



## Environmental Assessment

### **Saxon Harbor Campground**

*Hurley, Iron County, WI*

*June 7, 2019*

*Prepared by on behalf of Iron County Forestry and Parks Department*

Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC

2121 Innovation Court

De Pere, WI 54115

*Prepared for*

FEMA Region V, Disaster #4276, Project ID UGWW805, PW-00149

536 South Clark Street, Sixth Floor

Chicago, IL 60605



# FEMA

## List of Acronyms, Chemical Formulas, and Abbreviations

ADA—Americans with Disabilities Act	NAAQS—National Ambient Air Quality Standards
AADT—Annual Average Daily Traffic	NCA—Noise Control Act of 1972
AIRFA—American Indian Religious Freedom Act	NEPA—National Environmental Policy Act
APE—Area of Potential Effect	NHIS—Natural Heritage Information System
BMP—best management practices	NHPA—National Historic Preservation Act
CAA—Clean Air Act	NOI—Notice of Intent
CaB2—Clarion Loam	NO <sub>2</sub> —Nitrogen Dioxide
CSAH—County State-Aid Highway	NRCS—Natural Resources Conservation Service
CEQ—Council on Environmental Quality	NRHP—National Register of Historic Places
C.F.R.—Code of Federal Regulations	O <sub>3</sub> —Ozone
CTH A - County Trunk Highway A	OSHA—Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CO—Carbon monoxide	PA—Public Assistance
Df—Dundas Silt Loam	Pb—Lead
EA—Environmental Assessment	P.L.—Public Law
EIS—Environmental Impact Statement	PM <sub>10</sub> Particulate matter
EO—Executive Order	Sb—Land, Hayden-Lester
EPA—U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	SHPO—State Historic Preservation Office
ERR—Endangered Resources Review	SO <sub>2</sub> —Sulfur Dioxide
ESA—Endangered Species Act	Ta—Terrace Escarpments
FEMA—Federal Emergency Management Agency	THPO—Tribal Historic Preservation Office
FIRM—Flood Insurance Rate Map	Tribes—Native American Tribes
FONSI—Finding of No Significant Impact	USACE—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
FPPA—Farmland Protection Policy Act	U.S.C.—United States Code
ft msl—feet above mean sea level	USDA—U.S. Department of Agriculture
Ga—Glencoe Silty Clay Loam	USFWS—U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
HaB—Hayden Loam	Wb—Webster-Glencoe Silty Clay Loams
HaB2—Hayden Loam Moderately Eroded	Wc—Webster-Le Sueur Silty Clay Loams
LcB—Lester Loam	WDNR—Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
LcB2—Lester Loam Moderately Eroded	Wis. Adm. Code—Wisconsin Administrative Code
Ldn—Day-Night Average Sound Level	
Lf—Le Sueur-Lester	
LOMR—Letter of Map Revision	

## **List of Tables**

Table 1: Federally Protected, Endangered & Threatened Species within Iron County

Table 2: Summary of Environmental Impacts

## Table of Contents

SECTION ONE: BACKGROUND .....	1
1.1 Project Authority .....	1
1.2 Project Location.....	1
1.3 Purpose and Need.....	2
1.4 Existing Facility .....	3
SECTION TWO: ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS .....	4
2.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative .....	4
2.2 Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1 .....	4
2.3 Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2.....	6
2.4 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Consideration .....	8
SECTION THREE: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES .....	9
Preliminary Screening of Assessment Categories.....	9
3.1 Physical Environment .....	10
3.1.1 Geology, Seismicity and Soils .....	10
3.1.2 Water Resources and Water Quality.....	12
3.1.3 Floodplain Management (Executive Order 11988) .....	13
3.1.4 Air Quality.....	14
3.1.5 Coastal Zone Management .....	15
3.2 Biological Environment .....	16
3.2.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment .....	16
3.2.2 Wetlands (Executive Order 11990) .....	17
3.2.3 Threatened and Endangered Species.....	19
3.3 Socioeconomics .....	21
3.3.1 Visual Resources .....	21
3.3.2 Noise.....	22
3.3.3 Public Services and Utilities.....	23
3.3.4 Traffic and Circulation .....	23
3.3.5 Environmental Justice (Executive Order 12898) .....	25
3.3.6 Safety and Security .....	26
3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources .....	27
3.4.1 Historic Structures.....	28
3.4.2 Archaeological Resources.....	28
3.4.3 Tribal Coordination and Religious Sites.....	30
3.5 Comparison of Alternatives.....	31
SECTION FOUR: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	36
4.1 Relocation of County Highway A.....	36
4.2 Dredging .....	36

4.3 Repairs to the Harbor .....	36
4.4 Additional Disaster Damages .....	36
4.5 Forest Management Activities .....	37
4.6 Future Projects Near the Site .....	37
 SECTION FIVE: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	 37
 SECTION SIX: MITIGATION MEASURES AND PERMITS .....	 39
 SECTION SEVEN: CONSULTATIONS AND REFERENCES .....	 41
7.1 Consultations.....	41
7.2 References.....	41
 SECTION EIGHT: LIST OF PREPARERS.....	 42
Preparers, Contributors, and Reviewers.....	42
 APPENDICES .....	 43
Appendix A – Maps and Figures	
Appendix B – Photo Log	
Appendix C – Agency Correspondence	
Appendix D – Tribal Nation Consultation	
Appendix E – Public Notice	
Appendix F – Public Comments	
Appendix G – Technical Reports	
Appendix H – 65% Design Review Plan Set for Alternative Number 2	
Appendix I – Campground Design with no Wetland Impacts	

## SECTION ONE: BACKGROUND

---

### 1.1 Project Authority

During the incident period between July 11 and July 12, 2016, heavy rains resulted in severe flooding in Iron County. Heavy rainfall and overland flooding resulted in the inundation of Saxon Harbor and the surrounding area. Raging waters ripped through the entire facility causing severe erosion. The waters coursed through the campground. Under a major disaster declaration (FEMA-4276-DR-WI) signed by the President on August 9, 2016, Iron County was included in areas within Wisconsin eligible to receive Public Assistance (PA) program funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA's PA grant program provides federal assistance to government organizations and certain private nonprofit organizations following a Presidential disaster declaration. Public Assistance is authorized by Section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (Public Law 93-288), 42 U.S.C. § 5172. The Iron County Forestry and Parks Department applied for funding from FEMA's PA Program to be applied to the costs for relocating the campground (DR-4276-WI, Project Worksheet 149).

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [C.F.R.] Parts 1500 through 1508), FEMA Instruction 108-1-1 and DHS Instruction 023-01-001-01, Rev. 1, FEMA must fully understand and consider the environmental consequences of actions proposed for federal funding. The purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is to meet FEMA's responsibilities under NEPA and to determine whether to prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed project.

In accordance with federal laws and FEMA regulations, the EA for a proposed federal action must include an evaluation of alternatives and a discussion of the potential environmental impacts. This EA was prepared in accordance with FEMA's regulations as required under NEPA. As part of this NEPA review, the requirements of other environmental laws and executive orders are addressed.

Unless otherwise precluded by law, FEMA authorizes the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, to use this EA document to meet applicable NEPA requirements associated with grant compliance for Land and Water Conservation Fund grants 55-00247, 55-00728, and 55-00954.

### 1.2 Project Location

The proposed project location is north of the City of Hurley in Iron County, Wisconsin. The project is the relocation of a public campground located adjacent to Saxon Harbor on Lake Superior's southern shore and Oronto Creek, which joins Parker Creek and from there drains into Lake Superior. The approximate latitude and longitude of the project area is 46.558883, -90.439129. Appendix A presents a Site Location Map as Figure 1.

The campground serves a community of approximately 5,916 Iron County residents (2010 census). On a busy weekend, approximately 2,000 visitors visit Saxon Harbor and spend on average approximately \$83 daily throughout the community. The campground consists of four regions: a main campground, Northern lot, South Harbor lot, and East Harbor Lot (Figure 2 of Appendix A). The main campground area, west of County Road A, included 27 campground sites. The South Harbor lot, south of the Harbor and east of County Road A, included 6 campground lots. The Northern lot, located on the peninsula between the north basin and Lake Superior, included 5 tent sites. Finally at the East Harbor lot, a rustic walk-in site located at the confluence of Oconto and Parker Creek accessible only by a footbridge, included 5 tent sites. Due to the 2016 storm event, 26 of the 43 sites were damaged.

### **1.3 Purpose and Need**

The Saxon Harbor Marina and Campground is managed by Iron County Forestry and Parks and has long served as a recreational destination that includes lake and trout stream fishing, beaches, a marina, and campground facilities. Prior to damage to Saxon Harbor caused by storms in July of 2016, it is estimated that busy summer weekends would see upwards of 2,000 visitors, and the average daily spending in Iron County by this user group is around \$83 per person. Annual revenues to Iron County Forestry and Parks (Forestry and Parks) from camping and boating activities averaged around \$124,000, funding 50% of the total county parks annual budget (SmithGroupJJR, 2018). The campground provided opportunities for visitors and community members alike to enjoy the harbor and the town, and associated fees contribute to Forestry and Parks income. These visitors use the restaurants, grocery stores, and small businesses within the area. This economic activity ultimately benefits all residents. These multiple facilities constitute one single complex and the proximity of the Marina to the Campground is an integral part of the original design that must be part of the re-location project. Visitors use both sites and the success of the facility is in part related to the proximity of the Marina to the Campground.

Several storm events in July 2016 resulted in extensive damage to most of the Saxon Harbor facilities. Aerial images of the damage can be found on Figure 4 of Appendix A. The storm events washed out native vegetation throughout the facility and damaged all the docks, the harbor bathrooms, the main campground area and playground, the north campground lot and west campground lot. Tragically, one person was killed when the vehicle he was driving was swept away by the flooding along Orono Creek at the campground. In addition, the bridge on County Trunk Highway A (CTH A) that carried traffic across Orono Creek to the campground and marina was washed out by flooding.

The purpose of the project reviewed in this EA is to address post-disaster conditions at the main campground and related campground facilities to the south. These damages rendered the campsites unusable, thereby making a significant recreational feature of Iron County's Saxon Harbor complex unavailable for public use. The loss of these facilities has resulted in a corresponding loss in income to Forestry and Parks, as well as the incidental economic activity generated by tourism.

Restoration of the destroyed camping facilities is complicated by the fact that the damaged Main Campground site is located within the Oronto Creek floodplain. Iron County's current floodplain ordinance adopted September 27, 2016, details specific requirements and conditions for public or private campgrounds to be located in the floodplain. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) staff work directly with Iron County Zoning on all floodplain concerns and to ensure provisions set forth in the local floodplain ordinance are enforced when facilities or buildings are permitted at the local level. This particular campground and portion of Oronto Creek are subject to flash flooding, which limits the amount of advance notice that campers would receive in the event of a flood. Specifically, because the site cannot provide at least 72 hours of warning prior to flooding, the local zoning administrator is unable to issue a permit for restoration of the campground in the original location. Therefore, the action alternatives presented in this EA would mitigate flooding of the campground by relocating the campground south of Oronto Creek on higher ground outside of the floodplain.

The project need is to restore lost recreational facilities caused by the disaster event and to reduce sedimentation and erosion risk near the original main campground, the proposed relocated campground facility, and a downstream section of Oronto Creek. The main needs may be summarized as follows:

- 1) Restoring recreational campsites accessible by car and recreational vehicles (RVs) within close proximity and easy access to Saxon Harbor;
- 2) Restoring suitable campsite amenities to match or exceed those available before the July 2016 event; and
- 3) Reduce the sedimentation and erosion risk along Oronto Creek partially caused by the July 2016 storm.

Historically, the users at the old Saxon Harbor Campground used travel trailers and 5<sup>th</sup> wheel campers. Class A motorhomes occasionally would utilize the campground, but the typical user had a camping trailer and a tow vehicle. Most of the former campsites were longer than 45' and the smaller sites were not favored by users due to their size. These facts resulted in the determination to extend the size of the proposed camping pads to best accommodate the typical users of the facility. Construction of smaller camping pads would not be favored by users, leaving the potential for an under-utilized facility. Along with the size of individual sites, addressing expectations regarding amenities will result in reestablishing not only the recreational facilities, but the benefits of economic activity that those facilities bring to Iron County and surrounding communities.

#### **1.4 Existing Facility**

Saxon Harbor was established in 1856, serving as a port for the Iron Range. Over the years the port was abandoned, and a campground was constructed to increase visitor use of the harbor and environmental outreach. Currently, it is a picturesque viewpoint and tourist attraction for Iron County which provides conservation and environmental outreach for the community.

Pre-disaster, Saxon Harbor Campground had 43 campsites – 33 with electrical service, 5 lakeside tent sites, and 5 secluded walk-in tent sites. The campground also had a playground south of the harbor, water available at the main and south campground, restrooms at the harbor and



campground, showers, dump station, and a pavilion with kitchen facility available to rent. ATV trails can be accessed from Saxon Harbor. The main campground was located north of the Oronto Creek to the west of CTH A along the harbor. Secondary campground sites are located further south along CTH A with walking paths and foot bridge access to the harbor amenities.

Post-disaster, the main campground was significantly damaged, including the complete destruction of 26 sites, along with amenities including a playground and restroom facilities. Due to the disaster, all campground facilities have been closed to visitors until they can be repaired and replaced. Additionally, Country Road A bridge was washed out with the 2016 storm making the sites and harbor inaccessible to the public. Photos of the damage can be found in Appendix B - Photo Log.

## **SECTION TWO: ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS**

---

Following the NEPA process, all reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action were analyzed by Iron County. The design criteria and project purpose developed by the *Schematic Design Report* (Appendix G) were used in the technical and economic feasibility evaluation of each action alternative. Three alternatives were deemed technically and economically feasible and are detailed below. Non-feasible alternative actions are summarized in Section 2.4 but are not further considered within this EA.

### **2.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, the campground would be permanently closed to the public with unrestored bare soils open for future erosion. Visitors would be unable to use the campground causing the community of Saxon Harbor to be economically impacted. Due to the project location remaining in the floodplain, the WDNR and Iron County Zoning will not issue permits for reconstruction of the facilities. Without fill and grading of the site of the former campground, included in both of the following action alternatives, the erosion at the site will continue to impact the fisheries in Saxon Harbor and have an adverse impact on fish and wildlife habitat. This option does not address the needs identified in Section 1.3. by taking no action, campground facilities will not be restored, and erosion will continue to impair the qualities of Oronto Creek that make it suitable for trout fishing.

### **2.2 Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1**

The Proposed Action Alternative 2 involved work in three separate locations: fill and grading of the former campground site, relocation of the Saxon Harbor Campground to Area 1, and grading and stabilizing the bluff east of the new campsite to protect the fishery and water quality of Oronto Creek.

Fill and grading of the abandoned campsite includes the following actions:

- Restore grade through excavation to stable topography, approximately 1,200 cubic yards.
- Restore grade through spreading earthwork to stable topography, approximately 5,600 cubic yards.

- Installing rip rap for Oronto Creek slope stabilization.
- Excavation of old campground playground and finish grading, 1,000 cubic feet.
- Final grade landscaping to add native vegetation.
- Final grade erosion and sediment control with a jute mesh and seeding of 3,860 square yards.

This work would help control erosion that would otherwise impair Oronto Creek's ability to serve as suitable habitat for trout, in turn restoring its pre-disaster function as a recreational venue for sport fishing.

Construction of the new campsite along CTH A south of Oronto Creek involves replacing and expanding the existing 6 site campground area to 33 campsites. This proposed alternative provides the greatest number of campsites with the least disturbance to the forested area. A preliminary design of the proposed action is attached in Appendix H. This project area covers approximately 7.7 acres, and design considerations and requirements for the campground restoration and reconstruction are outlined in the *Draft Saxon Harbor Marina and Campground Schematic Design Report (Schematic Design Report)* (SmithGroupJJR, 2018), found in Attachment G. The following amenities are proposed:

- Target 33 total campsites, including RV campsites with driveways, restrooms.
- Optimal size of standard campsites is 65 feet by 16 feet, greater than the minimal length for a Class A campsite, 45 feet in length, with appropriate grading for drainage.
- Three (3) Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible campsites within 400 feet of a restroom facility and potable water source.
- Water and electrical hookups.
- Restroom and shower building with three toilets per gender.
- Playground area near the campground.
- Picnic tables.
- Fire rings.

The scope of work for the relocation of Saxon Harbor Campground includes:

- Demolition work to remove the existing standing buildings at the South Site. Demolition will be completed with FEMA authorization with the following conditions:
  - Acquire all necessary permits prior to demolition.
  - Implement best practices from demolition, asbestos and lead abatement.
  - Render properties safe and secure after demolition.
- Earth work to include clearing and grubbing of 16,000 square yards, excavating 96,000 cubic yards, compacting and stabilization of 6,000 cubic yards.
- Installation of temporary access for construction purposes on the east side of the proposed campground site.
- Installation of three culverts and catch basins for storm water.

- The existing west channel of the non-navigable stream is routed through the center of the campground loop, which provides a natural feature as well as potential storm water treatment and additional privacy spacing between the campsites.
- Utilities, such as electricity and water, will need to be installed in the campground. These utilities will be available for RV hook ups and the restroom facilities.
- Utilize best management practices (BMPs) for erosion control, including rock construction entrances, silt fences, bio logs, erosion control blankets and mats.

This campground would accommodate 33 total campsites. Layout of the campground can be found in Appendix H – 65% Design Review Plan Set. Construction would take approximately 12 months, and the result would be the restoration of campground facilities at the Saxon Harbor complex.

The final action in Alternative 2 involves stabilizing the bluff east of the proposed campground to provide for erosion control. This action would protect the water quality and trout habitat in Oronto Creek, in turn restoring its pre-disaster function as a recreational venue for sport fishing. That work includes:

- Clearing and excavation of approximately 18,000 cubic yards of bluff east of the proposed campground.
- 100 square yards of rip rap stabilization.
- Plant native vegetation to final grade.
- Utilize BMPs for erosion control, including rock construction entrances, silt fences, bio logs, erosion control blankets and mats.

### **2.3 Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2**

Alternative 3, similar to Alternative 2, locates the campground south of Oronto Creek, but splits the campsite into two pods along CTH A and at the confluence of Oronto and Parker Creeks. Work involved would include: fill and grading of the former campground site, relocation of the Saxon Harbor Campground to Area 1, construct improved and widened road, and grading and stabilizing the bluff east of the new campsite to protect the fishery and water quality of Oronto Creek.

Fill and grading of the abandoned campsite includes the following actions:

- Restore grade through excavation to stable topography, approximately 1,200 cubic yards.
- Restore grade through spreading earthwork to stable topography, approximately 5,600 cubic yards.
- Installing rip rap for Oronto Creek slope stabilization.
- Excavation of old campground playground and finish grading 1,000 cubic feet.
- Final grade landscaping to add native vegetation.
- Final grade erosion and sediment control with a jute mesh and seeding of 3,860 square yards.

Construction of the new campsite along CTH A south of Oronto Creek involves, replacing and expanding the existing 6 site campground area to 30 total campsites. This project area covers

approximately 7.5 acres. The scope of work for the relocation of Saxon Harbor Campground includes:

- Demolition work to remove the existing standing buildings at the South Site. Demolition will be completed with FEMA authorization with the following conditions:
  - Acquire all necessary permits prior to demolition.
  - Implement best practices from demolition, asbestos and lead abatement.
  - Render properties safe and secure after demolition.
- Earth work to include clearing, grubbing, and excavating of approximately 5.3 acres.
- Stabilization with erosion control measures of approximately 5.3 acres.
- Installation of temporary access for construction purposes on the east side of the proposed campground site.
- Installation of three culverts and catch basins for storm water.
- The existing west channel of the non-navigable stream is routed through the center of the campground loop, which provides a natural feature as well as potential storm water treatment and additional privacy spacing between the campsites.
- Utilities, such as electricity and water, will need to be installed in the campground. These utilities will be available for RV hook ups and the restroom facilities.
- Utilize BMPs for erosion control, including rock construction entrances, silt fences, bio logs, erosion control blankets and mats.

However, the access road will need to be improved and widened to allow two-way RV traffic. This alternative would include:

- excavating and grading,
- installing water and electricity utility lines,
- installing culverts,
- clearing and grubbing,
- expanding and paving the access road, and
- riprap and slope stabilization.

The final action in Alternative 3 involves stabilizing the bluff east of the proposed campground to provide for erosion control. This action would protect the water quality and trout habitat in Oronto Creek, in turn restoring its pre-disaster function as a recreational venue for sport fishing. That work includes:

- Clearing and Excavation of bluff east of the proposed campground.
- 100 square yards of Rip Rap Stabilization.
- Plant native vegetation to final grade.
- Utilize BMPs for erosion control, including rock construction entrances, silt fences, bio logs, erosion control blankets and mats.

Layout of the campground can be found on Figure 5 of Appendix A developed by SmithGroup (formerly “SmithGroupJJR”). Construction would take approximately 12 months.

## **2.4 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Consideration**

From many alternatives identified during the development of this project, a number of alternatives seriously considered were deemed not feasible and eliminated from further consideration for purposes of review in this EA. The first of these was to restore the flooded campground. This alternative would require raising the ground surface five (5) feet to an elevation above the FEMA floodplain elevation. Reconstruction within the mapped floodplain, by use of fill to elevate the campsites, is not preferred as it would still require potential emergency personnel for road closures and evacuations. From a safety standpoint, Chapter ATCP 79.11(4) Wis. Adm. Code states that “A campsite may not be located in an area of a campground that is subject to the accumulation of water or in any other area that would constitute a health or safety hazard.” Since Oronto Creek is historically prone to flash floods and there is no warning system available to notify campers of flash floods, restoring the flooded campground is not feasible. Furthermore, the re-alignment of County Highway A limits the available space for this alternative. The space limitations, loss of floodplain function with further development, and the resulting potential life safety risks from redeveloping the original campground resulted in this alternative being removed from consideration.

A second alternative considered but eliminated was to purchase land to develop a rustic campground on the hills overlooking the harbor. The proposed access road for this alternative would compromise known wetland areas and potentially disrupt a nearby active eagle nest. Furthermore, access would not be possible for RV campers, therefore not meeting the project need for RV access. Approximately 2,800 feet of road with base, culverts, and surfacing would need to be installed to allow access for all vehicles. Building this road would require the clearing of trees, in addition to that needed to create campsites and walkways, which would result in even greater impacts to wildlife habitat. Finally, due to the varying grades between the campsites and the marina, this alternative posed logistical challenges to constructing walkways compliant with the requirements of the ADA. These requirements also made this alternative cost prohibitive, which, added to the previously mentioned considerations, resulted in the elimination of this alternative from further analysis.

Iron County Forestry also considered constructing a campground off-site and away from the Marina. This alternative was quickly dismissed since it would not meet the needs of the community and purpose of the project, which is to provide a single complex that includes both a marina and campground. Locating the campground in an area remote from the marina would likely minimize use of the campground by marina users and not meet the needs of the Iron County community. In addition, this alternative was also found to be cost prohibitive due to the need to purchase additional land in addition to rebuilding the campground, marina, and associated facilities.

Another alternative considered was to use the same site as that proposed for Alternative 2, but to limit the size of the facility so as to result in no impacts on the nearby wetlands. This alternative also involved work in three separate locations: fill and grading of the former campground site, relocation of the Saxon Harbor Campground, and grading and stabilizing the bluff east of the new campsite to protect the fishery and water quality of Oronto Creek. The proposed layout is shown

in Appendix I. The primary difference between with alternative and Alternative 2 is that the proposed campground layout would result in only 18 campsites available, a reduction in number that prevents this alternative from being considered feasible, as it does not meet the needs of the project.

## **SECTION THREE: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES**

---

### **Preliminary Screening of Assessment Categories**

A preliminary screening of assessment categories narrowed the list of categories for which detailed assessments will be performed. The screening was based on readily available information on the proposed project and project area. The assessment categories that were identified as not applying to the proposed project or the project area include Coastal Barrier Resources, Hazardous Materials, and Zoning and Land Use.

Saxon Harbor is not located within a Coastal Barrier Resource System as shown on Figure 7 of Appendix A. For this reason, this category has been eliminated.

With regard to hazardous materials, during a site walk of the project area on May 25, 2017, a visual inspection was performed to observe the presence or absence of potential contamination of the project area. No signs of soil or vegetation staining, chemical containers or empty drums were observed. A photographic log presenting observations is presented in Appendix B.

Before the disaster event, Saxon Harbor Marina had a refueling dock. However, the marina itself is outside the project area for the work being reviewed under this EA. A review of the WDNR Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System website indicates that there are no current or former remediation sites in the project area. Figure 10 of Appendix A presents the search results and indicates the closest sites with current or former contamination, apart from the refueling dock at the marina, are 4.6 miles away from the proposed project. Although a Phase 1 EA has not been performed for the project area, hazardous materials are not anticipated to be present because they are not consistent with historical or current land use, no obvious signs of contamination were observed, and there are no contaminated sites near the project area. For these reasons, the Hazardous Materials assessment category has been eliminated.

No changes to zoning and land use will result from implementation of this project. The area has long been zoned as "Forestry," with forestry as the identified primary land use. However, due to the development of recreational uses at the marina, campground, and surrounding areas, the decision was made prior to the 2016 storms to adjust the land use designation of Saxon Harbor and its various facilities, including the campground, from forestry to recreational. Because the alternatives presented here require no change to Zoning and Land Use, that category has been eliminated.

### **3.1 Physical Environment**

#### **3.1.1 Geology, Seismicity and Soils**

The proposed project location is within the Lake Superior Lowlands physiographic province, which extends 5 to 20 miles inland from Lake Superior. The lowland is separated from the Northern Highlands province to the south by the Penokee-Gogebic Range. The Lake Superior Lowlands are characterized by a plain gently sloping to the north, toward Lake Superior. Elevations range from approximately 610 feet above mean sea level (ft msl) to approximately 700 ft msl. Rivers drain the lowland, carrying surface water runoff toward Lake Superior. Due to the nature of the unconsolidated underlying geologic units, surface water drainages, like Oronto Creek, have incised the plain, leaving behind rolling hills with moderate to steep slopes. The proposed project location lies at approximately 620 ft msl (National Geodetic Vertical Datum).

The lowland plain comprises sediments deposited by glaciers and sediments deposited in front of the glacier (proglacial) during Pleistocene and pre-Pleistocene periods of deposition. The uppermost surficial unit is the Miller Creek Formation, which is predominantly clayey till deposited beneath the glacier, and silty to sandy proglacial meltwater stream and lake deposits. The ice margin advanced and retreated multiple times and proglacial lakes filled and drained multiple times during the past 30,000 years to create complex, interbedded till and lake deposits. The Miller Creek Formation is underlain by the older Copper Falls Formation, which comprises silty and sandy till that is generally reddish-brown, with a small proportion of Paleozoic sedimentary clasts. Where adjacent to Lake Superior, the Copper Falls is typically exposed in wave-cut bluffs. The clayey overlying Miller Creek caps the bluffs, except where surface water drainages have incised through the Miller Creek, creating slopes of 10° to 15° (Clayton, 1984). In the proposed project area, glacial features have been subdued by lake wave action. The occurrence of clay-capped, sloped hills and wave action are conducive to rapid short-term erosion during storm events and slower long-term erosion during less severe, typical conditions.

The proposed project location within the Lake Superior Lowlands is seismically stable, with folding, faulting and erosion occurring during deposition of the sandstone bedrock sequence during the Cambrian period (Thwaites, 1912), between approximately 540 and 485 million years ago. Because of this seismic stability, the requirements of Executive Order (EO) 12699, Seismic Safety of Federal and Federally Assisted or Regulated New Building Construction, do not apply to the proposed project.

Soils have developed on the underlying geologic units as described above. Attachment 2 of Appendix G includes a soil map based on a U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) survey (USDA, 2018) completed in May 2018. There are predominantly six soil types shown in the project area. Soil classifications, prime or unique, slope, depth, erodibility, and stability for each soil type are summarized within Appendix G. Of the six soil types, Gichigami-Oronto complex soils are considered prime farmland.

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (Pub. Law 97-98, Sec. 1539-1549 codified at 7 U.S.C. § 4201 et seq.) was enacted in 1981 to minimize the unnecessary conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses resulting from federal actions. Programs administered by federal agencies must

be compatible with state and local farmland protection policies and programs. The NRCS is responsible for protecting significant agricultural lands from irreversible conversions that result in the loss of an essential food or environmental source.

Prime farmland is characterized as land with the best physical and chemical characteristics for the production of food, feed, forage, fiber and oilseed crops (USDA, 1989). This land is either used for food or fiber crops or is available for those crops, but is not urban, built-up land, or water areas. The NRCS has determined that Unit 444B–Gichigami-Oronto complex soils are considered farmlands of statewide importance. South of Oronto Creek within the Area of Intent, there are approximately 30 acres of Gichigami-Oronto soils.

The Farmland Conversion Impact Rating assesses non-soil related criteria, such as the potential for impact on the local agricultural economy if the land is converted to non-farm use and compatibility with existing agricultural use. The rating results in a score of up to 260 points, with the higher the number indicating the greater the need to consider the protection of the site as farmland. Sites receiving a total score of less than 160 need not be given further consideration for protection and no additional sites need to be evaluated.

### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under the No Action alternative, no adverse impacts to the geology, seismicity, and soils are anticipated. However, if the original campground site is not restored, there is potential for increased erosion from future storms.

### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

There is no anticipated impact to geology or seismicity from this project alternative.

Area includes soils protected under the FPPA. The Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, found in Attachment 1 of Appendix C, was completed in June 2018, resulting in a site rating of 144. Therefore, the site requires no further consideration for protection as farmland and no additional sites need to be evaluated.

Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction. The proposed measures include minimizing the disturbed area, maintaining vegetative cover, and providing inlet protection, silt fencing and erosion matting.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

There is no anticipated impact to geology or seismicity from this project alternative.

Soils found at the Campground Area 2 are similar to the soil composition found at Campground Area 1. This area includes soils protected under the FPPA. The Farmland and Conversion Impact Rating, found in Attachment 1 of Appendix C, was completed in June 2018, resulting in a site rating of 144. Therefore, the site requires no further consideration for protection as farmland and no additional sites need to be evaluated.



Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction. The proposed measures include minimizing the disturbed area, maintaining vegetative cover, and providing inlet protection, silt fencing and erosion matting.

### **3.1.2 Water Resources and Water Quality**

Water resources include surface water, groundwater, storm water, and drinking water (wetlands are discussed in Section 3.2.2). The project area is along Parker Creek, Oronto Creek, and Lake Superior.

The Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1977, 33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq., regulates discharge of pollutants into water, with various sections falling under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Section 404 of the CWA establishes the USACE permit requirements for discharging dredged or fill materials into waters of the United States and traditional navigable waterways. USACE regulation of activities within navigable waters is also authorized under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, 33 U.S.C. § 403 et seq.. Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, the EPA regulates both point and non-point pollutant sources, including storm water and storm water runoff. Activities affecting waters would be regulated under both the CWA and the Rivers and Harbors Act.

During a site walk of the project area on May 25, 2017, surface water resources were observed and photographed. A photographic log presenting observations is presented in Appendix B. The primary surface water bodies in the project area include Oronto Creek, Parker Creek, and Lake Superior. Oronto and Parker Creeks drain to the north, to Lake Superior, as shown on Figures 1 and 2 of Appendix A. Lake Superior is the largest freshwater lake in the world covering a surface area of 31,700 square miles with 2,725 miles of shoreline. Lake Superior serves as a regional drinking water source and is home to over 80 different fish species (Minnesota Sea Grant). The site is located within the Montreal watershed. Land use in the Montreal watershed is primarily forest (70%), wetland (22.70%) and a mix of open (3.10%) and other uses (4.10%). This watershed has 382.88 stream miles, 1,369.22 lake acres and 30,742.44 wetland acres. Because of this habitat diversity, Saxon Harbor is home to several fish habitats.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under the No Action alternative, no adverse impacts to surface waters are anticipated, though water quality may degrade due to continued erosion.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, no significant impacts are expected. All runoff from impervious surfaces would be treated onsite by being directed to storm water basins prior to discharge. The slope stabilization will prevent erosion and transport of sediment from the bluff south of Oronto Creek. During construction, appropriate BMPs would be installed (e.g., erosion control barriers, minimization of bare soil areas, revegetation of bare soils) in order to reduce transport of sediment.

Per the WNDR's Surface Water Data Viewer (<https://dnrm.wi.gov/H5/?viewer=SWDV>), the proposed campground area does not encompass any intermittent streams (see Attachment 15 of Appendix A). The site does include an established drainage path and constructed roadside ditch between the proposed campground and CTH A. Stormwater handling proposed as part of Alternative 2 includes modifying the existing swale and establishing a second drainage path in the middle of the campground. This second storm water management feature will convey water to the proposed bioretention basins. Armoring will not be used on these facilities, though some rip rap will be applied to the overflow weirs for storm water bioretention basins.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, no significant impacts are expected. All runoff from impervious surfaces would be treated onsite by being directed to storm water basins prior to discharge. The slope stabilization will prevent erosion and transport of sediment of the bluff south of Oronto Creek. During construction, appropriate BMPs would be installed (e.g., erosion control barriers, minimization of bare soil areas, revegetation of bare soils) to reduce transport of sediment. Like Alternative 2, this alternative does not alter Oronto Creek, Parker Creek, Lake Superior, nor will it affect any identified intermittent streams, though substantially identical limited drainage work will be required.

### **3.1.3 Floodplain Management (Executive Order 11988)**

EO 11988, Floodplain Management, requires federal agencies to act to minimize occupancy and modification of the floodplain. Specifically, EO 11988 prohibits federal agencies from funding construction in the 100-year floodplain unless there are no practicable alternatives. FEMA's regulations for complying with EO 11988 are promulgated in 44 C.F.R. Part 9. Based on the floodplain map provided by FEMA (Figure 6 of Appendix A), published in 1978, the current campground site is located within the floodplain and therefore cannot be funded from federal agencies for reconstruction. Iron County is currently completing the Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) based on direction from WDNR. Figure 14 of Appendix A is the proposed map revision showing the new floodplain boundary based on hydraulic modeling of the area with new CTA bridge alignment. The CLOMR submittal is currently under review by FEMA and identified as 18-05-3441R. The CLOMR submittal shows flood heights along Oronto Creek from 611.2 at the downstream side of CTH A to 605.9 at the confluence with Lake Superior.

### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no adverse impacts to the floodplain are anticipated. The campground would not be reconstructed within the current floodplain. However, without restoring the shore and protecting it from future storms, future erosion of the shoreline is possible. The floodplain will continue to evolve in this area through natural processes.

### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, a Letter of Map Revision is required to update the floodplain mapping. The project itself is unlikely to be adversely affected by the floodplain and itself is unlikely to adversely affect the floodplain. Comparing aerial images of pre-storm and post-storm events (Figures 3 and

4 of Appendix A), the site proposed for Alternative 2 area was not impacted by the 2016 July storms. It is expected that this proposed location shall not to be impacted by future flooding as all campsites will be constructed above the respective Base Flood Elevations on a bluff along Oronto Creek. Despite these facts, when the project location for the relocated campground is overlaid on the current FIRM (Flood Insurance Rate Map), panel # 5501820001B effective date April 1, 1988, the result is that the northern edge of the campground appears to be within the 100-year floodplain (Figure 6a of Appendix A). The overlay also makes clear that the current FIRM does not accurately depict the shoreline of Lake Superior or the locations of Oronto Creek or Parker Creek. The proposed map revision considers all cumulative changes in the vicinity including the realignment of County Highway A and shows the proposed campground site to be outside of the floodplain (Figure 14 of Appendix A).

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, a Letter of Map Revision is required to update the floodplain mapping, but the project itself is unlikely to be adversely affected by the floodplain and itself is unlikely to adversely affect the floodplain. Comparing aerials of pre-storm and post-storm events (Figures 3 and 4 of Appendix A), the site proposed for Alternative 3 was not impacted by the 2016 July storms. It is expected that this location shall not to be impacted by future flooding as all campsites will be constructed above the respective Base Flood Elevations on a bluff along Oronto Creek and Lake Superior. As noted above, this project location is within the 100-year floodplain as indicated in the FIRM and corresponding conversion letter, panel # 5501820001B for Iron County (Figure 6 of Appendix A), effective date April 1, 1988. However, the proposed map revision considers all cumulative changes in the vicinity including the realignment of County Highway A and shows the proposed campground site to be outside of the floodplain.

#### **3.1.4 Air Quality**

The Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq., requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment. The CAA established two types of national air quality standards; primary standards set limits to protect public health, including the health of “sensitive” populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly; and secondary standards set limits to protect public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility, damage to animals, crops, vegetation and buildings. Under the CAA, current criteria pollutants are: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Lead (Pb), Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>).

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Green Book provides detailed information about the NAAQS designations, classifications and non-attainment areas. According to the Green Book (<https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/mapnpoll.html>), the project area is not located in a non-attainment area.

### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no adverse impacts to the air quality are anticipated because construction would not occur.

### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, temporary, minor air quality impacts are anticipated as a result of construction on the parcel. To reduce these impacts, the project proponent would require construction contractors to water down construction areas as necessary to reduce the risk of fugitive dust and maintain factory-installed emissions controls on their equipment that meet state emissions standards. Although emissions from fuel-burning equipment could increase the levels of some criteria pollutants, these increases would be temporary, and equipment would not be running unless necessary for construction.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, temporary, minor air quality impacts are anticipated as a result of construction on the parcel. To reduce these impacts, the project proponent would require construction contractors to water down construction areas as necessary to reduce the risk of fugitive dust and maintain factory-installed emissions controls on their equipment that meet state emissions standards. Although emissions from fuel-burning equipment could increase the levels of some criteria pollutants, these increases would be temporary, and equipment would not be running unless necessary for construction.

## **3.1.5 Coastal Zone Management**

The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), 16 U.S.C. § 1451 et seq., enacted in 1972, was established to preserve, protect, develop, and where possible, restore or enhance the resources of the nation's coastal zone. Section 307 of the CZMA requires federal actions, within or outside of the coastal zone, to be consistent with the enforceable policies of a state's federally approved coastal management program (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 2018). The Wisconsin Department of Administration is responsible for managing the Wisconsin Coastal Management Program. Wisconsin has developed a "Strategic Vision for the Great Lakes" that focuses on variety of impacts to the Great Lakes including water quality, economic and community development, and recreational uses among others.

In Wisconsin, the coastal zone includes the entire County boundary of any County touching the shoreline of Lake Michigan and Superior, including Green Bay. The project area lies within the Wisconsin Coastal Zone along Lake Superior.

### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no adverse impacts to the coastal zone are anticipated because construction would not occur.

### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Consultation with Ms. Kathleen Angel of the Wisconsin Coastal Management Program in 2017 indicated that a consistency review was not required for the original proposed scope for this alternative and that any concerns would be covered through the permitting process. FEMA contacted Ms. Angel in 2018 noting adjustments to the scope which shifted work away from the coast of Lake Superior. Documentation is provided in Attachment 5 of Appendix C. Adverse

impacts to the coastal zone are not anticipated, but the project should have several clear benefits to water quality, recreational uses, and community engagement.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

The location of this alternative with regards to the Lake Superior Coastal Zone is essentially identical to that of Alternative 2. Due to the essentially identical locations of Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, Alternative 3 is not likely to require a consistency review by the Wisconsin Coastal Management Program. Impacts to the Coastal Zone by Alternative 3 are not anticipated. Any concerns about the impact of Alternative 3 on the Wisconsin Coastal Zone along Lake Superior would be addressed through the permitting process.

## **3.2 Biological Environment**

### **3.2.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment**

The project location is within an area south of the Oronto Creek with severe bluffs and forested areas zoned “F1, Forestry,” as shown on Figure 13 of Appendix A. Oronto Creek is a local trout fishing spot. The habitat types include a combination of hardwood swamp and upland in the area of direct impacts. Within a buffer area providing an area of potential secondary impacts are hardwood swamp, floodplain forest, shrub-carr, wet meadow, emergent marsh, and open water communities. More information can be found in the Saxon Harbor Campground Wetland Rapid Assessment (Rapid Assessment) (Wetlands & Waterways, LLC, 2018) provided in Attachment 4 of Appendix G.

### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, continued erosion of the creek embankments and shoreline may cause impacts to Oronto Creek, Lake Superior, and adjacent wetlands.

### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, due to the vegetation removal needed to construct in Area 1, construction activities may cause some temporary impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic environments. Potential impacts include alteration of topography, vegetation removal, erosion, sedimentation, soil compaction, and inundation. These impacts would be temporary, ending when construction activities conclude. Terrestrial and aquatic environments will be protected against potential impacts during construction. Native grasses and vegetation will be planted throughout disturbed areas. In the long term, reduced erosion and excessive sedimentation are expected to have positive impacts to nearby waters, wildlife, and fisheries.

Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction. The proposed measures include minimizing the disturbed area, maintaining vegetative cover, and providing inlet protection, silt fencing and erosion matting.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, due to the vegetation removal needed to construct in Area 2, construction activities may cause some temporary impacts to the terrestrial and aquatic environments.

Potential impacts include alteration of topography, vegetation removal, erosion, sedimentation, soil compaction, and inundation. These impacts would be temporary, ending when construction activities conclude. Terrestrial and aquatic environments will be protected against potential impacts during construction. Native grasses and vegetation will be planted throughout disturbed areas. In the long term, reduced erosion and excessive sedimentation are expected to have positive impacts to nearby waters, wildlife, and fisheries.

Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction. The proposed measures include minimizing the disturbed area, maintaining vegetative cover, and providing inlet protection, silt fencing and erosion matting.

### **3.2.2 Wetlands (Executive Order 11990)**

EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands, requires federal agencies to take action to minimize the loss of wetlands. The NEPA compliance process requires federal agencies to consider direct and indirect impacts to wetlands, which may result from federally-funded actions. Results from information gathered from the National Wetland Inventory Map and WDNR Wetland Inventory Map are provided on Figures 8 and 9 of Appendix A. A Wetland Delineation Report and a separate Rapid Assessment can be found in Appendix G. Six wetlands were delineated during the site visit, the identification of which was complicated by effects of the flooding events.

Wetlands 4, 5, and 6, were significantly disturbed at the time of the field visit due to the severe storm in 2016. These are all located to the west of the Marina and will not be affected by the action alternatives addressed here. Therefore, this document will not discuss these wetlands further.

Wetlands 1, 2, and 3 occur in locations which would be impacted by the action alternatives. Wetland 1, the largest of the delineated wetlands, covers an area stretching from near Parker Creek's confluence with Oronto Creek, then West along Oronto Creek to near County Highway A. The largest of the wetlands delineated during the site visit, Wetland 1 has soils consisting primarily of silty clay loam with redoximorphic features overlying high chroma/value clay loam and clay soils lacking redoximorphic features, mostly overlying shallow gravel and rock. The wetland communities in Wetland 1 are predominantly, PFO1 (Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous), PSS1 (Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous) and PEM1 (Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent) per the Cowarden classification system. No recent disturbances beyond the 2016 storm event were observed.

Wetland 2 covers a small isolated area south east of the Marina. The wetland soils within Wetland 2 consist primarily of silty clay loam with redoximorphic features overlying high chroma/value silty clay loam soils lacking redoximorphic features, overlying shallow gravel and rock. Wetland 2 is classified as a PFO1 (Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous) wetland community per the Cowarden classification system.

Wetland 3 was created by a man-made ditch running along the east side of County Highway A. The wetland soils within Wetland 3 consist primarily of silt loam with redoximorphic features overlying high chroma/value gravelly loamy overlying shallow gravel and rock. Wetland 3 is

classified primarily as a PSS1 (Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous) wetland community per the Cowardin classification system.

The Wetland Delineation Report concluded that Wetlands 1, 2, and 3 were relatively undisturbed with normal wetland characteristics. On February 2, 2018, the WDNR recommended a Rapid Assessment be completed along with an updated map showing the wetland types, which is included in Appendix A. The results of the WDNR Rapid Assessment showed high significance of human use values and wildlife habitat. Medium significance was determined for floristic integrity, fish and aquatic habitat, flood and stormwater storage, water quality protection, and groundwater processes. The wetland area is relatively pristine although invasive species were present. The wetland impact studied in the rapid assessment is relatively small considering the size of the watershed and overall wetland community. Finally, wetland species found on site were not rare or particularly unique.

The USACE was provided the Wetland Delineation Report in February of 2018 during a pre-application meeting. The report was provided to WDNR on January 18, 2018, April 5, 2018, October 5, 2018, and April 29, 2018 at each of the permit request meetings associated with the disaster repairs needed around Saxon Harbor. Results of the Rapid Assessment were shared with both agencies as well. A second pre-application meeting was held on April 24, 2019 to discuss revisions to the campground design and layout to reduce the footprint, grading, and wetland impacts.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no adverse impacts to wetlands are anticipated because construction would not occur.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Wetlands 1 and 3 are in part within the project area for the Proposed Action. Under this alternative, approximately 1 acre of wetlands would be disturbed or filled by construction of the new campground. The original estimate of 0.63 acres impacted by the campground has been revised to 0.75, and 0.27 acres of wetlands are expected to be impacted from slope stabilization activities. Currently, the campground is designed at 65% and it is expected the design area will change somewhat throughout the design process. The project design based on the project purpose and need will adversely impact wetlands. As the adverse impacts to wetlands are unavoidable, the project will require compensatory mitigation. There are three possible mechanisms for satisfying compensatory mitigation requirements of wetland individual permits and nonfederal wetland exemptions (WDNR, 2018):

1. Wetland mitigation banking: An individual permit applicant or exempt project proponent may purchase credits, if available, from an approved bank to satisfy their compensatory mitigation requirement.
2. In-lieu fee programs: An individual permit applicant or exempt project proponent can purchase credits from the WDNR-sponsored WI Wetland Conservation Trust in-lieu fee program to satisfy their compensatory mitigation requirement.

3. Permittee responsible mitigation: An individual permit applicant can complete a mitigation project within the same watershed service area or within a half mile of the permitted wetland impact. An exempt project proponent can complete a mitigation project within the same compensation search area.

During the pre-permit application meeting, several mitigation options were outlined and discussed pertaining to Wetland Bank Credits. The Ashland (Chequamegon) Bank was the most likely choice for the purchase of credits. Minutes from the February 2, 2018 meeting can be found in Attachment 2 of Appendix C. By the time of the second permit application meeting on April 24, 2019 (Attachment 2 of Appendix C), Lake Superior District credits were no longer available. However, advance credits through Wisconsin Conservation Trust in-lieu fee program are available. In a meeting on May 24, 2019, it was confirmed with the DNR and USACE that the advance credits through the Wisconsin Conservation Trust would be a viable option for this project, in the event that additional bank credits do not become available before project completion. All concerned agreed that permittee responsible mitigation does not seem to be a practical or viable option for this undertaking. Expected impacts to wetlands will require permits from the USACE and WDNR.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Wetlands 1, 2, and 3 would be partially impacted by Alternative 3. Under this alternative, approximately 1.75 acres of wetlands would be impacted by construction of the new campground. Mitigation would be in the form of purchasing wetland credits from a nearby bank if possible or as with Alternative 2, the applicant would purchase advance credits from the Wisconsin Conservation Trust in-lieu fee program. Expected impacts to wetlands will require permits from the USACE and WDNR.

### **3.2.3 Threatened and Endangered Species**

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, 16 U.S.C. § 1531, provides a framework for the conservation of endangered and threatened species and their habitats. Federal agencies are required to ensure that actions they fund, authorize, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species (including plant species) or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitats for such species.

In accordance with Section 7 of the ESA, the project area was evaluated for the potential occurrences of federally listed threatened and endangered species. The ESA requires any federal agency that funds, authorizes or carries out an action to ensure that their action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species (including plant species) or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitats. The Bald Eagle, while not listed under the ESA, remains protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Species listed under the ESA within Iron County (<https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/lists/wisc-cty.html>), along with the Bald Eagle, are noted in Table 1.



**Table 1: Federally Protected, Endangered & Threatened Species within Iron County**

Common Name	Scientific Name	Category	Status	Habitat
Bald Eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Bird	Protected	Habitat found in forested areas and near expanses of shallow fresh or salt water.
Canada Lynx	<i>Lynx canadensis</i>	Mammal	Threatened	Habitat includes northern forested areas
Northern Long-eared bat	<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>	Mammal	Threatened	Habitat includes caves and mines in the winter, upland forests in the spring and summer, and wooded areas in the fall.
Gray Wolf	<i>Canis lupus</i>	Mammal	Endangered	Habitat found in northern forested areas.

During all site walks of the Alternative site locations, no species listed by the USFWS as endangered or threatened were found on site. Bald Eagles were found nesting on site at alternative locations previously considered and rejected.

Attachment 6 of Appendix C is a memo detailing FEMA’s Section 7 determination. In addition, Attachment 3 of Appendix C presents the Endangered Resources Review (ERR) request submitted to the WDNR on June 30, 2017. The results recommend actions to conserve Wisconsin’s Endangered Resources. These recommendations for state-listed species will be incorporated into the final plan. On February 23, 2018, the DNR provided a summary of available NHI data for the project area to add the Floodplain Revisions, County Highway A Relocation, and Campground relocation into one review (Attachment 7 of Appendix C). The only species identified was the Bald Eagle nest in the alternative already dismissed. No further review for impacts to endangered species is necessary.

**Alternative 1 – No Action**

Under No Action alternative, no additional areas would be disturbed. No adverse impacts to threatened or endangered species or their critical habitats are anticipated because construction and additional loss of forested habitat would not occur.

**Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1**

Under this alternative, no significant impacts are expected, as none of the threatened or endangered species listed above are likely to be present on site. An ERR was completed, and recommendations will be incorporated into the final design. Mitigation will include implementing construction windows from July 30 through January 15 where human activity within 660 feet of the eagle nest should be avoided. Construction will result in the removal of approximately 17 acres of forested area, potentially decreasing the habitats for the Grey Wolf, Canada Lynx, Northern Long-eared Bat, and Bald Eagle. In addition to the fact that these species have not been identified in the project area, no impacts to these species is likely to occur during the construction phases due to environmental windows in construction permits and erosion control measures. The WDNR response to the ERR for this project supports these conclusions. Environmental windows in

construction permits are implemented to prevent construction during important mating and breeding periods, such as fish spawning season and rutting season. Erosion control measures would be implemented to prevent a decrease in habitat for identified water species to address changes in storm water runoff.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, impacts to species are roughly identical to those for Alternative 2, with the exception that construction would be conducted somewhat closer to the identified Bald Eagle nest previously noted. This alternative would result in the loss of more than 10 acres of forested area will be removed, though its location would have potentially greater impacts on the previously noted species due to increased construction activity in more densely wooded areas, as well as closer to the nesting site for the Bald Eagle. Despite these minor changes to impacts as compared to Alternative 2, no impact to these species is likely to occur during the construction phases due to environmental windows in construction permits and erosion control measures. Environmental windows in construction permits are implemented to prevent construction during important mating and breeding periods, such as fish spawning season and rutting season. Erosion control measures would be implemented to prevent a decrease in habitat for identified water species to address changes in storm water runoff.

## **3.3 Socioeconomics**

### **3.3.1 Visual Resources**

The Saxon Harbor Campground offers the community and tourists views of the natural bluff forested area and the Harbor. From the harbor, views to the southeast present the heavily-forested bluff, and to the south, views of the bluff on which the current 6-site camping area is situated. Public feedback and guiding principles provided in analyzing the future of the Saxon Harbor Campground are summarized in the *Schematic Design Report* (Appendix G). That report reflects a strong desire to enhance and protect viewsheds available throughout Saxon Harbor.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

No impacts are expected. The current situation will continue, with visitors unable to use the Harbor Campground and take advantage of its view of the Harbor and the surrounding natural environment.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Alternative 2 would not affect views of the harbor from the south, but views of the bluff from the harbor would be affected, specifically the forested section of the bluff. This currently presents as a wall of greenery, as the trees currently extend to edge of the bluff. As one of the goals of this project is to stabilize the bluff, the area would be cleared to accommodate grading. The bluff will be replanted with trees and within a few years the view would essentially be unchanged. Although this change results in the temporary loss of a view of the forested bluff, the cleared area will provide another location for unobstructed views of the harbor until the replanted vegetation matures. The view of the current campground from the harbor will be essentially unchanged, as the new campsites will be positioned south of the current camping area creating better views

from the campground of the harbor and Oconto Creek. There is no impact to the walk-in tent campsite therefore no views will be impacted.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Alternative 3 would have similar effects on views to the changes noted above for Alternative 2. The primary difference would be the loss of even more forested area on the bluff which would significantly change the viewshed along the entire width of the harbor. Figure 5 of Appendix A illustrates the extent of deforestation required for this alternative. Alternative 3, then, would significantly change the character of the entire length of the northern shore of Oronto Creek. The view would consist almost entirely of improved campgrounds and relatively bare bluffs, rather than the current views or those resulting from Alternative 2, which would leave a significant portion of the currently unimproved bluff unchanged. The only benefit would be additional areas from which to see unobstructed views of the harbor. Therefore, views from the campground of the Oronto Creek and Harbor would enhance the campground location. There is no impact to the walk-in tent campsite therefore no views will be impacted.

### **3.3.2 Noise**

Noise is defined herein as undesirable sound and is federally regulated by the Noise Control Act of 1972 (NCA), 42 U.S.C. § 4901 et seq.. Although the NCA gives the EPA authority to prepare guidelines for acceptable ambient noise levels, it only charges those federal agencies that operate noise-producing facilities or equipment to implement noise standards. The EPA's guidelines, and those of many federal agencies, state that outdoor sound level in excess of 55 decibels are "normally unacceptable" for noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools and hospitals.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no impacts related to noise are anticipated.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, only temporary short-term increases in noise levels would be anticipated during construction. Currently, there are no restrictions on construction activities. Iron County has allowed contractors to operate 24/7 with consideration given if complaints are received. The community will be notified about all changes as well as educational and outreach opportunities about the construction progress and anticipated work schedules and noise levels. Long term significant increases in noise levels would not be anticipated.

#### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, only temporary short-term increases in noise levels would be anticipated during construction. Currently, there are no restrictions on construction activities. Iron County has allowed contractors to operate 24/7 with consideration given if complaints are received. The community will be notified about all changes as well as educational and outreach opportunities about the construction progress and anticipated work schedules and noise levels. Long term significant increases in noise levels would not be anticipated.

### **3.3.3 Public Services and Utilities**

The nearest school districts within Iron County are in the City of Hurley and Town of Mercer, 16 miles and 50 miles, respectively, from the project location. The fire departments in Iron County include the Town of Saxon (5 miles), City of Hurley (17 miles), and Town of Mercer (50 miles). The nearest police department to the project site is the Hurley Police Department (17 miles). The project will not affect any of these public services. Electrical utilities for the Saxon Harbor area are provided by Xcel (Figure 11 of Appendix A).

This category of inquiry addresses the provision of basic utilities, i.e. electricity and water, to the proposed campsites. Before the storms, each site within the main campground included an electrical hookup for RVs and water spigots. The sites located in the smaller campground south of Oronto Creek had only an on-site water well. The utilities at both sites were destroyed by the storms.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no impacts related to public utilities are anticipated.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

At the project site under Alternative 2, sanitary and electric will be connected for the on-site bathrooms. Storm water swales, culverts, and biofilters will be installed to collect and transport storm water off site. A site plan detailing the utilities plan can be found in Appendix H.

Under this alternative, no anticipated long-term adverse impacts are expected during construction. After construction, the community and visitors will have a functional water and sewer system available for tourists and other visitors.

#### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

At the project site under Alternative 3, there are currently no utilities except an on-site water well. With construction of the new campground, sanitary and electric will need to be connected for the on-site bathrooms. Storm water swales, culverts, and biofilters will be installed to collect and transport storm water off site. As this alternative includes a segment of campground farther to the east of the current – spot campground utility lines would have to extend farther east than under Alternative 2.

Under this alternative, no anticipated long-term adverse impacts are expected during construction. After construction, the community and visitors will have a functional water and sewer system available for tourists and other visitors.

### **3.3.4 Traffic and Circulation**

The entrance to Saxon Harbor Campground is located on CTH A. Due to the 2016 storm events, the CTH A Bridge which carried traffic across Oronto Creek to the campground, was washed out by flooding caused by severe weather. The Wisconsin Department of Transportation began repairs to the CTH A Bridge in May 2018.

### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under the No Action alternative, no impacts related to traffic and circulation are anticipated. Only two rustic campsites would remain, one on the North Harbor and a second at the East Rustic Walk-In site with space for 11 tent units. Those campsites still available represent only approximately 25% of the original capacity prior to the damage of the main campground. The loss of camping sites will likely result in a significant decline in tourists, with a resulting drop in traffic throughout the complex.

### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, during construction there may be temporary traffic circulation delays due to construction work patterns that will impact businesses and traffic circulation. There will also be an increase in heavy equipment traffic. Access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and to minimize risks to safety and human health. The appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. The contractor will be required to develop a Traffic Plan, including safety and security measures to be implemented to keep the community and equipment operators safe.

After construction, and in high-demand camping weekends, it is expected that additional traffic will result from increased use of the camping facilities. The relocation of the primary campground south of Oronto Creek will allow any expected increase in traffic flows to avoid the harbor area. Although this alternative may result in an increase in traffic during camping season, it better manages traffic throughout the entire complex.

### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Alternative 3 results in the same changes to traffic and circulation as Alternative 2. In addition, this alternative will require a longer road for RV and car use to allow traffic to get to the campsite area located east along the bluff, increasing the distance cars would have to drive from the campsite to reach the harbor.

During construction there may be temporary traffic circulation delays due to construction work patterns that will impact businesses and traffic circulation. There will also be an increase in heavy equipment traffic. Access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and to minimize risks to safety and human health. The appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. The contractor will be required to develop a Traffic Plan, including safety and security measures to be implemented to keep the community and equipment operators safe.

After construction, and in high-demand camping weekends, it is expected that additional traffic will result from increased use of the camping facilities. The relocation of the primary campground south of Oronto Creek will allow any expected increase in traffic flows to avoid the harbor area. Although this alternative may result in an increase in traffic during camping season, it better manages traffic throughout the entire complex.

### **3.3.5 Environmental Justice (Executive Order 12898)**

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton signed EO 12898, entitled “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” The EO directs federal agencies, “to make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States....” In compliance with FEMA’s policy implementing EO 12898, Environmental Justice (FEMA Instruction 108-1-1), the socioeconomic conditions and potential effects related to the No Action, and alternative actions are reviewed.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance suggests that an environmental justice population may be identified if “the minority population percentage of the affected area exceeds 50%, or if the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis” (CEQ, 1997). The CEQ defines low-income populations based on an annual statistical poverty threshold. In 2013, the poverty threshold for the 48 contiguous states for an individual under the age of 65 living alone was \$12,119 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014).

For analyzing impacts to the minority and low-income populations at the Proposed Action Area, data from Iron County is compared to the State of Wisconsin to determine if there were any siting concerns relative to Environmental Justice.

The minority population of the Proposed Action Area (0% as it is a County Park with no full-time residents) is less than the state as a whole (13.8%) and lower than surrounding county (Iron) geographical area (2.1%). Neither of these differences is considered meaningful.

Income-related data is only available as an estimate and is available at the Census Tract Level. The median household income for Iron County is estimated at \$41,270, and the percentage of the individuals with incomes below the poverty level is estimated at 12.8%. The median household income for the State of Wisconsin is estimated at \$56,811, and the percentage of individuals with incomes below the poverty level is estimated at 11.8%. These figures are well under the threshold

The percentage of the population below the poverty level for the Proposed Action Area (0%) is lower than the state as a whole (11.3%) and also lower than surrounding Rock County geographical area (11.4%). These differences are not considered meaningful.

No appreciable minority or low-income populations exist within the area directly affected by the Proposed Action. No local community with appreciable minority or low-income populations exists in the surrounding Iron County geographical area. Based on this analysis, there is no concern regarding environmental justice to minority populations at the Proposed Action Area.

It should also be noted, however, that the restoration of campsites at Saxon Harbor and the protection of habitat related to sport fishing is expected to have positive benefits for all residents of Iron County. Campground revenues account for approximately 50% of the total Forestry and Parks’ annual budget and are used to offset operational expenses for other County facilities. In

addition, spending by tourists add to the local economy in nearby towns, stimulating the creation of tourism-related jobs and services.

***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under the No Action alternative, without restoration of the campground, Forestry and Parks and local businesses lose tourist revenue.

***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, there is no disproportionately high or adverse long-term impact to the minority community within Iron County. The project will not interfere with minority housing or community centers. The Proposed Action is assumed to have a short construction window with a small number of construction workers dedicated to the project area. It is possible that the county within the general Project Area (Rock) could experience short-term temporary beneficial effects to the local economy through induced spending from construction employees working on the project.

The project also has potential secondary and sustainable economic benefits to the community as a whole by supporting recreational tourism (both for the local community and out-of-state individuals and communities), increasing employment opportunities, and adding positive environmental value, which would be a boost to the overall economy. The proposed project will restore the revenues on which Forestry and Parks and other Iron County services depend. The effects of tourist dollars in other areas of the local economy will be reestablished as well.

***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

Under this alternative, as with Alternative 2, there is no disproportionately high or adverse impact to the minority community within Iron County. The short-term and long-term impacts under both alternatives are identical.

**3.3.6 Safety and Security**

To minimize risks to safety and human health, construction activities would be performed using qualified personnel trained in the proper use of the appropriate equipment including appropriate safety precautions; additionally, activities would be conducted in accordance with the standards specified in Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) regulations, following standard operating procedures and safe work plans.

***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no impacts related to safety and security are anticipated.

***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

Under this alternative, construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the activities. During construction, access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and to minimize risks to safety and human health. Appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. There would be no disproportionate health and safety risks to children.

### **Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2**

As with Alternative 2, under this alternative, construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the activities. During construction, access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and to minimize risks to safety and human health. The appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. There would be no disproportionate health and safety risks to children.

### **3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources**

In addition to review under NEPA, consideration of effects to historic properties is mandated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and implemented by 36 C.F.R. Part 800. Requirements include the Agency's identification of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), which is defined in 36 C.F.R. Part 800.16(d) as "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking which may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if such properties exist."

Historic properties are defined in 36 C.F.R. Part 800.16(l) as buildings, structures, objects, sites or districts included or eligible for listing in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In addition to identifying historic properties that may exist in the proposed project's APE, FEMA must also determine, in consultation with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), what effect, if any, the action will have on historic properties. Moreover, if the project would have an adverse effect on these properties, FEMA must consult with SHPO and/or THPO on ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effect. In addition, the NHPA requires that FEMA consult with any other interested consulting parties, including relevant and appropriate members of the public and/or federally-recognized Native American Tribes (Tribes).

For the Saxon Harbor Campground project, FEMA consulted with the SHPO on both the campground relocation and the return of Saxon Harbor itself to pre-disaster condition. At that time, there were two alternatives for the campground location, both of which were included in the archaeological survey which was prepared in support of FEMA's finding. FEMA initiated consultation with the SHPO on November 16, 2017, to inform SHPO of the scope of the proposed undertakings. FEMA determined that no historic properties, either structures or archaeological resources, existed within the APE for either undertaking. The consultation materials included documentation supporting FEMA's finding of no historic properties affected. SHPO concurred with FEMA's finding in their response dated November 21, 2017.

Although Tribal lands do not constitute any part of the APE, in compliance with the NHPA and related executive orders regarding consultation with federally-recognized Indian Tribes, FEMA notified THPOs and tribal leaders of eight federally-recognized Tribes with potential ancestral interests in Iron County, requesting comment on the restoration of the harbor and the relocation of the campground. These notifications were prepared in April of 2017 and included a preliminary campground location that was later rejected. However, the site location outlined for the two proposed undertakings in that notification included the locations of both Alternatives 2 and 3



presented here. One tribe, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe of Minnesota responded, noting that they have no record of sites of religious or cultural significance in the area.

FEMA's consultations met the requirements of a number of laws and executive orders, including but not limited to Sections 1508.27(b)(3,6, and 8) of NEPA regarding the context and intensity or severity of impacts on historic and cultural resources and Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended, and implemented by 36 C.F.R. Part 800. Applicable laws and executive orders governing treatment of archaeological artifacts and Tribal resources are noted in the appropriate sections below.

Select documents from the SHPO consultation documentation are included in Attachment 4 of Appendix C. An electronic copy of the full set of documentation is available upon request from Duane Castaldi at [duane.castaldi@fema.dhs.gov](mailto:duane.castaldi@fema.dhs.gov). Copies of the tribal letters and responses are provided in Appendix D.

### **3.4.1 Historic Structures**

Construction drawings show two structures in the vicinity of the Alternative 2 proposed campground area to be demolished. One is a sanitary facility (restrooms) built early mid-1970s constructed of concrete block with pit toilets, while the other is a pre-fabricated storage shed for the previous campground built in 2008. Neither are historic structures.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no impacts to historic structures are anticipated.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

No impacts to historic structures are anticipated.

#### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

No impacts to historic structures are anticipated.

### **3.4.2 Archaeological Resources**

The Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 provides for the survey, recovery, and preservation of significant scientific, prehistoric, archeological or paleontological data when such data may be destroyed or irreparably lost due to a federal, federally licensed, or federally funded (in part or whole) project. If such data is anticipated to be destroyed or irreparably lost, FEMA will consult with the Secretary of the Interior in an effort to recover, preserve, and protect such data. Other federal laws applicable to this undertaking include the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) of 1978, under which FEMA is responsible for the protection and preservation of American Indian sites, possessions, and ceremonial and traditional rites. If any of these are anticipated to be affected by the Proposed Action, AIRFA promotes consultation with American Indian religious practitioners by the federal agency. In accordance with the NHPA, information concerning the nature and location of archaeological resources and traditional cultural properties and detailed information regarding archaeological and cultural resources is confidential.

Finally, records related to the presence of archaeological and/or burial sites are confidential, and are exempt from open records requests pursuant to Wis. Stat. §44.48 and 157.70. For this reason some of the information in the archaeological report included in Appendix G has been redacted.

#### ***3.4.2.1 Archaeological Survey***

Site locations for Alternatives 2 and 3 include portions of a previously-identified archaeological site, referred to as the Saxon Trading Post Site. A Phase 1 Archaeological Survey was conducted in July 2017. As noted in the report (Attachment 8 of Appendix G), no remains or artifacts were discovered, and further archaeological work is not recommended. That report, in conjunction with FEMA's documentation, supported FEMA's finding and the SHPO's concurrence (Appendix C) that no historic archaeological properties will be affected by any of the project alternatives presented here.

#### ***Alternative 1 – No Action***

Under No Action alternative, no impacts to historic or cultural resources are anticipated.

#### ***Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1***

An archeological assessment of the project area was conducted in July 2017 (Attachment 6 of Appendix G). That assessment suggests it is unlikely that cultural resources or human remains will be encountered during construction and that no further archeological work is recommended. If any cultural artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, construction will be halted, and appropriate authorities will be contacted immediately.

The following project conditions would provide additional protection to archaeological sites potentially impacted by Alternative 2:

1. Applicant will require its contractor to monitor ground disturbance and if any potential archeological resources are discovered, to immediately cease construction in that area and notify the State and FEMA. The applicant will ensure construction activities in the vicinity of the discovery are immediately halted and will take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the property until FEMA concludes consultation with the SHPO, THPOs, and other appropriate consulting parties, including Tribes.
2. Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile. If this is not the case, the subrecipient shall inform FEMA of the fill source so required agency consultations can be completed prior to beginning ground disturbing activities.

#### ***Alternative 3 – Campground at Area 2***

An archeological assessment of the project area was conducted in July 2017 (Attachment 6 of Appendix G). That assessment suggests it is unlikely that cultural resources or human remains will be encountered during construction and that no further archeological work is recommended. If any cultural artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction, construction will be halted and appropriate authorities will be contacted immediately.

The following project conditions would provide additional protection to archaeological sites potentially impacted by Alternative 3:

1. Applicant will require its contractor to monitor ground disturbance and if any potential archeological resources are discovered, to immediately cease construction in that area and notify the State and FEMA. The applicant will ensure construction activities in the vicinity of the discovery are immediately halted and will take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the property until FEMA concludes consultation with the SHPO, THPOs, and other appropriate consulting parties, including Tribes.
2. Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile. If this is not the case, the subrecipient shall inform FEMA of the fill source so required agency consultations can be completed prior to beginning ground disturbing activities.

### **3.4.3 Tribal Coordination and Religious Sites**

In accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part 800.8(a)(2), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation indicates that consultation with Tribes should begin early in the NEPA process regarding the possible effects of disaster recovery efforts on cultural properties of religious or traditional significance, or cultural properties formally designated as Traditional Cultural Properties. Amendments to Section 101 of the NHPA in 1992 strengthened the connection between the NHPA and AIRFA (42 U.S.C. § 1996). AIRFA requires consultation with Native American groups concerning proposed actions on sacred sites on federal land or affecting access to sacred sites. It establishes federal policy to protect and preserve for American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, and Native Hawaiians their right to free exercise of their religion in the form of site access, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom to worship through ceremonial and traditional rites. AIRFA requires federal agencies to consider the impact of their actions on religious sites and objects important to these peoples, regardless of eligibility for listing on the NRHP.

Tribal consultation was also undertaken in accordance with EO 13175, titled Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, signed by President Clinton on November 6, 2000. This EO directs federal agencies, “to establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of Federal policies that have tribal implications, to strengthen the United States government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes, and to reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates upon Indian tribes....”

FEMA submitted invitations to join the consultation or to provide comment on the presence or absence of known cultural properties of religious or traditional significance, or of cultural properties formally designated as Traditional Cultural Properties, within the proposed project area. This request for comment was sent on April 12, 2017, to the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians, the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Indians, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, the White Earth Band of Ojibwe, the Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, and the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska. Those letters and the responses received are included in Appendix D, Tribal Nation Consultation. One tribe, the Mille Lacs Band of

Ojibwe of Minnesota responded, noting that they have no record of sites of religious or cultural significance in the area. No tribe had comments regarding the proposed archaeological survey, which commenced after the 30-day response period had elapsed.

**Alternative 1 – No Action**

Under the No Action alternative, no impacts to Tribal cultural resources are anticipated.

**Alternative 2 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 1**

Under Alternative 2, no impacts to Tribal cultural resources are anticipated.

**Alternative 3 – Proposed Action, Campground at Area 2**

Under Alternative 3, no impacts to Tribal cultural resources are anticipated.

**3.5 Comparison of Alternatives**

This section describes the potential impacts from the proposed alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. Where potential impacts exist, conditions or mitigation measures to offset these impacts are detailed in the body of the document. A summary table is provided below.

**Table 2: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Environment	Alternative 1: No Action Impacts	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Impacts and • Mitigation	Alternative 3: Impacts and • Mitigation
Soils and Geology	Potential for continued long-term erosion.	<p>No significant long-term impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction.</li> <li>• A Post-Construction Storm Water Permit will be obtained.</li> </ul>	<p>No significant long-term impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction.</li> <li>• A Post-Construction Storm Water Permit will be obtained.</li> </ul>

Affected Environment	Alternative 1: No Action Impacts	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Impacts and • <i>Mitigation</i>	Alternative 3: Impacts and • <i>Mitigation</i>
Water Resources and Water Quality	No adverse impacts to surface waters are anticipated, though water quality may degrade due to continued erosion.	<p>Temporary impacts to surface water during construction expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction.</i></li> <li>• <i>A Post-Construction Storm Water Permit will be obtained.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Temporary impacts to surface water during construction expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction.</i></li> <li>• <i>A Post-Construction Storm Water Permit will be obtained.</i></li> </ul>
Floodplain Management	No impacts expected.	A FEMA Letter of Map Revision will correct the mapped floodplain at this location. Otherwise, no impacts expected.	A FEMA Letter of Map Revision will correct the mapped floodplain at this location. Otherwise, no impacts expected.
Air Quality	No impacts expected.	<p>No permanent impacts. Temporary impacts during construction are anticipated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reduce the potential for temporary air quality impacts during the construction by minimizing, running fuel-burning equipment running time, minimizing open construction areas, and watering open construction areas to control dust when necessary.</i></li> </ul>	<p>No permanent impacts. Temporary impacts during construction are anticipated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reduce the potential for temporary air quality impacts during the construction by minimizing, running fuel-burning equipment running time, minimizing open construction areas, and watering open construction areas to control dust when necessary.</i></li> </ul>
Coastal Zone Management	No impacts expected.	<p>No significant impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Requirements for federal consistency to be met through permitting requirements.</i></li> </ul>	<p>No significant impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Requirements for federal consistency to be met through permitting requirements.</i></li> </ul>

Affected Environment	Alternative 1: No Action Impacts	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Impacts and • <i>Mitigation</i>	Alternative 3: Impacts and • <i>Mitigation</i>
Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment	Erosion of the creek embankments and shoreline may cause impacts.	<p>Impacts due to construction activities are likely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Terrestrial and aquatic environments will be protected against potential impacts during construction. Native grasses and vegetation will be planted throughout disturbed areas.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Impacts due to construction activities are likely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Terrestrial and aquatic environments will be protected against potential impacts during construction. Native grasses and vegetation will be planted throughout disturbed areas.</i></li> </ul>
Wetlands	No impacts expected.	<p>Approximately 1 acre of wetlands to be impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impacts would be offset by securing best available wetland mitigation approved by DNR and USACE.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Approximately 1.75 acres of wetlands to be impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Impacts would be offset by securing best available wetland mitigation approved by DNR and USACE.</i></li> </ul>
Threatened and Endangered Species	• No impacts expected.	<p>Potential for decreased habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environmental windows in construction permits minimize potential harm to species.</i></li> <li>• <i>Avoid engaging in construction activities within 660 feet of a bald or golden eagle nest during nesting and fledging.</i></li> <li>• <i>To reduce any potential adverse effects on the federally threatened Northern Long Eared Bat, trees with woody stems greater than 3" diameter at breast height may not be cut between April 1 and September 30 of any year.</i></li> <li>• <i>Recommendations from the WDNR response to the ERR will be implemented during construction.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Potential for decreased habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environmental windows in construction permits minimize potential harm to species.</i></li> <li>• <i>Avoid engaging in construction activities within 660 feet of a bald or golden eagle nest during nesting and fledging.</i></li> <li>• <i>To reduce any potential adverse effects on the federally threatened Northern Long Eared Bat, trees with woody stems greater than 3" diameter at breast height may not be cut between April 1 and September 30 of any year.</i></li> <li>• <i>Recommendations from the WDNR response to the ERR will be implemented during construction.</i></li> </ul>

Affected Environment	Alternative 1: No Action Impacts	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Impacts and • Mitigation	Alternative 3: Impacts and • Mitigation
Zoning and Land Use	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected. • A LOMR will be submitted to allow the campground to be permitted in the location currently mapped as floodplain	No impacts expected. • A LOMR will be submitted to allow the campground to be permitted in the location currently mapped as floodplain
Visual Resources	No impacts expected.	Views of the bluff from the harbor would be temporarily changed, and views of the Harbor from some parts of the bluff would be improved.	Views of the bluff from the harbor would include more campsites, and views of the Harbor from some parts of the bluff would be improved.
Noise	No impacts expected.	Short-term impacts due to construction. • Construction activities will be limited to hours that comply with the Town of Saxon's noise ordinance and equipment will be kept in a good working order to minimize noise.	Short-term impacts due to construction. • Construction activities will be limited to hours that comply with the Town of Saxon's noise ordinance and equipment will be kept in a good working order to minimize noise.
Public Service and Utilities	No impacts expected.	No impacts expected.	• No impacts expected.
Traffic and Circulation	Short-term decline in number of visitors expected to result in reduced traffic.	No long-term impacts expected. • Access to the site restricted to protect the public. • Appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction. • The contractor will be required to develop a Traffic Plan, including safety and security measures.	No long-term impacts expected. • Access to the site restricted to protect the public. • Appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction. • The contractor will be required to develop a Traffic Plan, including safety and security measures.
Environmental Justice	Community expected to be affected by loss of economic activity.	Resulting increase in economic activity not expected to cause disproportionately high or adverse impacts to minority communities.	Resulting increase in economic activity not expected to cause disproportionately high or adverse impacts to minority communities.

Affected Environment	Alternative 1: No Action Impacts	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Impacts and • <i>Mitigation</i>	Alternative 3: Impacts and • <i>Mitigation</i>
Safety and Security	No impacts expected.	<p>Construction activities increase the safety risks for those performing the work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All construction activities will be performed using qualified personnel, and all activities would be conducted in accord with OSHA standards.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Construction activities increase the safety risks for those performing the work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All construction activities will be performed using qualified personnel, and all activities would be conducted in accord with OSHA standards.</i></li> </ul>
Historic Structures	No impacts.	No impacts.	No impacts.
Archaeological Resources	No impacts expected.	<p>No impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If any potential archaeological resources are discovered, will immediately cease construction in that area and notify the WEM and FEMA.</i></li> <li>• <i>Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile, or repurposing fill from areas being graded as part of the proposed alternative.</i></li> </ul>	<p>No impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If any potential archaeological resources are discovered, will immediately cease construction in that area and notify the WEM and FEMA.</i></li> <li>• <i>Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile, or repurposing fill from areas being graded as part of the proposed alternative.</i></li> </ul>
Tribal Coordination and Religious Sites	No impacts expected.	<p>No impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If any potential archaeological resources are discovered, will immediately cease construction in that area and notify the WEM and FEMA.</i></li> <li>• <i>Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile, or repurposing fill from areas being graded as part of the proposed alternative.</i></li> </ul>	<p>No impacts expected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If any potential archaeological resources are discovered, will immediately cease construction in that area and notify the WEM and FEMA.</i></li> <li>• <i>Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile, or repurposing fill from areas being graded as part of the proposed alternative.</i></li> </ul>



## **SECTION FOUR: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

---

Cumulative impacts are the incremental actions when added to the project in the past, present, or future and how their combined effect of the proposed action impacts the vicinity of the project area. In accordance with NEPA, this EA has reviewed all the Alternatives and other actions according to their cumulative impact on the proposed project area. Surrounding the Harbor Campground, there are three other projects being completed in the area – relocation of County Highway A, repairs to the harbor, and dredging within the harbor.

### **4.1 Relocation of County Highway A**

The relocation of County Highway A, damaged by the 2016 storms, was recently completed and affects all alternatives. It provides access to the harbor from the campground by car. With the relocated alternatives there is an increased distance from the campgrounds to the harbor. If County Highway A had not been relocated and repaired, access to the harbor would have been limited, reducing demand for use of the harbor and campgrounds. No significant impacts to traffic and circulation are expected to result from this change.

### **4.2 Dredging**

Removing the built up of sediment from the 2016 storms will benefit those wishing to use the harbor. Harbor use will promote use of the campgrounds. Measures will be put in place as required by permits to restrict transport of sediment within working areas to limit any impacts from this work.

### **4.3 Repairs to the Harbor**

Repairs and restoration of the harbor allows tourists and residents to make use of the harbor's resources. These repairs included work on and near the site of the subject project, namely the minor improvement of an existing access path for equipment needed to construct a water building that serves the Harbor. The work on this temporary road and construction of this water facility to the east of the proposed campground site have limited permanent environmental impacts. Harbor repairs and associated work will result in beneficial economic effects similar to those noted in Section 3.4.5, Environmental Justice, above.

### **4.4 Additional Disaster Damages**

Severe storms, straight-line winds, and flooding caused additional damage and debris to Saxon Harbor and associated facilities in June of 2018. Under DR-4383-WI, Iron County Forestry received FEMA funding for additional repairs to the Marina, and to remove debris accumulated in Saxon Harbor, Oronto Creek, and Parker Creek. Funding was also requested for minor repair to an earthen berm along Oronto Creek. Some of this work has been completed, and some is to be completed.

#### **4.5 Forest Management Activities**

The management of Iron County's forest resource is the Department's primary focus. This important resource provides Iron County a large source of revenues annually and reduces the burden on the County taxpayers. In a typical year, Iron County will manage, or harvest, approximately 3,000 acres. These harvest acres include mostly County Forest lands, but also will include other County-owned lands, as those areas become ready for treatments. Silvicultural activities are exempted from wetland review in Wisconsin, as long as Best Management Practices (BMPs) are followed to minimize impacts to wetlands during forest management activities. These include operating under frozen ground conditions, riparian zones along streams, and not leaving topwood within streams.

During early 2019, Iron County completed logging operations in the area of the proposed campground and the areas to the west. The proposed campground site was treated using a method of woodland management called "coppicing," in which the trees are cut to near ground level. While this action represents impacts to the proposed campground, those impacts are consistent with plans to clear the area of trees in order to facilitate the development of the campground.

In the areas to the east of the proposed site only the Aspen were removed. In that area, large, overmature Aspen were removed while leaving the younger trees to maintain an overstory canopy. This silvicultural activity was accomplished following the BMPs to minimize environmental effects as part of Iron County Forestry's annual maintenance activities.

#### **4.6 Future Projects Near the Site**

The Asset-Based Community Development Strategy calls for improvements such as trails, kiosks, kayak launches to be installed throughout the harbor complex. These would have negligible environmental impacts.

Any future projects will be required to comply with appropriate local, state, and federal rules and regulations. Compliance with these regulations will help avoid negative cumulative impacts.

### **SECTION FIVE: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

---

In 2016, shortly after the FEMA-4276-DR flood event, the Iron County Board initiated discussions with the community regarding the need to restore the campground. Public notice for community input was advertised in several newspapers and news websites within the community on September 8, 2016. Results from the surveys can be found in Appendix F. The community participated in a survey providing feedback into what they are looking for in a campground and lessons learned from the previous campground. The most notable issue was the lack of cell service on site, which is a serious security and safety issue for any visitor or boater. On December 6, 2016, the Iron County Board of Supervisors met to discuss rebuilding the campground and Saxon Harbor marina. During this meeting Iron County Forestry and Parks Department representatives explained to the board the funding options from FEMA. The outcome of this meeting was for the Iron

County Forestry and Parks Department to return to with more details about the proposed restored campground site.

On May 4, 2017, the Campground Relocation Plan was presented to a group of Saxon Harbor Stakeholders, and on October 10, 2017, to the community. These presentations reviewed the construction schedule, project alternatives, and scope of work. Stakeholders brought forward concerns or suggestions to improve the design to better meet the needs of the community. A primary concern voiced was the need for more campground space in response to demand and to provide continued support for Iron County tourism.

This EA will be available to the public for review and comments for 30 days. Public notice regarding the public comment period and the availability of this document was published on April 2, 3 and 4, 2019, in the *Daily Globe*, which is the county's newspaper of record and the newspaper located closest to the project area. The same notice was published on April 4 and 11 in the *Iron County Miner*. The Draft EA was also available for review at the Iron County Forestry Department Office, 607 3rd Ave N, Suite 2 Hurley, WI 54534, from 6 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Thursday. Electronic copies for review will be available on the FEMA website under "Recent Environmental Documents & Public Notices in Region V" (<https://www.fema.gov/recent-environmental-documents-public-notice-region-v>) and on the Iron County website [www.ironcountyforrest.org](http://www.ironcountyforrest.org). A copy of the public notice is included in Appendix E. The public was given the opportunity to comment on the project from April 2 to May 20, 2019.

On April 25, 2019, the USACE expressed concerns with the project by phone call to FEMA. Concerns centered around alternatives that could reduce impacts to wetlands. Wisconsin DNR sent additional comments on the Environmental Assessment on May 20, 2019. FEMA hosted a conference call on May 24, 2019, to allow the applicant, resource agencies, and funding program to walk through all concerns. The results of the phone conference included a number of revisions to the EA as well as clarification on permitting requirements. This final EA incorporates all appropriate changes.

## **SECTION SIX: MITIGATION MEASURES AND PERMITS**

---

In accordance with the applicable local, State, and Federal regulations, the applicant would be responsible for acquiring any necessary permits prior to commencing construction at the proposed project area. During the design process for the site, other permits not referenced may need to be included. Construction activities will adhere to all permit requirements. The following permits and approvals may be required prior to construction:

1. USACE – Section 404 Wetland Disturbance Permit
2. WDNR – Individual Wetland Permit
3. WDNR – Wetland Mitigation
4. WDNR – Construction Permit
5. WDNR – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, may be required
6. WDNR – Post Construction Storm Water Permit

Iron County Forestry will follow all state and federal rules and regulations that pertain to the proposed project and will obtain all applicable permits prior to commencing work at the proposed site. If permit conditions change the scope of work for the project, changes to scope will be submitted to FEMA for additional review.

The mitigation measures listed here will be followed for the implementation of the Proposed Action:

1. Subrecipient will implement BMPs as required by permits to minimize soil erosion and storm water runoff during construction. The proposed measures include minimizing the disturbed area, maintaining vegetative cover, and providing inlet protection, silt fencing and erosion matting.
2. Subrecipient will implement measures to reduce the potential for temporary air quality impacts during the construction, including keeping fuel-burning equipment running time to a minimum, minimizing open construction areas, and watering open construction areas to control dust when necessary.
3. If hazardous materials are encountered during the construction timeline, the materials will be handled and disposed of properly in accordance with all their applicable rules and regulations.
4. Terrestrial and aquatic environments will be protected against potential impacts during construction. Native grasses and vegetation will be planted throughout disturbed areas.
5. Avoid engaging in construction activities within 660 feet of a bald or golden eagle nest during nesting and fledging.
6. To reduce any potential adverse effects on the federally threatened Northern Long Eared Bat, trees with woody stems greater than 3" diameter at breast height may not be cut between April 1 and September 30 of any year.
7. Construction activities will be limited to hours that comply with the Town of Saxon's noise ordinance. Additionally, all equipment will be kept in a good working order to minimize noise.
8. To protect the community and construction operators against risks to safety and human health, all construction activities will be performed using qualified personnel trained in the

proper use of the appropriate equipment including all appropriate safety precautions. Additionally, all activities would be conducted in a safe manner in accordance with the standards specified in the OSHA regulations.

9. Subrecipient will monitor ground disturbance and if any potential archeological resources are discovered, will immediately cease construction in that area and notify the WEM and FEMA. Subrecipient will ensure construction activities in the vicinity of the discovery are immediately halted and will take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the property until FEMA concludes consultation with the SHPO, THPOs, and other appropriate consulting parties.
10. Contractor is expected to use fill from a commercial source or regularly-maintained stockpile, or repurposing fill from areas being graded as part of the proposed alternative. If this is not the case, the subrecipient shall inform FEMA of the fill source so required agency consultations can be completed prior to beginning ground disturbing activities
11. If deviations from the proposed scope of work result in substantial design changes, including the need for additional ground disturbance, additional removal or vegetation, or in any other unanticipated changes to the physical environment, the Subrecipient must contact FEMA, and a re-evaluation under NEPA and other applicable environmental laws will be conducted by FEMA.
12. The applicant is responsible for obtaining and complying with all required local, State, and Federal permits and approvals.

## SECTION SEVEN: CONSULTATIONS AND REFERENCES

---

### 7.1 Consultations

The following agencies and interested parties were consulted during the preparation of this EA:

Bad River Band of Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians  
Federal Emergency Management Agency  
Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa  
Iron County  
Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians  
Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Indians, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe  
Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin  
Town of Saxon  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
White Earth Band of Ojibwe  
Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska  
Wisconsin Department of Administration  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources  
Wisconsin State Historic Preservation Office

### 7.2 References

- Archaeological Research Inc., 2017. Phase 1 Archaeological Investigations for Saxon Harbor and Saxon Harbor Campground Relocation. July 2017.
- Clayton, L., 1984. Pleistocene geology of the Superior Region, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Information Circular 46, 40 p.
- FEMA Flood MAP Service Center | Search By Address (FEMA Flood Map Service Center | Search By Address) <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed May 30, 2018.
- Minnesota Sea Grant [http://www.seagrant.umn.edu/fisheries/superior\\_fish\\_species](http://www.seagrant.umn.edu/fisheries/superior_fish_species). Accessed May 30, 2018.
- SmithGroupJJR, Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC, and U.P. Engineers & Architects, Inc., 2018. *Draft Saxon Harbor Marina and Campground: Schematic Design Report*. January 2018.
- Thwaites, F. T. Sandstones of Wisconsin of the Wisconsin Coast of Lake Superior, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey Bulletin No. 25, 1912.

- U.S. Census Bureau, 2010. American Fact Finder.  
[https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community\\_facts.xhtml](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml). Accessed May 30, 2018.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. Soil Survey Staff, National Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey, Wisconsin. <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed May 30, 2018.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. National Wetlands Inventory  
<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>. Accessed May 30, 2018.
- U.S. Geological Survey. U.S. Seismic Hazard Maps  
<https://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/hazmaps/conterminous/index.php#2018>. Accessed June 6, 2018.
- Wetlands & Wetlands, LLC, 2017. Wetland Delineation Report for Saxon Harbor Marina and Campground Reconstruction. October 26, 2017.
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. RR Sites Map  
<https://dnrmaps.wi.gov/H5/?viewer=rrsites>. Accessed May 30, 2018.
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Wetland Inventory Data Viewer  
<https://dnrmaps.wi.gov/H5/?Viewer=SWDV&runWorkflow=Wetland> Accessed May 30, 2018.
- Wisconsin Historical Society. Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory, Ironton Harbor, Saxon, Iron, WI, 18641.

## **SECTION EIGHT: LIST OF PREPARERS**

---

### **Preparers, Contributors, and Reviewers**

Michael Raimonde and Jill Morris, Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC  
Eric Peterson, Forest Administrator, Iron County Forestry and Parks Department  
Duane Castaldi, Regional Environmental Officer, FEMA Region V  
Maureen Cunningham, Regional Counsel, FEMA Region V  
Nicholas Dorochoff, Deputy Regional Environmental Officer, FEMA Region V  
Leah Nicol, Environmental Analysis and Review Specialist, Wisconsin DNR  
William Sande, USACE Hayward, WI Regulatory Field Office  
Amanda Ratliff, Public Assistance Branch Chief, FEMA Region V  
Jennifer Grobe, Public Assistance Specialist, FEMA Region V

## **APPENDICES**

---

**Appendix A – Maps and Figures**

**Appendix B – Photo Log**

**Appendix C – Agency Correspondence**

**Appendix D – Tribal Nation Consultation**

**Appendix E – Public Notice**

**Appendix F – Public Comments**

**Appendix G – Technical Reports**

**Appendix H – 65% Design Review Plan Set for Alternative Number 2**

**Appendix I – Campground Design with no Wetland Impacts**

For a limited time, the appendices are available on the Iron County Forestry and Parks web site. Visit <https://www.ironcountyforest.org/> and scroll down to see links to a copy of this EA and all Appendices.

To obtain a copy of this report or portions of it, please contact Duane Castaldi, Regional Environmental Officer, FEMA, 536 South Clark Street, 6th Floor, Chicago, IL 60605-1521, or at [duane.castaldi@fema.dhs.gov](mailto:duane.castaldi@fema.dhs.gov).



## Appendix A

### Maps and Figures

- Figure 1: Site Location Map**
- Figure 2: Site Layout**
- Figure 3: Pre-Storm Aerial**
- Figure 4: Post-Storm Aerial**
- Figure 5: Preliminary Alternative Action 3**
- Figure 6: Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and FEMA Conversion Letter**
- Figure 7: Wisconsin Coastal Barrier Resource Systems**
- Figure 8: WNDR Wetland Inventory Saxon Harbor**
- Figure 9: Wetland 444 – Waterways & Wetlands, Inc.**
- Figure 10: Brownfield Redevelopment and Remediation Saxon**
- Figure 11: Iron County Utilities**
- Figure 12: Future Land Use**
- Figure 13: Zoning District Map**
- Figure 14: Letter of Map Revision Support**

## **Appendix B**

### **Photo Log**

## **Appendix C**

### **Agency Correspondence**

- Attachment 1: Farmland Impact Calculation Form**
- Attachment 2: Wetland Pre-Application Meeting Minutes and Correspondence**
- Attachment 3: WDNR Endangered Resources Review**
- Attachment 4: SHPO Consultation**
- Attachment 5: Coastal Zone Management Consultation**
- Attachment 6: Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation**

**Attachment 1**  
**Farmland Impact Calculation Form**

**Attachment 2**  
**Wetland Pre-Application Meeting Minutes and Correspondence**

**Attachment 3**  
**WDNR Endangered Resources Review**

**Attachment 4**  
**SHPO Consultation**

**Attachment 5**  
**Coastal Zone Management Consultation**



**Attachment 6**  
**Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation**

## **Appendix D**

### **Tribal Nation Consultation**

**Attachment 1: Tribal Notification Letters**

**Attachment 2: Responses**

**Attachment 1**  
**Tribal Notification Letters**

**Attachment 2**  
**Responses**

## **Appendix E**

### **Public Notice**

- Attachment 1: Newspaper Articles and Notices**
- Attachment 2: Meeting Minutes, December 6, 2016**
- Attachment 3: Public Meeting and Presentation, October 10, 2017**
- Attachment 4: Stakeholder Meeting Minutes, May 4, 2017**
- Attachment 5: FEMA Public Notice**

**Attachment 1**  
**Newspaper Articles and Notices**

**Attachment 2**  
**Meeting Minutes, December 6, 2016**

**Attachment 3**  
**Public Meeting and Presentation, October 10, 2017**



**Attachment 4**  
**Stakeholder Meeting Minutes, May 4, 2017**

**Attachment 5**  
**FEMA Public Notice**

**Appendix F**  
**Public Comments**

**Attachment 1: Redevelopment Survey Summary**

**Attachment 1**  
**Redevelopment Survey Summary**

## **Appendix G**

### **Technical Reports**

- Attachment 1: Saxon Schematic Design Report**
- Attachment 2: Custom Soil Resource Report**
- Attachment 3: Wetland Delineation Report**
- Attachment 4: Wetland Rapid Assessment Report**
- Attachment 5: Tree Survey Project**
- Attachment 6: USFWS Species by County**
- Attachment 7: WDNR NIH Report Summary**
- Attachment 8: Archaeology Report Saxon Harbor**

**Attachment 1**  
**Saxon Schematic Design Report**

**Attachment 2**  
**Custom Soil Resource Report**

**Attachment 3**  
**Wetland Delineation Report**



**Attachment 4**  
**Wetland Rapid Assessment Report**

**Attachment 5**  
**Tree Survey Project**

**Attachment 6**  
**USFWS Species by County**

**Attachment 7**  
**WDNR NIH Report Summary**

**Attachment 8**  
**Archaeology Report Saxon Harbor**

## **Appendix H**

### **65% Design Review Plan Set for Alternative Number 2**

**Appendix I**  
**Campground Design with no Wetland Impacts**