

Responses to Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Comments on the Green Lake Economic Analyses Report by Stantec Consulting Services (October 25, 2025).

WDNR comments ordered numerically with Stantec responses in italics.

1. The report appropriately distinguishes between lake effects and population effects, but this distinction is not always clear particularly in Sections 2.2.1–2.2.3 and the interpretation of Tables 2–4. My suggestions will be to add a short paragraph upfront explicitly defining lake effects and population effect and explicitly state that population effects define the counterfactual baseline, and lake effects are applied only to this adjusted baseline. This clarification reduces confusion and concerns about double counting.

Added language to clarify the distinction between effect types to the opening paragraph of section 2.3 prior to presenting results for ease of interpretation.

2. The population-effect methodology sounds good but need to assert that it is based on stronger assumptions. I suggest to include the assumptions required such as proportionality (population driven economic activity scales linearly with housing density); household homogeneity (per-capita consumption patterns do not differ systematically between lake-adjacent and non-lake households within the same sub-industry), exogeneity (housing density near the lake is primarily a consequence of lake amenity value rather than unrelated historical or zoning factors), and no spatial spillovers. I suggest adding a sentence that violating these assumptions will likely bias estimates upward.

Added language/bullet points to the end of section 2.2.2 to address concerns about assumptions behind population effects being stated clearly.

3. Extension to Ripon: Although the approach is appropriate and defensible, I suggest to state clearly that these estimates are not statistically representative and intended for contribution accounting for not the casual inference.

Added some language to the last sentence in section 2.2.3 to clarify that the Ripon survey results were used as anecdotal evidence for economic contribution accounting rather than a statistical significance.

4. Tables 2-4 estimates/numbers are hard to understand particularly how the lake effects and population effects interact numerically. It will be good to identify which tables reflect population adjusted baselines, lake-attributable contributions, unadjusted economic totals.

Added a footnote to Table 4-2 clarifying the relative proportion of population/lake effects presented in the contribution table.

5. Impact Analysis: It will be good to show the inputs (number) fed into the IMPLAN, how much were allocated across relevant industries and the sectors modeled.

Added Table 2-5 to section 2.4.5 to display the inputs run through IMPLAN to arrive at the results. Because there are 2 scenarios with ranges of direct impacts (positive/negative with high/low end for each), we present percentage allocations to industry codes used for IMPLAN modeling.