State Park may have different effects on property taxes in the Town of Westport and property owners in the other tax assessment districts located in the Waukesha School District (see Table X). Increases or decreases in property taxes depend upon the assessed value of the proposed state acquisition in relation to the total valuation of the tax assessed district where acquisition is proposed and the entire school district involved. Because state aid is in lieu of taxes and to be paid only to the Town of Westport, it is likely that the other tax assessment districts located within the Waukesha School District will experience an increased tax burden.
The establishment and operation of a state park at this site may have an effect on property values in the vicinity. Some of the adjacent property is already high-priced lakefrontage; changing land values might affect surrounding agricultural lands. Since development pressures are large, a function of availability of suitable undeveloped land, land use trends toward urbanization and housing development can be expected in the vicinity of the park. Within a few years the proposed park may resemble a suburban or urban park as a result of surrounding developments.

Acquisition for Lake Mendota State Park would convert 299 acres of land from agricultural uses, about two-thirds of which is currently cropped. Average yields per acre for all soil types included in lands presently under agricultural use are approximately 110 bushels for corn, 16 tons for silage, 70 bushels for oats, 4.5 tons for alfalfa hay and 136 AUN for bluegrass. Losses in agricultural production due to state land acquisition would depend upon what proportion of the 299 acres to be converted is currently in specific crops. The economic losses of foregone agricultural land use incomes are difficult to determine.

Lake Mendota State Park would influence the local economy and business activity through direct monetary income to land owners and through construction expenditures. Construction contractors and employees, suppliers of sand, lumber and gravel and park operations and maintenance personnel will be obtained from local labor and business.

Secondary economic impacts from state park development include increases in business for area merchants, especially those selling food and beverages, picnic supplies, motor fuel, auto service and popular commodities. A general increase in sales activity at existing retail establishments will likely be noted. It is not anticipated that an increase in new business developments will occur as a result of the park's existence, but future development measures may initiate such an increase.

The acquisition and development of this project would be accomplished through the use of state and federal tax monies. As previously stated, 50 percent of the cost will be paid by state GRP funds, 25 percent by federal LANDCON allocations and 25 percent by special LANDCON contingency funds. This would result in a total gain by Wisconsin of federal monies not otherwise available.

The proposed Lake Mendota State Park would include a large part of the Department of Natural Resources budget for recreational acquisition and development over the next few years. The proposed Lake Mendota State Park is located in an area which has a relatively high level of existing recreational development and land access (see Table 9).Use of funds for the proposed park would reduce the monies, both state and federal, available to acquire and develop facilities in regions that do not have the same level of recreational facilities as the Madison area. However, a major state park near Madison might result in savings of money normally expended for transportation. This reflects a trend to develop state-sponsored facilities near population centers in an attempt to serve more people.

The proposed Lake Mendota State Park will utilize $1,042,297.50 of federal LANDCON funds. One-half, or $521,133.75, will be taken from the regular 1075 state allocation to the Bureau of Parks and Recreation (see Table 10). The use of these monies will in no way effect the LANDCON allocation to local units or the state's contingency reserve. It will affect the regular state agency allocation by removing more than half of the total amount allocated to the Bureau of Parks and Recreation. Such a large single and costly project may cause a reallocation of the allocations to other state agencies and GRP units, as these allocations are not fixed.

Special LANDCON contingency reserve funds to be utilized for Lake Mendota State Park will be taken from an 38.3 million fund that is set aside to meet priority needs statewide. This proposed project will not utilize state contingency reserve funds.
CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Construction vehicles will contribute emissions to the air, thus altering air quality. Adequate erosion control practices will be followed during construction. Construction disturbances are temporary impacts but they may cause permanent changes to land and vegetation in the form of structures, roads, and parking lots.

During construction approximately 52 acres of the 441 total will be disturbed. The vegetation to be removed from these areas will largely be areas. The wooded areas of the site will remain intact except for the removal of hazardous trees. The beach areas have numerous dead and dying trees to be removed. The majority of disturbed land will be former agricultural land which has been disturbed by cultivation for many years.

BEACH SAND BLANKET

The placement of the beach sand blankets will cause a reduction of biological productivity and eliminate spawning habitat in the immediate beach area. Three-hundred cubic yards of sand or pea gravel will be deposited in a single action. This impact will be limited to the same blanket area only. Since the proposed beach is subject to offshore winds, wave action is not expected to be serious and only small amounts of added sand or gravel will be needed to maintain the blankets.

BEACH USE

Beach use will cause water turbidity due to the action of swimmers during park operation.

The periodically high bacteria counts and swimmers’ itch problems experienced at other Madison area beaches will likely occur at this site also.

TRAFFIC LOADS

Increased traffic loads on county “M” and adjacent roads may affect local road travel. This traffic and that generated on internal park roads may also slightly diminish the present high air quality of the area. Routings of town roads within the park boundary may cause inconvenience to shoreline residents.

VISITOR DISTURBANCE

The impact of park visitors will adversely affect plant and animal communities and air quality, especially in the high-use areas such as the beach, boat landing and picnic areas. However, the flora and fauna of the area is comprised largely of species adapted to non-disturbed environments.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Land acquisition of these 441 acres will reduce tax revenues generated locally by 1.72 percent and preclude alternative future uses of these lands. In addition, approximately 299 acres of agricultural land will be taken out of production, decreasing present agricultural yields for the region.

UTILITY DEMAND

Increased demands on public utilities are a necessity of park operation. This new increment to existing services may cause some inconvenience and increases in local costs which are unavoidable.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

No Action

Taking no action on the establishment of Lake Mendota State Park would, for the time being, preclude the acquisition of these lands as public ownership. Current landowners would continue private use of the property and could dispose of the property at their discretion. There is no guarantee that future owners would attempt to preserve the resources of the site.

If this land is not developed for park purposes, it will inevitably be removed from agricultural production and wetlands status for residential development. Population growth, land use trends, proximity to the expanding urban area and prospective availability of public services point to this conclusion.
Present acquisition of these lands carries a “now or never” urgency that makes a no action alternative undesirable from the viewpoint of recreational and resource preservation interests.

**Less intensive development**

A primitive or wilderness preservation type park alternative would involve land acquisition with no development. Since the area was once farmed or used recreationally, except for the wetlands area, it lacks the pristine character necessary for such an alternative to be meaningful. Several hundred years would be required before vegetation on the site would reach climax.

In addition, because the site is highly accessible to many people, moderate to heavy use is anticipated, dictating the installation of certain facilities to prevent environmental damage.

A less intensive park development would undoubtedly attract a different type of park visitor and result in fewer visitations annually. However, less intensive development would not meet the primary recreational needs of most Madison area day users. Running water and flush toilets, offices and adequate parking lots, roads and picnic shelters are needed to accommodate these users.

**Wildlife Area**

The developed character, high costs of shoreland and opposition by residents of Borcher’s Beach, Second Ward Beach and Morris Park discount the alternative of establishing a wildlife refuge or public hunting area on the site. Also, the Barn Drey Marshland Preservation Project fulfills this role upstream from the proposed park, adjacent to its northern boundary.

**Reduction of park boundaries**

Originally, Dane County purchased a 194-acre county park on the site in question. The 194-acre site was determined by the size of a single available parcel. Optimum recreational benefits and functional capabilities were more important than availability of certain parcels in determining the present proposed state park site of 444 acres. Reduced park size would eliminate certain recreational and interpretive uses but it is nonetheless a valid alternative.

According to Figures 8 and 9, which show existing land ownership and proposed development, parcels 3 and 11 are the most critical acreages for park acquisition and development. These two parcels total 230 acres and provide lake access.

Access to CW "M" from them is limited however.

**Wetland Complex**

Parcels 6, 8, 13 and 16 consist primarily of wetland along Six-Mile Creek and total an additional 76 acres. These lands could be deleted from the park proposal without a severe reduction in day use recreational capacity. However, acquisition of these wetlands is assigned to accommodate state park management goals of resource preservation and nature education. From that standpoint they are a welcome and almost necessary addition.

**V Camps**

Elimination of Camp Wakanda and Harle Obrich (parcels 2 and 4 on Figure 3) is another park acreage reduction option. This alternative would significantly reduce the amount of oak upland within park boundaries, thus decreasing vegetative diversity. Lake access would also be decreased. Day use recreational capacity of the park would remain essentially unchanged, but the group day use facility at Camp Wakanda would be eliminated. The YMCA and YWCA camp properties have been included in the acquisition proposal to broaden the function of Lake Mendota State Park.

**Other Alternatives**

The central land parcels (1, 7 and 10) are proposed for picnic area development and provide some topographic diversity to the adjacent farmland. These lands would act as a buffer for the lake frontage parcels. The other five small parcels have also been included to insure an easily administrated park boundary. Their recreational value is marginal and, depending on criteria used, their inclusion is not of critical functional necessity to the state park proposal.

A final reduction in park boundaries alternative would involve partial acquisition of parcel 11. The portion west of the town road off "M" has been included in the park proposal to preserve the wetlands along Farm Creek and to enhance water-quality benefits by eliminating agricultural runoff from livestock. Acquisition and relocated costs for this partial acquisition would be quite high. Due to the nature of
Improvements, a substantial proportion of the economic impact due to lost tax base may be attributed to acquisition of this portion of park land. On the other hand, operation of this farm by the present landowner would be impossible if the other agricultural acreage in this parcel was acquired, since the landowner does not own additional property in the area.

Acquisition of the entire Lake Mendota shoreline within the park boundary area is economically unfeasible. Over 60 residences would be involved in such acquisition. Lane values, in the range of $10,000 to $20,000 per front of shoreline, high relocation compensatory costs and lost property tax revenues negate the economic possibility of Department acquisition of these lands for park development.

Expansion of the park boundary west of ITH "M" was also considered. The problems of crossing this major traffic arterial are serious and could not be justified for expanded recreational uses.

More intensive park development could include larger picnic areas, marina facilities and overnight campsites. The physical size of the park site would not accommodate this more intensive development without crowding and deterioration of facilities. Acquisition of additional land would provide economically feasible and logistically difficult due to land values and the presence of Highway "M".

Though various regional and recreational plans have stressed a need for water-based recreation, existing marina facilities are meeting demands in the area.

Brandon Park impact

Public lake access and preservation of lakeshore lands, presently a higher priority in this area is inconsistent with the alternative of more intensive park development. The day use character of the Lake Mendota State Park proposal coordinates with the Department of Natural Resources recent trend toward a broader definition of state park, away from the high use, water oriented, overnight camp type facility.

Local feeling

Economic advantages associated with more intensive park development would be partially offset by campground and maintenance costs. Holding several meetings locally, it has also become evident that there is a substantial negative feeling among the local residents toward a camping facility.

MP beach

In light of the difficulties which may be encountered with weed growth and periodic high bacterial counts, park development without a beach is a viable alternative. Swimming is one of the most popular recreation forms in Wisconsin's state park system and is ranked as a favored activity in the Wisconsin Outdoors Recreation Plan. Although swimming use of the park would be less than half of the park with a beach. The necessity of swimming facilities is greater than usual. In this case, given the proximity of the proposed park to the densely populated Madison area.

Swimming pool

A variation of the no beach concept might be the development of a park with an artificial swimming pool. High initial costs, maintenance costs and energy consumption questions are associated with swimming pools. A swimming pool recently built at Blue Mounds State Park, for example, has a user capacity of 220 persons and costs approximately $500,000 to build. The proposed natural beach would serve at least 300 people at the time and cost about $140,000 to develop.

Several alternative solutions to the subsidization access situations at Gorcher's Beach were considered (see Figure 19). These alternatives were established on a cost-effective basis, on an environmental basis, and on a functional basis. The alternative that was chosen is proposed to function as a part of the town road system. Costs for the various road route alternatives are based in a preliminary investigation report by Department of Transportation, Division of Highways, District 9.

Road route alternatives

Alternatively one would involve the reconstruction of Oak Avenue to a flatter grade. About seven feet of earth would be removed from the top of the hill and a number of trees would be removed. The road right-of-way would have to be widened in order to reduce the grade of the hill. Construction disruptions...
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and visual impacts associated with this alternative are greater than the proposed roadway route. The estimated costs would be $33,000.

Alternative Two would involve the obliteration of Oak Avenue and the construction of a 200-foot section of new road connecting Morris Park Road and Borcher's Beach Road. This alternative would also call for the removal of some trees, but would cause less overall environmental disturbance than Alternative One. The cost is estimated at $32,000.

Alternative Three would involve obliterating Oak Avenue and constructing either of the new roads connecting Borcher's Beach Road and CTH "N." This alternative would involve disturbance of a significant amount of land and vegetation to obtain a level road route. Costs for this alternative are estimated at $40,000.

The proposed roadway route is the least costly of the four alternatives considered because it involves minimal earth moving and construction materials. The roadway proposal leaves Oak Avenue open for use in fair weather and in case of emergency. Alternative Two, which also provides direct access between Borcher's Beach and CTH "N" would have both normal and emergency traffic enter on Camp Wakanda Road. This would increase travel distance for access to Borcher's Beach and Morris Park by about 1,200 feet.

**ALTERNATE SITES**

**Cheoahie Marsh**

The primary alternate site for park development was Cherokee Marsh. While the DNR and the city of Madison both have sizable land holdings in Cherokee Marsh, the area was eventually discounted due to the fragility of the wetlands and the lack of dry land for recreational development. Also, though many surface acres of open water exist in the marsh area, water depth is insufficient to permit significant water-oriented recreation. The public is currently benefiting from city of Madison ownership of Cherokee Marsh. Operation focuses on natural areas preservation and an outdoor education program carried out by the Madison Board of Education.

**Government's Island**

Another site investigated for state park acquisition was "Government's Island" located across the north bay of Lake Mendota, almost directly east of the proposed site. This parcel is owned by the State of Wisconsin and is the site of the Mendota State Hospital and Wisconsin Central Colony. These institutions are intensively developed facilities and occupy 95% of the usable land on the site. The Government's Island site was discounted for two major reasons: (1) most of the usable land is already developed and (2) the effects of large numbers of park visitors on the patients at the institutions are impossible to predict.

**ACTION BY OTHER AGENCIES**

An onetime Dane County considering purchasing the Camp Wakanda land for recreational purposes. However, funding and program changes prevented this action.

**USE OF LAKE MENDOTA STATE PARK BY PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS**

The United States of Ho-Topic, a group of Native Americans residing in the Madison area, has indicated an interest in using Camp Wakanda by deed or lease for use by the members of the group. This request is proposed for consideration as an alternative for the use of Camp Wakanda. Ideas suggested for the camp include the development of an Indian cultural or religious retreat, an Indian community center, recreational camps, summer camps, day care center, educational or resource center, center for employment development of Native Americans and other uses to be solicited from Indian members in the Madison area.
Under the recommended use of Camp Wakanda as a part of the State park, the camp would be available on a reservation basis to the United Tribes of Oahe as well as all other groups that wished to utilize the facilities for compatible day use programs and activities. An exclusive use of State park property by an individual or group would be discriminatory under State and federal regulations and would not qualify for State ORP or Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund expenditures. These funds must be used for recreational facilities for the general public which precludes any exclusive use arrangements.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Management of the proposed site as a state park leaves more land use options open for the future than other development would. Land acquisition is thus an immediate action with short term economic repercussions as well as long term consequences. The elimination of prime agricultural land from production will effect future food production capacities of the area. However, future generations will have the benefit of open space recreation and long term resource protection. Agriculture will most likely decline as a result of private development even if the park is not developed publicly.

Net biological productivity, in terms of historically native flora and fauna, not agricultural foods and fibers, will be enhanced in the long term.

IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRECEIVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED IF THE PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED

In absolute terms, the commitment of this site to park use would not be irreversible. However, it is highly unlikely that once the park is established its land use would change. Due to the anticipated involvement of federal LAMON funding the land is permanently committed to recreation and resource protection. Only a change of legislation on the federal level or specific permission by the Secretary of the Interior could change this land use status.

For all practical purposes, roads, parking lots and buildings would be permanent, and their materials would be unsalvageable due to costs. Fuel, wear on construction equipment and the depletion of resource materials are similarly unrecoverable, as is the manpower expended on planning, construction and maintenance of the proposed park.
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### Resident Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Bird</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common toad</td>
<td>Cat bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton tail rabbit</td>
<td>Common sandpiper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great neck</td>
<td>Crows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey squirrel</td>
<td>English sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard frog</td>
<td>Field sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mink</td>
<td>Grackle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole</td>
<td>Great blue heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskrat</td>
<td>Green heron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposum</td>
<td>Horned lark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoon</td>
<td>Killdeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slunk</td>
<td>Marsh wren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vole</td>
<td>Meadowlark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water snake</td>
<td>Red-winged blackbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodchuck</td>
<td>Red head duck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American bittern</td>
<td>Robin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Jay</td>
<td>Scree ral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-winged teal</td>
<td>Song sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown thrasher</td>
<td>Starling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal</td>
<td>Wood duck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transient Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Bird</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grey fox</td>
<td>Golden eye duck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red fox</td>
<td>Great horned owl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed deer</td>
<td>Mallard duck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldpate duck</td>
<td>Pileated grebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bufflehead duck</td>
<td>Red-tailed hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvasback duck</td>
<td>Rough-legged hawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper’s hawk</td>
<td>Scap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cot</td>
<td>Whistling swan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
LAKE MICHIGAN STATE PARK
ZONING CATEGORIES AND REGULATIONS
Condensed from Dane County Zoning Ordinance, 1971

19.06 R-1 RESIDENCE DISTRICT

(1) USES PERMITTED

(a) Single family detached dwellings.

(b) Gardening, including truck gardens, nurseries and greenhouses, but not including the raising or keeping of poultry, livestock, bees or fur-bearing animals, including rabbits, except as otherwise herein provided.

(c) Municipal buildings, except buildings for the repair or storage of road building or maintenance machinery.

(d) Telephone, telegraph and power transmission lines, water, gas and sewer lines; any building or structure accessory to the operation of such lines, including electric transformer stations, telephone exchanges, pumping stations and the like.

(e) Public parks, golf courses, tennis courts, archery ranges.

(f) Churches and schools, colleges and universities conducted for profit, but not including private music, dancing, business or vocational schools.

(g) Institutions of a charitable or philanthropic nature, hospitals, clinics and sanitoria, except contagious hospitals and insane asylums.

(h) Libraries, museums and community buildings, private clubs and fraternities, except those whose principal activity is a service customarily carried on as a business, and except also riding clubs.

(i) Home occupations.

(j) Accessory buildings, including private garages and buildings clearly incidental to the residential use of the property; provided, however, that no accessory building may be used as a separate dwelling unit.

(k) Cemeteries, when they comply with the provisions of Section 157.06 of the Statutes.

(2) BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT

(a) Buildings hereafter erected or structurally altered shall not exceed two and one-half (2½) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height.

(3) AREA, FRONTAGE AND POPULATION DENSITY REGULATIONS

(a) For unplatted lands, where public sewer is not available, the lot area shall be determined by percolation test according to formulas of the state board of health, but no such lot or building shall have a width of less than one hundred (100) feet or area of less than fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet.

(b) For platted, or unplatted lands where public sewer is available, the minimum lot width shall be one hundred (100) feet and the minimum area fifteen thousand (15,000) square feet.

(c) No building, together with its accessory buildings, shall occupy in excess of thirty (30) percent of the area of an interior lot or thirty-five (35) percent of the area of a corner lot.

(4) SETBACK REQUIREMENTS

(a) Setbacks from front lot line or highway right-of-way shall conform to the requirements of Section 10.17.

(5) SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) There shall be side yards in the aggregate of not less than twenty-five (25) feet and no single side yard shall be less than ten (10) feet.
(6) REAR YARD REQUIREMENTS
   (a) The minimum depth of any rear yard shall be fifty (50) feet.

10.06 R-2 RESIDENCE DISTRICT

(1) USES PERMITTED
   (a) All uses permitted in the R-1 Residence District.

(2) BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT
   (a) The height limitation shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

(3) AREA, FRONTAGE AND POPULATION DENSITY REGULATIONS
   (a) For unplatted lands, where public sewer is not available, the minimum lot area shall be determined by percolation test according to formulas of the state board of health, but no such lot or building site shall have a width of less than seventy-five (75) feet or an area of less than ten thousand (10,000) square feet.
   (b) For plats, or for unplatted lands where public sewer is available, the minimum lot width shall be seventy-five (75) feet and the minimum area ten thousand (10,000) square feet.
   (c) No building, together with its accessory buildings, shall occupy in excess of thirty-five (35) percent of the area of an interior lot or forty (40) percent of the area of a corner lot.

(4) SETBACK REQUIREMENTS
   (a) Setback from front lot line or highway right-of-way shall conform to the requirements of Section 10.17.

(5) SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS
   (a) The minimum width of any side yard shall be ten (10) feet.

(6) REAR YARD REQUIREMENTS
   (a) The minimum depth of any rear yard shall be thirty-five (35) feet.

10.37 R-3 RESIDENCE DISTRICT

(1) USES PERMITTED
   (a) All uses permitted in the R-1 Residence District.

(2) BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT
   (a) The height limitation shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

(3) AREA, FRONTAGE AND POPULATION DENSITY REGULATIONS
   (a) For unplatted lands, where public sewer is not available, the lot area shall be determined by percolation test according to formulas of the state board of health, but no such lot or building site shall have a width of less than sixty (60) feet or an area of less than eight thousand (8,000) square feet.
   (b) For plats, or for unplatted lands where public sewer is available, the minimum lot width shall be sixty (60) feet and the minimum area shall be eight thousand (8,000) square feet.
   (c) No building, together with its accessory buildings, shall occupy in excess of thirty-five (35) percent of the area of an interior lot or forty (40) percent of the area of a corner lot.

(4) SETBACK REQUIREMENTS
   (a) Setback from lot line or highway right-of-way shall conform to the provisions of Section 10.17.
SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum width of any side yard shall be ten (10) feet.

REAR YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum depth of any rear yard shall be twenty-five (25) feet.

10.02 R-2 RESIDENCE DISTRICT

USES PERMITTED

(a) All uses permitted in the R-1 Residence District.

(b) Duplexes, multiple family dwellings, apartment houses, apartment house complexes, condominum apartments.

(c) Mobile home parks, subject to the provisions of 10.25 (4) Application for Approval of Site.

(d) Nursing homes, convalescent homes or extended care facilities provided that such buildings be located not less than 50 feet from any lot in a residence district. Subject to the provisions of 10.25 (4) Application for Approval of Site.

BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT

(a) For single family dwellings and duplexes the maximum building height shall be two and one-half (2½) stories or thirty-five (35) feet.

(b) For apartments the maximum building height shall be four (4) stories.

AREA, FLOORING AND POPULATION DENSITY REGULATIONS

(a) For unplatted lands where public sewer is not available:

1. For single family dwellings the minimum lot area shall be determined by percolation tests according to formulas of the state board of health, but no such lot or building site shall have a width of less than sixty (60) feet or an area of less than eight thousand (8,000) square feet.

2. For multiple family dwellings, apartment houses and apartment house complexes, the minimum lot area shall be determined by percolation tests according to formulas of the state board of health, but no such lot or building site shall have a width of less than sixty (60) feet or an area of less than five thousand (5,000) square feet per dwelling unit.

3. For duplexes the lot width and area shall be the same as for the R-2 Residence District.

(b) For platted and unplatted lands where public sewer is available:

1. For single family dwellings the minimum lot width shall be sixty (60) feet and the minimum lot area shall be eight thousand (8,000) square feet.

2. For duplexes the lot width and area shall be the same as for the R-2 Residence District.

3. For multiple family dwellings, apartment houses and apartment house complexes containing efficiency or one bedroom apartments, the minimum lot width shall be sixty (60) feet and the minimum lot area shall be two thousand (2,000) square feet per unit.

4. For multiple family dwellings, apartment houses and apartment house complexes containing two bedroom apartments the minimum lot width shall be sixty (60) feet and the minimum lot area shall be two thousand two hundred fifty (2,250) square feet per unit.

5. For multiple family dwellings, apartment houses and apartment house complexes containing apartments of more than two bedrooms the minimum lot width shall be sixty (60) feet and the minimum lot area shall be two thousand two hundred fifty (2,250) square feet per unit.

6. If apartment houses or apartment house complexes contain a mixture of one, two or more than two bedrooms then the lot area shall be prorated.
7. When computing the minimum areas for apartment house complexes driveways which are not through streets, parking spaces, swimming pools and facilities which are common to all of the buildings in the complex shall be considered part of the total area of the complex.

(c) Mobile Homes Parks shall provide a minimum lot area of three thousand (3,000) square feet of lot area for each mobile home exclusive of roadways within the park area.

(4) SETBACK REQUIREMENTS

(a) Setback from front lot line or highway right-of-way shall conform to the requirements of Section 10.17; provided, however, that driveways within an apartment house complex, leading to buildings or parking spaces, which are not through streets, shall not be considered streets for the purpose of determining setbacks.

(5) SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum side yard on each side of a building not exceeding two and one-half (2½) stories in height shall be ten (10) feet on each side.

(b) For buildings exceeding two and one-half (2½) stories in height the side yard on each side shall be increased by ten (10) feet for each full story over two stories.

(c) For apartment house complexes, where each building is not on a separate parcel of land, the minimum distance between buildings shall be the sum of the side yards which would be required if the buildings were on separately described parcels.

(d) No mobile home shall be located within ten (10) feet of any side lot line of a mobile home park.

(6) REAR YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum depth of any rear yard shall be twenty-five (25) feet; provided that for buildings exceeding two and one-half (2½) stories or thirty-five (35) feet in height the rear yard shall be increased by ten (10) feet for each full story over two stories.

(b) No mobile home shall be located within twenty-five (25) feet of the rear lot line of a mobile home park.

(7) OFF-STREET PARKING

(a) Off-street parking shall be as required by Section 10.18.

10.09 RH-1 RURAL HOMES DISTRICT

(1) USES PERMITTED

(a) All uses permitted in the R-1 Residence District.

(b) General farming, including dairying, livestock raising and similar uses, except fur farming, rodent breeding and rearing, or any animal breeding and raising for experimental purposes, apiculture, feeding of livestock for market.

(c) Roadside stands.

(2) BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT

(a) The building height shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

(3) AREA, FRONTAGE AND POPULATION DENSITY REGULATIONS

(a) For unplatted lands where public sewer is not available:

1. The lot width and area shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

(b) For areas where public sewer is available:

1. The lot width and area shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.
SETBACK REQUIREMENTS

(a) Setback from front lot line or highway right-of-way shall conform to the requirements of Section 10.17.

SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum side yards shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

REAR YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum rear yard shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

10.10 AE-1 RECREATIONAL DISTRICT

(1) USES PERMITTED

(a) All uses permitted in the RH-1 District.

(b) Boat livery and the sale of bait.

(c) Ski slides and toboggan slides.

(d) Recreational camps and facilities, tourist and trailer camps, campgrounds, concession stands and other facilities necessary to serve the premises. Subject to provisions of 10.23 (4) Application for Approval of Site and Section 10.18 of this ordinance.

(2) BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT

(a) The building height limitations shall be the same as for the R-1 Residence District.

(3) AREA, FRONTAGE AND POPULATION DENSITY REQUIREMENTS

(a) The lot width and area shall be the same as for the R-3 Residence District.

(b) No building, together with its accessory buildings, shall occupy in excess of thirty-five (35) percent of the area of an interior lot or forty (40) percent of the area of a corner lot.

SETBACK REQUIREMENTS

(a) Setback from front lot line or highway right-of-way shall conform to the requirements of Section 10.17.

SIDE YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum side yard shall be the same as for the R-3 Residence District.

(b) For the buildings permitted in 10.10 (1) (d), no building shall be located within one hundred fifty (150) feet of a residence district.

REAR YARD REQUIREMENTS

(a) The minimum depth of any rear yard shall be twenty-five (25) feet.

OFF STREET PARKING

(a) Off-street parking shall be provided as required by Section 10.18.
APPENDIX C
EXPLANATION OF SECTION 4(f),
DOT ACT OF 1966
From Wisconsin Division of Highways
Facilities Development Section
"An Overview of the Environmental
Activities Process" February 1975

4(f) Lands

4(f) lands are publicly owned lands such as parks, recreational areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historical sites. The designation "4(f)" refers to section 4(f) of the DOT Act of 1966, now Section 1653(f), 49 U.S.C.

Before approving a project which utilizes 4(f) land, the Secretary of the Federal DOT must:

1. Consult with the Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, or Housing and Urban Development (HUD);
2. Determine that there are no prudent and feasible alternatives to the use of the 4(f) land;
3. Include all possible planning to minimize harm; and,
4. Prepare a statement documenting early consultation, inspection of feasible alternatives, and plans for minimizing harm should 4(f) land be taken.

If it appears that 4(f) land may be taken, in order to comply with 4(f) mandates, Wis. DOT and FHWA must first make a determination of significance of the land.

Determination of significance may occur in several ways: (it should be noted that FHWA must concur in this determination):

1. It may be obvious by inspection (e.g., parks);
2. A 4(f) statement is not required if the official having jurisdiction over the lands states (in writing) that the park, recreation area, etc., is not significant. If there is no such statement, the land is considered significant.
3. Some publicly-owned lands have multiple uses; for example, a national forest may be used partially for recreational purposes. In these cases, if the land in question is not being used for 4(f) purposes and there is no definite formulated plan for such use, 4(f) does not apply.
4. Marginal cases such as use of land for fairgrounds, school playgrounds, etc., must be evaluated on a case by case basis. One applicable test might be a determination of how the land is used in "off-hours." If it is open to the public for regular 4(f) use, especially on an organized basis, it would probably be considered 4(f) by FHWA.

If the land is determined to be significant, a 4(f) statement must be prepared to include the following considerations:

A. It must first be determined and documented that there are no prudent and feasible alternatives to the use of the 4(f) land. This determination must be legally defensible. PUBN 7-7-2 states that "unique problems, truly unusual factors present, cost or disruption to the community of unusual magnitude" must be shown.
8. It must be shown that the best possible measures have been taken to minimize harm. Such measures might include any or all of the following:

1. Functional replacement of the land;
2. Design features to enhance the land (e.g., addition of playground equipment or a bike path);
3. Coordinate construction so that work can be done in such a way that there will be the least possible impact on public use (e.g., construction in period of least use); and,
4. Consult with the agency having jurisdiction over the land concerning measures to minimize harm.

C. Coordinate with HUD on open-space land or BOR if LAWCON land is involved.

4(f) Lands and Type I Process

When it has been determined that 4(f) lands are to be taken for a proposed project, the 4(f) statement is processed in the following manner:

The 4(f) statement should be a self-contained document. If it is combined with an EIS, the normal procedure is to prepare the document as a Draft EIS/4(f) statement. The draft 4(f) statement then accompanies the Draft EIS through the FDS and FHWA review process.

The official submittal of the 4(f) statement to FHWA for approval occurs when the Final EIS/4(f) is transmitted. Up to this point, review time would not be affected appreciably due to the addition of a 4(f) statement. However, when the final 4(f) statement reaches FHWA Regional and Washington offices, a time-consuming legal review is likely.

If 4(f) lands are involved in one of the alternates addressed in an EIS, the following procedures apply:

1. If it is expected at the outset that the chosen alternate will be 4(f), the draft documentation should be processed as a Draft EIS/4(f) and as much information about the 4(f) land as possible, included.
2. If 4(f) land is among other alternates and is not expected to be the preferred alternate, it should be discussed within the EIS but not processed as a draft EIS/4(f) document.
3. If, during the evaluation of alternates, the 4(f) alternate becomes preferred, the document would become a Final EIS/4(f).

In the case of a Negative Declaration, the 4(f) statement should be attached to the Negative Declaration and transmitted in the normal manner. FHWA approval of the Final Negative Declaration will be held in abeyance until the 4(f) Statement has been approved. In these cases, documentation of early coordination with pertinent federal agencies must take the form of a letter from the agency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Overlook</th>
<th>Wooded</th>
<th>Nature Preserve</th>
<th>Special Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Park</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Monona</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Park</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Arrow Park</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Park</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Park</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armory Park</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaylord Park</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Arboretum Park</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Park</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Woodlawn Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Woodlawn Park</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grid Location**

- Woodland Section - 12
- Johnson Park Section - 21
- Eisenhower Park Section - 32
- Red Arrow Park Section - 43
- Madison Arboretum Park Section - 51
- North High Park Section - 62
- Central Park Section - 73
- East Woodlawn Park Section - 84
- West Woodlawn Park Section - 95
- East Madison Park Section - 106

**Note:** The grid location numbers correspond to the sections within each park.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Grid Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Beach</th>
<th>Bowling</th>
<th>Softball</th>
<th>Soccer</th>
<th>Swimming Pool</th>
<th>Fishing</th>
<th>Picnic Area</th>
<th>Toilets</th>
<th>Tennis Courts</th>
<th>Special Features</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Ridge Valley</td>
<td>E-15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pond</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orton</td>
<td>S-10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wooded</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>S-8</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie</td>
<td>C-16</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker Reservoir</td>
<td>G-12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood</td>
<td>M-16</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenk</td>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlook</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seve</td>
<td>E-13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segoe Triangle</td>
<td>E-13</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan Triangle</td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Village</td>
<td>N-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shermood Forest</td>
<td>D-15</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson Street</td>
<td>C-14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyview</td>
<td>C-10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturdiv Street</td>
<td>H-11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset</td>
<td>C-12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Manor</td>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Starbuck Creek</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Heights</td>
<td>N-3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom Way</td>
<td>O-8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Court</td>
<td>F-8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>P-9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahara Place</td>
<td>O-9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. J. Faunke</strong></td>
<td>F-15</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goldfield</strong></td>
<td>H-9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graystone</strong></td>
<td>M-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hayden</strong></td>
<td>S-11</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage Heights</strong></td>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Hall</strong></td>
<td>L-10</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lew</strong></td>
<td>N-13</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral Point</strong></td>
<td>J-12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northland Manor</strong></td>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Osage Hills</strong></td>
<td>E-14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penn</strong></td>
<td>L-15</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarry</strong></td>
<td>G-11</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Harbor</strong></td>
<td>E-10</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Hills</strong></td>
<td>S-14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waukesha</strong></td>
<td>C-14</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Madison Parks and Recreational Facilities**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Grid Location</th>
<th>Acres Location</th>
<th>Special Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brittingham</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elver</td>
<td>B-16</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Viles</td>
<td>J-11</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>G-12</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>E-9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottisch</td>
<td>G-9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olin</td>
<td>H-13</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisland</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney</td>
<td>H-9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Point</td>
<td>N-14</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larner</td>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>235.8</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Features</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Playfields</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Stevens</td>
<td>M-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Jones</td>
<td>M-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevels</td>
<td>G-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitcho</td>
<td>K-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>L-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsch</td>
<td>L-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. E. Clarke</td>
<td>H-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittingham</td>
<td>K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Avenue Beach</td>
<td>E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthay Beach</td>
<td>M-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman Street Beach</td>
<td>L-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Villas Park</td>
<td>J-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison</td>
<td>L-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefront</td>
<td>K-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Park</td>
<td>G-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottisch</td>
<td>H-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenney Park</td>
<td>K-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Beach</td>
<td>M-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowo Beach</td>
<td>N-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#12.3 acres of this site is included as a neighborhood park in Table 1.
Economic Profile

DANE COUNTY

Dane County is based economically not only on state government and the university, but has strong manufacturing and agricultural sectors. Madison has reached such size and diversity that it has become an enormous attraction for people seeking job security and/or cultural advantages.

POPULATION

1970 population 280,272  .  % of state 6.57

1960-70 change (%) 30.7  .  state avg. 11.8

Density 242.4  .  per sq. mi.  state avg. 80.8

Net migration 1960-70 99,107  .  in

Net migration 1950-60 14,227  .  in

% Distribution (Virt. in percent)

Age:

Male Female Male Female
Under 10 49,445 47,582 (37) 35 (24) 32
10-14 61,382 63,745 (33) 43 (34) 43
15-19 22,227 23,776 (20) 16 (20) 16
65 & over 8,885 12,023 (10) 6 (13) 9
Total 132,139 186,123 100% 100%

Median age 24.3  .  state avg. 27.2

Births (esp.) 1960-69 6,096 1965-69 5,276

INCOME

Family income, 1969 (Current)

Median County $11,203  .  State esp. $11,098

Family income groups: County % State % Change

Under $4,000 9 13
4,000-5,999 8 9
6,000-7,999 10 12
8,000-9,999 14 16
10,000 & over 59 51

County 1970 buying power: 1 $553,583,000  .  % of state 6.87

LABOR FORCE

Employees Covered by OASI-Medicare 1970

Employee Jan.-Mar. Dec.-

Total 77,207 5119,955 4,983
Construction 5,817 10,191 508
Manufacturing 16,819 33,745 301
Transport., util. 5,568 10,136 164
Wholesale trade 5,169 10,169 374
Retail trade 19,514 18,870 1,482
Finance, ins., etc. 6,343 10,656 560
Services 17,280 21,134 1,486

Employment Trends (Residents)

1970

1960 1970 % Dif. Wage (in percent)

Agric., forestry 6,662 5,006 4.1 (6.5)
Mining 52 120 -0.1 (0.5)
Construction 5,167 6,216 5.0 (5.0)
Manufacturing 14,628 15,807 12.9 (31.0)
Transport., util. 4,242 5,762 4.7 (5.2)
Other services 26,730 90,225 73.2 (59.0)

Copyright State Management Survey of Buying Power Further reproduction is forbidden.

Available for 50c a copy from Document Sales, 1 W. Wilson St., Madison 53702.
### Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms:</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>4,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1-5 farms:*</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land in farms (acres):</td>
<td>406,600</td>
<td>656,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All land in farms:</td>
<td>79,1</td>
<td>85,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. size of farm (acres):</td>
<td>103,6</td>
<td>159,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. cropland harvested per farm reporting any:</td>
<td>100,4</td>
<td>93,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of land &amp; buildings/farm</td>
<td>$75,216</td>
<td>$44,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators working off farm 100 days or more:</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Products Sold (to nearest thousand):**

| Total                                | 75,714  | 51,530 |
| Avg. pr farm:                        | 20      | 12     |
| State avg.:                          | 15      | 9      |
| Crop, incl. nursery products and hay:| 12,507  | 9,492  |
| Forest products:                     | 25      | 62     |
| Livestock, poultry, and their products: | 63,062  | 41,971 |
| Dairy products:                      | 32,160  | 25,589 |

* Farms with total sales of $2,500 and over.

### Forestry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>74,600</th>
<th>% of land area: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in forest:</td>
<td>74,600</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State avg.:</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major species:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type (inc. below)</th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th>Stock Savages (1000 cu. ft.)</th>
<th>(1000 bd. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine (inc. below)</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>29,255</td>
<td>102,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple (hard)</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>7,404</td>
<td>5,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other hardwoods</td>
<td>19,924</td>
<td>42,326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/ North Central Forest Experiment Station, 1968, in cooperation with Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

### Minerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind quarryd, processed:</th>
<th>Sand &amp; Gravel</th>
<th>Limestone - crushed and broken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of production, 1968:</td>
<td>$3,168,000</td>
<td>% of state: 4.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retail Trade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of stores: 1967: 9,203</th>
<th>8,804</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add $000)</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber, hw., farm equip.</td>
<td>42,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. mdc.</td>
<td>66,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>85,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>81,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas stations</td>
<td>32,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>26,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furn., house equip.</td>
<td>24,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating, drinking places</td>
<td>42,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug stores</td>
<td>18,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wholesale Trade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of establishments: 1967: 414</th>
<th>1963 415</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales (add $000)</td>
<td>1967 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of state</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

E-2
DANE COUNTY-A DESCRIPTION

Dane County, the seat of Wisconsin's state government and state university, is the second most populous county and one of the fastest growing. In the decade from 1950, population increased by 31.1 per cent, a little over double the state's increase. During the 1960's the increase was almost 31 per cent. While 80 per cent of the land area is in farms, population density is a relatively high 242 per square mile, indicating the presence of numerous cities and villages.

Looking at the age distribution of the population, it is seen that, when compared with the rest of the state, the county has a "shortage" of persons under 18 years of age, and a large "surplus" of persons in the 18 to 44 group, then a "surplus" again in the 45-64 and 65 and older groups. The attractiveness of the county is illustrated by a net immigration of 29,000 persons during the 1960's. University students are part of the immigrants, and they are the chief reason for the large 16-44 year old bulge. There are more than 20,000 basically nonresidents at U.W.

Median family income of $11,263 is substantially higher than the state average. With 6.57 per cent of the state's population, Dane County has 6.87 per cent of the buying income. Counting students in the population deflates this figure.

The county is a net importer of labor; that is, substantial numbers of jobs are filled by persons who live elsewhere and commute to Dane County. Nearly 4,000 commuted to factory jobs, according to a 1960 estimate, but this seems to be changing, and more commuters are white collar.

In addition to the state government and the university, the number of service jobs is swelled by the presence in the county of numerous federal workers, in such establishments as the Forest Products Laboratory and the Veteran's Hospital. Further service workers are found in insurance—several insurance companies have headquarters in Madison—and in regional sales offices. Altogether, service jobs account for 73 per cent of the employment of Dane County residents, against 52 per cent statewide.

While manufacturing is important, manufacturing is the second largest employer. Farming accounts for only 4 per cent of the jobs held by residents.

Despite the relatively small number of persons engaged, agriculture makes an important contribution to the county's economy. Dane is first in rank among all Wisconsin counties in farm income; it leads also in cropland harvested. The county has much high-grade farm land, and its location gives it a comparatively long growing season for crops like corn.

As elsewhere, the number of farms is decreasing, the average size of farms is increasing, and the value of land has gone up. Average sales per farm at $20,000 are well above the state average. Dairy products are the single most important source of farm income, as is typical of Wisconsin, but the county lies within the corn belt, and swine and beef cattle are important, also.

Topographically, the county comprises both glaciated and driftless (or "old drift") terrain, which means that part of the land is rolling and open, and part is hilly, cut by steep valleys. The western part of the county is hilly. Lakes are present in the glaciated portions; the two largest, both at Madison, are Mendota and Monona.

Only 10 per cent of the land area is in woodlands. Among common trees are oak and elm. Large volumes of sand and gravel are produced, and also crushed limestone. There are deposits of high grade silica sand.

The volume of retail trade is high. The county has 7.22 per cent of the state's sales, with only 6.57 per cent of the population. Per capita sales were $1,795 in 1967, compared with the state average of $1,577. Especially strong are the apparel and general merchandise categories. The county also has a substantial wholesale trade volume.

Products made by Dane County manufacturers, range from meat packing to surgical and medical instruments. Manufacturing is relatively less important in Dane County than in the state as a whole, accounting for 58 jobs per thousand residents, against 118 statewide. Nevertheless, the county has a varied and fast-growing industrial base. The county has witnessed the opening of several firms in the past few years. The presence of the university, with its scientific community and facilities, as well as the cultural advantages offered, has attracted several research organizations and manufacturers of technical equipment.

Dane County's transportation system is outstanding—the 8-system, rail, pipelines, and a major airport (Truax) at Madison.
MANUFACTURING DATA

No. of establishments, by employment size: 1967.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of estab.</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>13,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of state</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total payroll</td>
<td>$118,400</td>
<td>81,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(add 000)</td>
<td>% of state</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. earnings/hr. prod. workers</td>
<td>$3.27</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State avg.</td>
<td>$3.09</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value added, mfg. (add 000)</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
<td>140,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of state</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jobs, June 1969, per 1000 population: 1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>State avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dane</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight Largest Manufacturing Employers -- Data as of March 1970 2/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Mayer &amp; Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Meat packing</td>
<td>3600-3899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graber Mfg. Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>Traverse curtain rods, etc.</td>
<td>600-699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Newspapers, Inc.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Newspaper publishing</td>
<td>300-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kippcoast Corporation</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Die casting</td>
<td>300-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnes Co., Div. of Wehr Corp.</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>Streeting, air distribution systems</td>
<td>300-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Equipment Co.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Milk coolers, etc.</td>
<td>300-399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray-O-Vac, Div. of ESB, Inc.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Dry cell batteries</td>
<td>800-899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Chemical Co., Div. of Air Reduction Co.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Surgical &amp; medical instruments</td>
<td>500-599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three Largest Nonmanufacturing Employers (Private) 3/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product or Business</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Telephone Co.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Telephone service</td>
<td>1100-1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remo's Drug Stores, Inc.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Drugs, notions</td>
<td>900-999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Family Mutual Ins.</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>700-799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dane County has a relatively small number of factory jobs for a county so populous. Yet, manufacturing has been increasing. Closing of the Gehloll Machine Co. early in 1971 has had an impact locally. The county has considerable diversity, but it has little in the way of a heavy machinery base. Some tendency to attract to Madison the R & D operations of manufacturing companies has been noted. There is a strong feeling that companies that can further utilize University of Wisconsin scientists and engineers should settle in the area. Also, those that want to be near a major airport.

(1) Employment covered by Unemployment Compensation divided by 1957 population. (2) Adapted from Division of Unemployment Compensation data. Plant openings, expansions, or closings since March 1969 have not been taken into account where information was secured. Some limited plants may have zero size classes available, e.g., earnings. (3) Employment covered by Unemployment Compensation divided by 1975 population.
## SERVICE INDUSTRIES

### No. of establishments (1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hotels, motels, rec. camps</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>Business services</th>
<th>463</th>
<th>Receipts: (add 000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNMENT FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property assessment—Full value</th>
<th>% of state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>$3,184,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>$3,266,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To nearest thousand.

## POPULATION OF INCORPORATED PLACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belleville,</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Earth,</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mounds,</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn,</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottages</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coon Plains,</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Pere,</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>2,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield,</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 972 in this county.

## OUTDOOR RECREATION HIGHLIGHTS

- Land designated for recreation use: 30.194 acres.
- Lakes over 100 acres: 11.
- Lakes with public access: 15.
- Number of lakes: 729,100.
- Acres of named lakes: 30,430.
- Acres of public access lakes: 17.
- Acres of public access reservoirs: 1,250.
- Recreation areas: 19.
- Number of special interest areas: 1.
- Total acres: 25,284.
- Acres of public access: 17.
- Acres of public use: 16.
- Acres of private use: 35.
- Private use: 30.
- Public use: 29.
- Community use: 2.
- Regional use: 1.

* Courtesy Bureau of Planning.

## GOVERNMENT (cont.)

### Tax Levy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax levy</th>
<th>$7,320</th>
<th>State avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Per capita

| Per capita | $234.66 | State avg. |

### Full value rate

| Full value rate | 26.06 | State avg. |

### County rate

| County rate | 5.39 | State avg. |

### School rate

| School rate | 17.77 | State avg. |

### Personal

| Personal | $34,579 | State avg. |

### Corporate

| Corporate | $5,199 | State avg. |

### State shared taxes

| State shared taxes | 2019 | 2020 |

### Total

| Total | $3,190 | 2019 |

### State aid

| State aid | 2019 | 2020 |

### Welfare

| Welfare | $7,807 | 2019 |

### Educational

| Educational | $18,877 | 2019 |

### Highway

| Highway | $5,916 | 2019 |
Responsibilities Following Project Completion - 6(f) Conflict Procedures

Instructions: This sheet should be inserted into Part 685.2.1 of the Grants-in-Aid Manual. It provides guidance in determining when a Section 6(f) conflict will result from a proposed action and the procedure and documentation to be used in requesting approval of the use conversion.

Determine Section 6(f) Applicability

When a change in use of Fund-assisted land is contemplated by the sponsor, a determination has to be made by, first, the State Liaison Officer, and ultimately by the Bureau, as to whether a Section 6(f) conflict will result.

If it is found that a Section 6(f) conflict will result and the conversion of use is approved by the Bureau, then it is necessary to acquire replacement land subject to the requirements noted in this insert. Only land will satisfy the provisions of Section 6(f). The value of new capital improvements or a reimbursement to the Fund will not be acceptable.

It is necessary initially for the $1.0 and the MOR to review the project agreement and supporting documents to determine the project scope and to assure that the lands proposed for a conversion of use fall within that scope and thus within the purview of Section 6(f).

If the subject lands are considered part of the project scope, the Bureau would generally consider a conversion of use to occur if one of the following actions were to be taken:

1. Granting by the participant to another party control, or partial control, of the land which would result in use other than public outdoor recreation as approved by the Bureau. This includes granting control of the land for the construction and maintenance of a utility line, pipeline, irrigation ditch, road, or other similar facility. It applies whether the intention is above or below ground level. A possible exception could occur if the participant, without relinquishing any control over the area, would allow a non-owner to construct a water line, pipeline, underground utility, or similar construction which would not impair the present and future recreational use of the property and the surface area would be restored to the preconstruction condition.

2. Constructing or installing structures or facilities by the project sponsor or others on lands considered within the project scope which would not be compatible with the existing outdoor recreation uses or would result in a nonrecreational use other than that acknowledged and approved by the Bureau.
Common examples of actions that have resulted in Section 6(f) conflicts include:

1. Granting control or partial control of land for transportation rights-of-way, powerline rights-of-way, pipelines, sewer lines, and landfills.

2. Construction of structures such as fire stations, civic centers, libraries, indoor recreation facilities, and communication towers.

The Bureau recognizes that the above actions are not all-inclusive and that other kinds of actions not listed would in fact result in a Section 6(f) conflict. The authority to make a final determination as to whether a potential Section 6(f) conflict exists rests with the Bureau.

Requests for Approval of Changes in Use

When the potential conversion has been established, the state should accompany its request to the Bureau for approval of the conversion with the following documents, as appropriate:

1. A justification for the proposed action and a certification by the state that the conversion would be in accord with the existing statewide comprehensive outdoor recreation plan.

2. Maps illustrating the location of the Fund-assisted land that would be taken or converted and the location of the proposed replacement land. Where appropriate, site plans or parcel maps should be submitted.

3. Assurances by the state that the land proposed for substitution is of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness to the land to be taken or converted. Land values should be based on appropriate appraisals meeting SOR standards (Manual Part 675.2.5).

4. A discussion of the conversion's impact on recreational values and experiences within the Fund-assisted park area.

5. When appropriate, a discussion of feasible alternatives to the action requiring conversion. This discussion should explore alternatives which would either mitigate the effects of the conversion or preclude the conversion completely.

6. As applicable, a copy of the proposed easement or other less-than-free interest conveyance document. A summary of the restrictions on construction and repair work is required in conversions associated with utility lines, pipelines, irrigation ditches, etc.

Upon receipt of the necessary documentation, the Bureau will take appropriate action and advise the SIO on the final determination.
Mr. C. D. Besadny
Director, Department of
Natural Resources
Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Dear Mr. Besadny:

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the preliminary environmental report for Lake Mendota State Park. The report deals effectively with the cultural environment, one of the principal concerns of the National Park Service. As no established or studied unit of the National Park System or any Natural Landmark (natural or historic) would be affected by the establishment of this park, we have no additional comments.

Sincerely yours,

Dan E. Davis
Acting Regional Director
C. D. Beasady, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Department of Natural Resources
P.O. Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Re: Preliminary Environmental Report for
the Proposed Acquisition, Development
& Management of Lake Mendota State Park,
Dane County, Wisconsin

March 13, 1975

Dear Mr. Beasady:

The above report was forwarded to us by our Milwaukee office, since no National Forest lands are involved.

We generally agree with the principle and methods planned for the development of Lake Mendota State Park. We feel that the report adequately discusses alternatives and environmental consequences, and sets the stage for meaningful public hearings.

The impact statement should consider the possible loss of trees where there is compaction due to increased pedestrian traffic.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this report.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ALFRED H. TROY
Assistant Director
Environmental Protection & Improvement
Dear Mr. Besadny:

We have reviewed the preliminary environmental report for the proposed acquisition, development, and management of Lake Mendota State Park, Dane County, Wisconsin, and offer the following general comments:

1. The soils are generally suitable for the proposed use.

2. The report states on page 28 that construction activities will create permanent adverse effects. Construction activities normally create temporary effects. No mention is made of adequate erosion control during and after construction. Many adverse effects can be minimized by preparing and implementing a sound erosion and sediment control plan. A reference to such a plan should be included in the report.

3. The report makes no mention of plans or provisions for conservation land treatment of the park after development. What measures will be needed to dispose of runoff water from parking areas and to protect trails and picnic areas from excessive erosion?

4. Installation of 4 miles of interior access roads could cause disruption of the natural drainage patterns unless adequate design provisions are made.

5. Depending upon criteria used, one-half to two-thirds of the area can be classified as prime agricultural land.

6. Water quality has been declining in the lake during recent years. Can adequate quality be maintained to support the proposed park uses?

7. The proposed project has no effect on Soil Conservation Service projects.
We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed park development. Do not hesitate to contact us if you have further questions on these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard W. Akley
State Conservationist

cc: J. Schoeegler, SCD, Madison, Wisconsin
    A. Porter, ACS, Madison, Wisconsin
Mr. C. D. Besadny  
State of Wisconsin  
Department of Natural Resources  
Box 450  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Dear Mr. Besadny:

We have completed our review of the Preliminary Environmental Report for Proposed Acquisition, Development and Management of Lake Mendota State Park, Dane County, Wisconsin. We have no objections to the implementation of this proposal.

The EIS should discuss in greater detail the type of trees and shrubs that will be planted in the park. Any plans to establish a prairie ecosystem at the park should be discussed.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Preliminary Environmental Report.

Sincerely yours,

Gary A. Williams  
Chief,  
EIS Review Section
March 17, 1975

Mr. C. D. Badenay, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Department of Natural Resources
4410 University Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Re: Preliminary Environmental Report for Proposed Acquisition, Development and Management of Lake Mendota State Park, DADE COUNTY, WISCONSIN

Dear Mr. Beadnay:

The State Planning Office, Department of Administration has reviewed the above preliminary environmental report (PER) and would like to make the following comments:

1. The PER presented adequate description and analysis of the project and major environmental issues. The clear style of the text and the well organized and annotated format greatly simplified our review.

2. We support acquisition and development of Lake Mendota State Park as proposed. It is of the greatest importance to develop general outdoor recreation facilities in locations easily accessible from the most highly populated areas of the state.

3. If poor water conditions in the future restrict use of the beach we would nevertheless oppose the alternative of swimming pool construction. The additional money required would be better spent treating the cause of the water quality problem.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project.

Respectfully,

Thomas H. Krauskopf
Planner
February 28, 1975

Mr. C. D. Besadny, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Department of Natural Resources
Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

SHSW 0006-75-1

Dear Mr. Besadny:

Reference your January 30, 1975 letter 1600 and the enclosed Preliminary Environmental Report for the proposed acquisition, development and management of Lake Mendota State Park in Dane County, Wisconsin.

We are looking forward with pleasure to cooperating in the survey mentioned on page 27 of the report.

Sincerely,

James Morton Smith
State Historic Preservation Officer

JMS:dp

cc: Mrs. James Woodburn, President
Dane County Historical Society
February 21, 1975

Mr. C. D. Badary, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Department of Natural Resources
P. O. Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Dear Mr. Basadny:

Attached are the comments of this agency relating to the preliminary environmental report for the proposed acquisition, development and management of Lake Mendota State Park, Dane County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Wilbur J. Schmidt
Secretary

attachment
Pursuant to your February 5 memo, I am providing herewith a number of comments concerning the preliminary environmental report on the Lake Mendota State Park which was prepared by DNR's Bureau of Parks and Recreation.

My direct involvement with either the waterfront or land areas of the proposed park has been extremely limited in recent years because of a shift in departmental responsibilities and personal priorities within the past few years.

In general, I feel that the report is well prepared and covers virtually all of the significant items which could involve an environmental impact.

It appears that bathing beach will be developed at the site of the long-time operated Camp Indiannals. There was some comment in the report that there would be a likelihood of such a beach being closed to the public on occasions when there might be some high bacteria counts attributable to waste water discharges or significant runoff from farmland. It is my recollection that during a period of over twenty years this office monitored the Lake Mendota bathing waters off Camp Indiannals, and I cannot recall that on any occasion did we experience high bacteria counts. This was true, even though Six Mile Creek discharging into Lake Mendota less than a mile north of Camp Indiannals contained effluents from municipal sewage treatment plants at Waunakee, DeForest and Windsor. It was apparent that any discharges from Six Mile Creek traveled in a northeasterly direction into the Yahara River and probably never flowed southwesterly toward Camp Indiannals.

It is recalled that the bathing area at Camp Indiannals was treated on occasion for swimmers itch, and that occasionally algae problems were experienced. It would be my expectation that the usual algae and weed problem will not diminish along this shore of the lake, and that during some summer days there will be extensive objectionable odors from decaying algae.

In October of 1968 at the suggestion of the Madison Rivers and Lakes Commission, this office in cooperation with the Madison City Health Department and the office of the Dane County Sanitarian conducted a survey of private sewerage systems on Lake Mendota waterfront properties where it was believed they may have been contributing to lake pollution or public health nuisance conditions. This survey was therefore conducted around all of the Lake Mendota shore area not served by municipal sewers in 1968. Our report on the survey indicated that there were about 229 structures consisting of year-round homes, summer cottages and a number of business establishments. It was possible to survey approximately 40% of those properties, truly a representative sample, from which it was possible to draw the following conclusions:
1. That nearly 70% of the waterfront properties not served by municipal sewers around Lake Mendota are located on soils unsuitable for private sewage disposal systems because of poor soil permeability, high ground water table and/or steep sipes.

2. That on 5% of the properties surveyed there was evidence of the discharge of sewage onto the ground surface or into the lake, thus constituting a public health hazard or lake pollution.

3. That despite the unfavorable characteristics of a considerable portion of the soils in the survey area as they relate to the absorption of sewage effluent, property owners in general in the area have been diligent in maintaining septic tank systems in operating condition.

4. That probably the most feasible solution to operating problems associated with private sewage systems located on marginal or restricted soils is the extension of municipal sewers to serve the area.

It will be noted from the fourth conclusion that the extension of municipal sewers to serve the area would be the most feasible solution to any private sewage problems. It is noted from the DNR report that there are plans to transport sewage from the proposed park to the Waunakee interceptor from the Madison Metropolitan Sewage district. It would seem that this should be a temporary measure, and that long-range planning should include the construction of municipal sewers around the entire remainder of Lake Mendota.

The DNR report mentions the possibility of construction of a municipal waterworks plant here in the future. It would be my recommendation that such a system be installed whenever financially feasible.

It would seem to me that in general, the site would be suitable for the proposed state park.
February 21, 1975

Mr. C. D. Besadny, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Department of Natural Resources
Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Dear Mr. Besadny:

RE: Preliminary Environmental Report for Proposed Acquisition, Development and Management of Lake Mendota State Park, Dane County, Wisconsin

We concur in the desirability of the recent addition of parks near urban areas to the roles of both federal and state agencies and hope that this project proceeds rapidly.

We have two comments on the report. First, we feel that wherever possible private holdings in state parks and forests should be reduced as much as possible. In this case, we recognize the economic constraints on purchase of properties in the three shorefront developments, but we feel that a long range perspective requires consideration of eventual reversion of these properties to park purposes. Two possible mechanisms are purchase of the properties with life estate for the current owners and acquisition of first options on the properties, the choice to be made depending on the availability of funding at different times.

Attachment to the Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District in the 2nd Ward Beach Area and the condition of the various properties are two factors which might be considered in deciding which properties to acquire, if funds are limited.

Second, we want to emphasize the importance of maintaining and protecting the Indian mound in the project area.

Sincerely,

Marc L. Williamson
Environmental Coordinator

MLW:mdk
Mr. C. D. Besadny, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Department of Natural Resources
Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Dear Mr. Besadny:

Thank you for forwarding a copy of the Preliminary Environmental Report for the Proposed Lake Mendota State Park to me for review. Please pardon the delay in responding.

After reading the sections concerning property taxes, I offer several comments.

Page 10 -- Tax Rates

The information, except for one figure, appears correct. The 1973 assessed value for the Town of Westport should read $14,056,080, rather than the stated $11,477,350.

Page 10 -- Land Valuation

The stated $12,300 as the total 1973 tax revenue generated within the park boundaries is inaccurate. The nine parcels of land and the five improvements have an assessed value of $239,700. Taking $239,700 times .06151 (the total tax rate), the actual 1973 tax revenue generated then is $14,743. In addition, 16 parcels are being purchased and of these one or two may be exempt. There should have been assessments for all taxable real property as well as personal property.


It appears that reference is being made to the amount of taxes that would not be collected on the land based on 1973 statistics. Again, all real and personal property should be considered. The $12,300 is not the correct amount, as I mentioned earlier, and would not represent all of the taxes collected from the properties to be purchased.
Page 29 -- Economic Effects

If the local tax base is the desired reference here, the assessments of the properties considered for purchase should be used with a comparison to the total 1973 assessed value of the town. On the other hand, if the taxes paid are to be used as a reference, the stated 1.42 percent is incorrect because this is based on another figure that doesn't represent all the taxes paid for 1973.

If the department can be of any further assistance to you in this project, please contact Glenn Holmes, Bureau of Property and Utility Tax.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
David W. Adamany
Secretary of Revenue

DWA:js
cc: Glenn Holmes
March 14, 1975

Mr. C. D. Besadny, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Box 450
Madison, Wisconsin 53701

Dear Mr. Besadny:

Re: DNR No. 1600
Preliminary Environmental Report for the Proposed Acquisition, Development, and Management of Lake Mendota State Park
Dane County, Wisconsin

We have reviewed the above Preliminary Environmental Report and offer the following comments:

1. We agree with the statement on page 26 that the development of a State Park along CTH "H" would generate increased traffic and could accelerate the need for additional capacity on CTH "H". We suggest that provisions be made to allow for possible right of way expansion along the proposed park border to avoid or lessen possible future 4(f) and/or 6(f) conflicts.

2. We suggest that the Dane County Highway Department be contacted concerning the above and be included in your distribution of the Environmental Impact Statement.

We thank you for the opportunity of commenting on this Preliminary Environmental Report.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

T. J. Hart, Administrator
Division of Planning
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
March 7, 1975

Mr. C. D. Besadny, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
Wisconsin Dept. of Natural Resources
4613 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53702

RE: No. 1600
Planning Review No. 75-16
Preliminary Environmental Report for
Proposed Acquisition, Development, and
Management of Lake Mendota State Park,
Dane County, Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Besadny:

The Dane County Regional Planning Commission has reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Report regarding the proposed acquisition, development, and management of Lake Mendota State Park. The Commission had previously supported this proposal when presented for review under the OMB Circular A-95 (December 9, 1974).

In accordance with the provisions of the Wisconsin Environmental Policy Act, we are offering the following comments related only to the Preliminary Environmental Report as submitted.

1. The Preliminary Environmental Report has generally presented a thorough analysis of the impacts on the environment as a result of the development of a State park at this location.

2. Anticipated improvements to CTH "M". The Preliminary Environmental Report notes that the MATS Plan calls for a four-lane divided roadway facility (page 8). It further notes (page 26) that upgrading of CTH "M" is proposed for the near future, and that the presence of a State park would accelerate this upgrading.

NOTE: This is not accurate. It would be more accurate to note that the Madison Area Transportation Plan 1970 designates CTH "M" to be a "standard arterial" roadway. The extent of eventual widening will be determined by detailed design studies prepared prior to improvements.
Continuation of a four-lane divided facility along CTH "M" is one possible cross-section, and this would be the same as CTH "M" improvements recently constructed west of CTH "O". New construction on CTH "M" is not currently programmed before 1980. The presence of the State park could accelerate consideration of improvements to CTH "M".

3. Right-of-way reservation along CTH "M". The Environmental Impact Statement does not address itself to the possible need for a wider right-of-way.

NOTE: It is requested that DNR dedicate any property falling between the existing center line of CTH "M" and a line 60' from that center line, with this property to be dedicated for any future transportation facility improvements. This is particularly important in view of current Federal DOT, Section 4-F, requirements for special and extensive justifications for using any park lands for transportation purposes.

4. Controlled access. The Environmental Impact Statement does not mention the fact that CTH "M" is under control of Dane County's Controlled Access Ordinance.

NOTE: It should be noted that any modifications to access to CTH "M" will require review and approval by the County Highway and Transportation Committee.

5. Park entrance. The Environmental Impact Statement discusses a single park entrance, noting it is to be located at the intersection of CTH "M" and Oncken Road (pages 13 and 17).

NOTE: In the design of the entrance facility, consideration should be given to providing adequate storage capacity to meet peak-hour entrance volumes, and a safe entrance to and from CTH "M". This design could include: realignment of Oncken Road at this point to provide for adequate sight distance; possible improvement to CTH "M" to allow for a left turn lane; possible addition of a deceleration lane on the right side.
Mr. C. D. Resadny, Director
Page 3
March 7, 1975

The Commission appreciates the opportunity to review the Preliminary Environmental Report and hopes that the comments are useful to you in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

Charles Montemayor
Executive Director

CM: sr
cc: Dane County Clerk
Chairman, Town of Westport
President, Village of Waunakee
Mayor, City of Middleton
Dane County Parks Commission
City of Madison Parks Division
City of Madison Department of Public Health
Mayor, City of Madison
President, Village of Shorewood Hills
President, Village of Maple Bluff
Mr. C. D. Besadny, Director  
Bureau of Environmental Impact  
Department of Natural Resources  
P. O. Box 450  
Madison, Wis. 53701

Re.: Preliminary Environmental Report  
for the Proposed Acquisition Development and Management of Lake Mendota State Park.  
Your file reference 1600

Gentlemen:

We have reviewed the above subject report and as a whole we find the report adequate. However, there are three areas of minor concern to the City.

The first of these is on page 8 (Mass Transit). It should be pointed out that the bus service to the City of Middleton is the Middleton Bus Company charter held by the City of Middleton who has in turn contracted with Madison Transit for the service. This is not an extension of Madison transit service.

The second item is on page 10 (Area Parks). The City of Middleton operates and maintains for the general public a boat ramp at the end of Lake Street on the west side of the lake to include a parking lot. This does not appear in your list or on the map (figure #6).

The third item is on page 26 (County Highway "M"). This statement refers only to the area of County Trunk "M" east of Middleton as we read it. This highway is a part of the total area-wide transportation plan. The highway improvements outlined for County Trunk "M" east being required earlier means that the feeder roads will also need an accelerated improvement schedule. This will include Century Avenue from Highway 12 to Allen Boulevard and Allen Boulevard from Century Avenue south to University Avenue within the City's limits.

If we can be of any further assistance, please call.

Sincerely,

CITY OF MIDDLETON

[Signature]

Don E. Mayo, P. E.  
Director of Public Works

cc: Dane County Regional Plan Commission
March 10, 1975

Mr. C.D. Besadny, Director
Bureau of Environmental Impact
State DNR - P. O. Box 450
Madison, WI 53701

Re: PER Lake
Mendota State Park

Dear Mr. Besadny:

We are in receipt of the noted Preliminary Environmental Report for the proposed Lake Mendota State Park and have the following comments:

1. p. 10 under Cherokee Marsh. The last sentence should be revised to read, "It is owned and operated by the City of Madison Parks Department and heavily utilized by the Madison Board of Education."

2. p. 30 under Cherokee Marsh. The last sentence should be revised to read, "Operation focus on natural areas preservation, public trail systems, and an outdoor education program carried out by the Board of Education."

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Superintendent of Parks

FWB:jmb
The possible effects of pedestrian traffic on site vegetation are addressed on page 24 and 30.

Erosion control and permanency of construction impacts are addressed on page 30.

Final site planning for Lake Mendota State Park will include a drainage plan to include placement of culverts and drainage ways to dispose of excess runoff water. Department of Transportation engineers will determine road and parking lot drainage facilities to accommodate these problems. Final site planning is contingent upon completion of the environmental impact statement process.

The information on prime agricultural land was incorporated on page 8.

A description of existing water quality in the Lake Mendota State Park area is provided on pages 2, 4 and 5. Possible impacts of the park on water quality are discussed on page 23 and possible beach closings are discussed on pages 26 and 30. A no beach alternative is described on page 32.

Tree and shrub plantings are described on page 18. Expanded discussion of the prairie establishment project is found on page 18.

See reply to comment 5.

A discussion of existing sewer facilities and possible future sewer extensions is found on page 10.

Utility availability as a development control in this area is addressed on page 25. Potential problems with sewer extension hookups through recreational lands are discussed on page 28.

Since there was no indication of firm plans for a public water supply in the near future, changes were made on page 10.

As mentioned on page 14, the high land values of lake frontage property and numerous property improvements have caused funding and acquisition approval limitations which limit inclusion of these residential properties in the proposed park. In addition, there is substantial local feeling against present or future acquisition of these three shorefront developments. The unpredictability of future funding limits consideration of the life estate and right of first refusal options. The alternative proposal of expanded park boundaries is addressed on page 32.

See discussion of Indian burial mounds on pages 7 and 28.

The suggested correction has been made on page 13.

Suggested corrections have been incorporated on page 13.

The suggested correction has been made on page 28.

Suggested corrections have been incorporated on page 28.

Existing transportation corridors and potential right-of-way expansion A-F problems are described on pages 8 and 10. Impacts on transportation systems are discussed on pages 26 and 27. A discussion of Section D-F is found on pages 22 and 23. See also Appendices C and F.

The Dane County Highway Department has been included in the list of local agencies for distribution project information. A preliminary impact statement (see page 11). Comments from the Dane County Regional Planning Commission on the Preliminary Environmental Report were included Dane County Highway input.

Suggested corrections and additional information have been incorporated on pages 8 and 27.

The Department does not presently own the lands adjacent to CTH "M" and will not be able to consider dedicating any portion of the property for highway use until acquisition is complete. Before any decision to dedicate park lands, once acquired, for highway use, an environmental evaluation and an assessment of all alternatives available to avoid use of park lands will be made. It should be pointed out that the highest point in the proposed park is within 150 feet of CTH "M". Expansion of the highway towards the park, which would involve cutting into a high bank, may affect the use of this high point as a scenic overlook.

The information provided has been incorporated on page 8.

The park entrance traffic capacity problem is addressed on page 16.

The suggested correction has been added on page 10.
22) The City of Middleton public boat ramp has been added to the discussion on page 12 and Table 9, and is located on Figure 6.

26) The information provided is incorporated on page 27.

27) The suggested correction has been made on page 12.

28) The suggested correction has been made on page 34.