Cou	nty _	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	_ Des. No.	1600913	
	C	ATEGORICAL EXCI	LUSION /	na Environmental Do ENVIRONME PROJECT INFORMA	NTAL ASSESS	MENT FORM	
	Roa	d No./County:	State Road	l (SR) 2 at Heavilin	n Road, Porter Cour	nty	
	Desi	gnation Number:	1600913		-		
		ect Description/Termini:	SR 2 at Heavilin Road, Intersection Improvement  Project termini measured from center of existing intersection:  Northern Terminus: approximately 200-ft north (no northern leg, but SR 2 alignment will be shifted northward within project area)  Southern Terminus (Heavilin Rd): approximately 400-ft south  Eastern Terminus (SR 2): approximately 710-ft east  Western Terminus (SR 2): approximately 720-ft west				
		completing this form, I conclude the complexity of the complexity (CE):	hat this project o	qualifies for the following	ig type of Categorical Exc	lusion (FHWA must	
		Categorical Exclusion, Le Level 2 - table 1, CE Level					
		Categorical Exclusion, Le Level 3 - table 1, CE Level					
	x	Categorical Exclusion, Le Level 4 - table 1, CE Level				rical Exclusion Manual	
		Environmental Assessmen is necessary to determine the					
•		For documents prepared by or for Envi to release for public involvement or si		s Division, it is not necessa	ary for the ESM of the distric	t in which the project is	
9	Appr	ESM Signature	Date	ES Signati	ıre	Date	
		FHV	VA Signature		Date		
	Releas	se for Public Involvement		RE	B 4-1	17-19	
-	ESM I	nitials Dat	te	ES Initials	Date		
	Certif	ication of Public Involvement		ublic Involvement	Date		
		Do not approve until after Section I ES/District Env.	06 public invol	vement and all other en	vironmental requirements	have been satisfied.	
		er Signature:   nd Organization of CE/EA Preparer:	C.J. Cunninghan		Date:		
This	s is pag	e 1 of 32 Project name:	State Road 2 a	t Heavilin Road, Interse	ction Improvement D	Date: April 15, 2019	

		mulana bepa	itinent of Transp	, O, tuti O1,	•
County	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913
		<u>Part I - PU</u>	BLIC INVOLVE	<u>MENT</u>	
Every Feder project devel	al action requires some lopment process. The le	e level of public involver	vement, providing for ex nent should be comme	arly and continuous o	pportunities throughout the
If N	es the project have a his o, then: Opportunity for a Public H		under the Historic Bridg	Yes es PA*?	No x
*A public hea FHWA, SHP	aring is required for all h O, and the ACHP.	istòric bridges process	ed under the Historic B	ridges Programmatic A	Agreement between INDOT
Discuss wha meetings, sp Remarks:	ecial purpose meetings,  Notice of Entry for Sur 6, 2017 and October 9, 2 project and notifying the analysis. An example of Section 106 Consulting To meet the public invol of "Adverse Effect", an public comment period of publication appear in Ap  Public Hearing The proposed project wi (INDOT) Public Involves	newspaper articles, elevey or Investigation - No. 2017 to property owners of these letters is located in the located and are advertised in the closed 31 days later on Sopendix D-77. No community meet the minimum request a public hearing. Hocument for public invo	letters to affected proper, have occurred for this lotice of Entry for Survey ocated in the vicinity of the may be entering their proper Appendix G-1 and G-2.  Section 106, the Federal Have Times of Northwest Indicates were received from the later of t	s project.  or Investigation letters we project area to inform to perty to gather data for ensighway Administration's ana (NWI Times) on Aug tof the public notice and the public.  current Indiana Department of the public and public	them of the proposed avironmental search (FHWA's) finding gust 3, 2018. The search the affidavit of the affi
Public Con Will the proj	troversy on Environme ect involve substantial c	ental Grounds ontroversy concerning	community and/or natur	al resource impacts?	Yes No
Remarks:	Some public controvers concerning this project safety they provide.	sy is known to exist regai is not yet known. The op	ding roundabouts along sta portunity is needed to edu	ate routes. The level of concate the public about rou	ontroversy indabouts and the
•					•
					•

County _	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913
<u>Part l</u>	<u>II - General Pr</u>	oject Identific	ation, Descri	otion, and Desi	gn Information
Sponsor of th	ne Project:	Indiana Department of	Transportation	INDOT Distri	ct: <u>LaPorte</u>
Local Name	of the Facility:	Intersection of SR 2 and	Heavilin Road	.,	
Funding Sou	rce (mark all that apply	): Federal x	State x Local	Other*	
*If other is se	lected, please identify t	the funding source:	N/A		
PURPOSE .	AND NEED:				
	ransportation problem to (Refer to the CE Manu			he traffic problem should	NOT be discussed
Need: The need for th	ne project stems from the	intersection's inability to	o safely and efficiently h	andle current and projected entary School south of the in	
through the pro 2018, and 53 Meastbound cars westbound rear	oject area is 45 miles per l MPH in September 2015. running off the road east	hour (MPH). The 85th p Of the 25 accidents occ of Heavilin Road where er, five injury accidents (	percentile speeds on SR 2 curring near the intersecti SR 2 curves northward.	e speed reduction. The speed reaction. The speed reaction Rd were 5 ton since 2010, nine of them Eight of the accidents (32% acluding three involving inc	1 MPH in June 1 (36%) involved %) involved SR 2
for southwest \ to I-23) prepare	Valparaiso as this area dev ed in 2015 to evaluate the	velops into a dense urbar anticipated traffic impac	n community. According ets associated with the so	new school is intended to ser g to a Traffic Impact Study ( chool, 580 additional daily t SR 2 at Heavilin intersection	(TIS) (Appendix I-6 wo-way vehicle
volumes. It wa hours. LOS and performance me	as determined the growth alyzes roadways and inte	in traffic would decrease rsections by categorizing l, density, congestion, et sciated to each level of se	the intersection's Level traffic flow and assigni c. LOS assigns grades A	applying growth rates to cu of Service (LOS) during th ng quality levels of traffic b A through F, with A being th	e AM and PM peak ased on
٠	<ul> <li>LOS B – reasonable</li> <li>LOS C – stable flow</li> </ul>	free flow			,
•	<ul> <li>LOS D – approachin</li> </ul>	g unstable flow	•		
•	<ul> <li>LOS E – unstable flo</li> <li>LOS F – breakdown</li> </ul>	ow, operating at capacity in flow or gridlock.			
ifternoon, Witl norning and a I	h the school traffic added	, the TIS determined the Inder the forecasted traff	intersection of SR 2 and fic volumes for Horizon	OS C in the morning and a Heavilin Road to function Year 2036, the intersection k period.	at a LOS C in the
olumes. How	ever, the rate of crashes is in traffic during which to	expected to increase as	traffic density increases,	increase along with higher thereby reducing the numb rther demonstrate the need t	er and size of
				peed along the SR 2 corrido h in the construction year at	

State Road 2 at Heavilin Road, Intersection Improvement Date: April 15, 2019

This is page 3 of 32 Project name:

County Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No. 1600913
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ON (PREFERRED ALTERN	NATIVE):	7
County: Porter	Municip	****	it is a second Hospilin
Limits of Proposed Work:	Northern Project limit be shifted northward v SR 2 western leg – ap SR 2 eastern leg – app	t – approximately 200-ft north (	intersection
Total Work Length:	0.27 Mile(s)	Total Work Area:	5.1 Acre(s)
ls an Interchange Modifica If yes, when did the FHWA	tion Study / Interchange Justifi grant a conditional approval fo	cation Study (IMS/IJS) requir or this project?	ed? Yes¹ No Date: N/A
f an IMS or IJS is required; pproval of the IMS/IJS.	a copy of the approved CE/EA	A document must be submitte	ed to the FHWA with a request for fina
nprove safety or roadway of Existing Conditions: This project is located in Centro Road (SR) 2 and Heavilin Rowest) runs north-south, terming the being under stop control. See SR 2 is listed as a minor arter, speed limit on SR 2 is 45 mpt 2-ft. paved shoulders. Heaviling way along SR 2 is 60-ft. wide recording errors, INDOT does acquired from the adjacent processed adjacent the intersection County Highway Department located immediately southwest	ter Township, Valparaiso, Porter (ad. SR 2 runs in the east-west throating on the south side of SR 2. Appendices B-1 through B-6 for pial on INDOT's functional classifit, and the posted speed on Heavili in Road is also two lanes with 10-t, while the existing apparent right is not possess clear title of the right operty owners as part of the proposition (coutside the existing right-of-way is immediately southeast of the intersection. Also nearby	County, Indiana and involves in ough the intersection. Heavilin The existing intersection is a T-project area maps, project illust ication map and Heavilin Road in Road is 30 mph. SR 2 is a twoff. travel lanes and no roadway e-of-way along Heavilin Road is t-of-way surrounding the project improvements.  by is used primarily by the Portentersection. The now-demolisher is the Porter County Emergen	provement to the intersection of State Road (also identified as County Road 50 intersection with only Heavilin Road rations, and project area photographs. is listed as a local road. The posted o-lane road with 12-ft. travel lanes and shoulders. Existing apparent right-of-40-ft. wide. However, due to property at limits, these areas will need to be re-  ar County government. The Porter and Porter County humane society was by Management Center, located immediately north of the intersection.

This is page 4 of 32 Project name:

						-
County	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913	

The project scope has been narrowed from what was introduced in the initial early coordination. The previously considered project scope elements are described in the "Other Alternatives Considered" section. The reduction in project scope and impacts did not warrant re-coordination with regulatory agencies.

All improved roadway surfaces – along SR 2, along Heavilin Road, and within the roundabout – will be surrounded by concrete curb and gutter, which will drain into a new storm sewer system. The storm sewer system will drain stormwater generally from northwest to southeast where it will be collected into a proposed detention basin immediately southeast of the proposed roundabout (Appendix B-26). The basin will then empty eastward into the existing stormwater drainage network. 26)

Lighting improvements will also be included, with the addition of approximately eleven light fixtures located along the roundabout approaches. All driveway aprons adjacent to the improved roadway will be reconstructed within the limits of the proposed construction limits.

The majority of the project's excavation will involve preparation of the roadway subgrade and installation of proposed storm sewers, which will require excavation to an approximate maximum depth of 8 to 10 feet.

The maintenance of traffic (MOT) will be phased and will not require a complete intersection closure. The roundabout and its immediate SR 2 approaches will be constructed while SR 2 and Heavilin Road remain open to traffic. Once the roundabout and SR 2 approaches are constructed, SR 2 traffic will be shifted through the roundabout, and Heavilin Road will be closed while its roundabout approach is constructed. A detour for Heavilin Road will involve Division Road to the south and CR 100 W to the west. Refer to the MOT section in this document for more details concerning the construction phasing and detours.

The roundabout design offers many safety advantages, while also improving the efficiency of the intersection in the construction year and horizon year. Roundabouts offer an immediate reduction in speed as vehicles must slow to approximately 20 MPH to maneuver the intersection. Roundabouts have also been shown to reduce the number of overall collisions, while significantly reducing the rate of injury and fatality crashes. This is a result of the lower speed at which vehicles traverse the intersection and the angles at which vehicles interact, eliminating the possibility for T-bone or head-on collisions.

A roundabout at SR 2 at Heavilin Road would also improve the construction year AM Peak operational efficiency from LOS C to LOS A, while improving the PM peak from LOS D to LOS A. Under the forecasted traffic volumes for Horizon Year 2036, the intersection is expected to improve from LOS E (existing configuration) to LOS A during the AM peak, and from LOS F to LOS A during the PM peak.

The preferred alternative meets the project's purpose and need by introducing intersection geometry that reduces speeds along the SR 2 corridor and provides safer intersection geometry with fewer conflict points and fewer opportunities for vehicle collisions. These factors will help to improve intersection safety. The roundabout will also improve the intersection's operational efficiency for the construction year and horizon year traffic.

See Appendices B-1 through B-6 for project illustrations and project area photographs. Refer to Appendices B-7 through B-33 for the preliminary construction plans, Appendix B-13 for an exhibit illustrating the areas of anticipated right-of-way acquisition.

# OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Describe all discarded alternatives, including the Do-Nothing Alternative and an explanation of why each discarded alternative was not selected.

The following alternatives were considered:

- Signalized Intersection: Signalized intersection improvements were considered for the project, but it would not have
  adequately addressed the project's purpose and need of increasing the operational safety of the intersection. A signalized
  intersection would permit high-speed crashes. Moreover, a signalized intersection is not warranted at this intersection as
  determined by the 2015 Traffic Impact Study prepared in conjunction with Heavilin Elementary School (Refer to section 7.3
  of the TIS in Appendix I-19). Therefore, this alternative does not meet the purpose and need. No further consideration will be
  given to a signalized intersection alternative.
- 2. Passing Blisters: Adding a passing blister for westbound through traffic on SR 2 was considered for the project, but it would not have adequately addressed the project's purpose and need of increasing the operational safety nor the operational efficiency of the of the intersection. A passing blister would permit high-speed crashes and high number of vehicular conflict points would remain. Additionally, the primary breakdown in the operational efficiency of the existing intersection configuration involves northbound left-turning vehicles from Heavilin Road onto SR 2. Free flow traffic on SR 2 does not

This is page 5 of 32 Project name: State Road 2 at Heavilin Road, Intersection Improvement Date: April 15, 2019

		11.	ididila Dop	a,, o,				
County	Porter		Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913		
•	alternative would not	correct that br	eakdown. An an emain at LOS 'C	the peak hour, causing a batalysis of the traffic association in the construction year at and need. No further construction	ited to a passing blister re and decrease to LOS 'E' i	n the horizon year.		
3.	3. Roundabout with a 4th (northern) leg: Consideration was given to a roundabout that would include the realignment of the nearby Danvers Parkway to connect the north side of the roundabout. This alternative would remove the existing intersection of Danvers Parkway and SR 2, which occurs approximately 700 feet west of the intersection. The benefits of such an alternative do not outweigh the added costs and project impacts. Additional project impacts would include conversion of county-owned property to right-of-way and loss of terrestrial habitat by way of additional tree clearing. (See early coordination aerial graphic in Appendix B-3, which represents the consideration of this alternative). This alternative would meet the project's purpose and need. However, because of economic considerations and right-of-way and ecological impacts, no further consideration will be given to a roundabout with a 4th (northern) leg.							
4.	4. Pedestrian Connection to Heavilin Elementary School: A pedestrian connection along the west side of Heavilin Road between the roundabout and Heavilin Elementary School, to be funded by Valparaiso Community Schools (VCS), was once considered as part of the project. To support this pedestrian linkage, other pedestrian improvements would have been included near the roundabout and along SR 2. A High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk beacon (also known as a HAWK beacon) was considered. Such a system would stop SR 2 traffic and allow pedestrians to cross safely. VCS expressed their desire to no longer pursue the pedestrian route along Heavilin Road. Therefore, this alternative was removed from further consideration.							
5.	The state of the managed project Housever the "Dow							
Sect impa	ion 106 consulting nort	ies (discussed would not mee	further in Section	t be avoided, mitigation for on C). The "Do-Nothing" a eed. All other alternatives v	iternative is the only after	manye mar does not		
It would it It would it It would it	not correct existing c not correct existing s not correct the existin not correct existing d result in serious impa	apacity defic afety hazard ng roadway g eteriorated c	iencies; s; eometric defici onditions and r	r practicable because ( encies; naintenance problems; ond general welfare of the	or .	X X		
ROADV	VAY CHARACTER	) r		·				
Current / Design F	al Classification:	Minor Art 11,595 1,448 45	erial VPD (20 Truck Perce Legal Speed	entage (%)3,3%	DT: 14,477 \	/PD (2040)		
Number Type of I Pavemer Shoulder Median V Sidewalk	nt Width: r Width: Width:	Existing  2 Vehicular – 12 2 N/A N/A		Proposed  2  Vehicular - 1 NB,  12  12  5,  7,  Varies  N/A  ft.	l SB	· · · · · ·		

	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913
Setting:		Urban x Sub			
Topography	<i>,</i> .	x Level Rol	ourban Rural ling Hilly		
		<u> </u>	ang [ ] miy		
Heavilin Roa					
	Classification:	Local Road			
Current AD	l∶ r Volume (DHV):	971 VPD (20			PD (2040)
Designed Sp		110 Truck Perce 35 mph Legal Spee			•
	poda (mpm.		20 mpn	•	
i 2		Existing	Proposed		
Number of L	.anes:	2	2		
Type of Lan		Vehicular – 1 NB, 1 SB	Vehicular - 1 NB, 1 SB		
Pavement V		10 ft.	11 ft.		
Shoulder Wi Median Widt		N/A ft.	2.5 ft. Varies ft.		
Sidewalk Wi		N/A ft.	N/A ft,		
	_		10/11		
Setting:	_	····	urban Rural		
Topography:	. [	x Level Roll	ing Hilly	•	
If the propose	d action has mul	tinle readways this section	should be filled out for each ro	odway	
ii iiio proposo	a dollori mas mar	upic roddwdys, tins section i	snould be filled out for each for	auway.	
		•			
<b>DESIGN CR</b>	ITERIA FOR B	RIDGES:			
			,		
•					
Structure/NB	I Number(s):	N/A	Sufficiency Rating:	N/A	
Structure/NB	·I Number(s):				e of Information)
		Existing	Proposed		e of Information)
Bridge Type:		Existing N/A	Proposed N/A		e of Information)
	pans:	Existing N/A N/A	Proposed		e of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restr Height Restri	pans: ictions: ctions:	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ton ft.	Proposed N/A N/A		e of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restr Height Restri Curb to Curb	pans: ictions: ctions: Width:	Existing   N/A   N/A   ton   ft.   N/A   ft.	N/A   ton   N/A   N/A   ft.   N/A   ft.		e of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to O	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width:	Existing   N/A   N/A   ton   ft.   N/A   N/A	Proposed   N/A   N/A   N/A   ton   N/A   ft.   N/A   N/A		e of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Ou Shoulder Wid	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith:	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ton  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  ft.	Proposed    N/A   N/A     N/A   ton     N/A   ft.     N/A   ft.     N/A   ft.     N/A   ft.     N/A   ft.		e of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to O	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith:	Existing   N/A   N/A   ton   ft.   N/A   N/A	Proposed   N/A   N/A   N/A   ton   N/A   ft.   N/A   N/A		e of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Outside Wicker Wicker Length of Chi	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work:	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A	N/A	(Rating, Source	
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Ou Shoulder Wid Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and str s: No bridges	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  ft.  cuctures; provide specific locator small structures are located.	N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   ft.   N/A   N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating), Source (Rating	ed. The
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Outside Wicker Wicker Length of Chi	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stress: No bridges proposed in	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft	Proposed  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  sation information for small structed within this project area, and ew storm sewer to collect and	(Rating, Source lettures.  In the control of the co	ed. The
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Outside Wicker Wicker Length of Chi	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and str s: No bridges proposed in basin, and t	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft	N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   N/A   ft.   N/A   N/A	(Rating, Source lettures.  In the control of the co	ed. The
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Outside Wicker Wicker Length of Chi	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stress: No bridges proposed in	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft.  ft	Proposed  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  sation information for small structed within this project area, and ew storm sewer to collect and	(Rating, Source lettures.  In the control of the co	ed. The
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  or small structures are located approvement will include a new the into Salt Creek. The project in the into Salt Creek.	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source lettures.  In the control of the co	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Source))  Ictures. Inone are proposed divert stormwater and include any of the control	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Source))  Ictures. Inone are proposed divert stormwater and include any of the control	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Source))  Ictures. Inone are proposed divert stormwater and include any of the control	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Source))  Ictures. Inone are proposed divert stormwater and include any of the control	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Source))  Ictures. Inone are proposed divert stormwater and include any of the control	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Source))  Ictures. Inone are proposed divert stormwater and include any of the control	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small
Bridge Type: Number of S Weight Restri Height Restri Curb to Curb Outside to Or Shoulder Wic Length of Ch	pans: ictions: ctions: Width: utside Width: ith: annel Work: e bridges and stricts: No bridges proposed in basin, and t structures.	Existing  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  N/A  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  ton  ft.  ft.  n/A  ft.  Tuctures; provide specific loc  or small structures are locat approvement will include a n the into Salt Creek. The pro-  tted or replaced as part of the	Proposed    N/A	(Rating, Source (Rating, Sourc	ed. The to a proposed culverts or small

This is page 7 of 32 Project name:

		Indian	ia Departi	nent of Tra	nsportauc	on,		
County	Porter		Route S	R 2 & Heavilin	-	Des. No.	1600913	···
MAINTEN	NANCE OF TRA	FFIC (MOT) DUR	ING CONST	TRUCTION:			•	
Is a tempor Will the pro Provision Provision Will the pro	ons will be made for swill be made for swill be made to be posed MOT subs		affic and so po bendent busing local special environments	osted. lesses, events or festival consequence	als. s of the action		Yes  x x x	No x x x
Remarks:	single 10-ft lane westbound (north up until defined temporary paven SR 2.	of traffic (MOT) will in each direction) and ternmost) travel lane venstruction limits for tent will be done beside	Heavilin Road will be construct the phase, the le the westbour	will remain open sted completely, curb line for the ad lane. This is d	n. During the fir a portion of the eastbound will to one so that traff	st phase of con eastbound lane be completed, a ic is continuous	struction, the will be constru- nd construction sly maintained o	cted of on
	Heavilin Road, I will be closed du involve Division miles.	e of the project construction of the second phase will in this phase and a discount to the south and	involve traffic letour will be u CR 100 W to	being maintained sed to access He the west. The ad	on SR 2. The e avilin Road. A ded travel distar	ntry onto Heav detour for Hea nce associated t	ilin Road from a vilin Road will to this detour is	2.6
	and temporary pa	f the project construct vement will be taken o	out. Traffic wil	I be maintained of	on both SR 2 an	d Heavilin Roa	d,	R 2
	The closures/lane emergency servic completion. Coo	tour plans are available restrictions will pose es); however, no signirdination with Valpara brough the duration of	a temporary in ficant delays a iiso Communit	convenience to t re anticipated, an y Schools has oc	aveling motoris d all inconvenie	sts (including so ences will cease	chool buses and upon project	
	construction, and completion. A co send on March 20 Center, and they County Emergend during construction	that no delays are assonded that no delays are assondination letter specification (Appendix C-4 were invited to provide by Service Center respondences is not on the emergency response version to ensure access is not on the content of the content	ociated with the fic to potential.  7) in which the comment on it conded on Marchailmained. Conditional control of the conded on Marchaintained.	e proposed impro impacts upon the project details vissues related to it is 27, 2019 (Appoordination will of	vements – both e Porter County vere conveyed to ngress and egre endix C-49) offi- continue prior to	during constru Emergency Se o the Emergenc ss during const ering to coording final approval	ction and upon rvice Center was by Management ruction. Porter nate before and of this documen	as
	The project spons construction. Del	or will be responsible ays may occur during	for contacting construction b	school districts a ut will cease with	nd emergency s project comple	ervices at least etion.	2 weeks prior to	<b>o</b>
ESTIMATE	ED PROJECT C	OST AND SCHE	DULE:					
Engineering *Note: dates	3: \$ 233,000 referenced above a	(2018-2019) Rigre as they appear in T	ght-of-Way: <i>IP/STIP</i> . <i>IND</i>	\$ 30,000 OT will revise the	<del></del>	Construction: If an Administra		(2019 on.
Anticipated :	Start Date of Con	struction: <u>Spr</u>	ing 2020					
						•		

This is page 8 of 32 Project name:

County Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913	
Date project incorporated into STIP	July 3, 2017 - 2018-2	2021 STIP (Appendix H-3	)		
Is the project in an MPO Area? X					
If yes,					
Name of MPO Northwestern Indian	a Regional Planning	Commission (NIRPC)			
Location of Project in TIP 2018-2021	NIRPC TIP (Append	dix H-1 to H-2).			
Date of incorporation by reference into	the STIP <u>July :</u>	3, 2017.		•	
		•			
DICHT OF WAY				i,	

	`Amount	(acres)
Land Use Impacts	Permanent	Temporary
Residential .	0.0	0.0
Commercial	0.0	0.0
Agricultural	0.0	0.0
Forest `	0.0	0.0
Wetlands	0.0	0.0
Other: (New acquisition of county-owned property)	2.46	0.25
Other: (Reacquisition of apparent existing right-of-way lacking clear title)	2.66	0.0
TOTAL	5.12	0.25

Describe both Permanent and Temporary right-of-way and describe their current use. Typical and Maximum right-of-way widths (existing and proposed) should also be discussed. Any advance acquisition or reacquisition, either known or suspected, and there impacts on the environmental analysis should be discussed.

# Remarks:

The project requires acquisition of approximately 5.12 acres of right-of-way. The existing apparent right-of-way along SR 2 is 60-ft. wide, while the existing apparent right-of-way along Heavilin Road is 40-ft. wide. However, due to property recording errors, INDOT does not possess clear title of the right-of-way surrounding the project limits. A total of 2.66 acres of existing apparent right-of-way must be reacquired from the adjacent property owners as part of the proposed improvements. In addition, the project also requires approximately 2.46 acres of new permanent right-of-way.

All of the 2.46 acres of new permanent right-of-way will be acquired from parcels owned by the Porter County Government. Approximately 1.91 acres will be acquired from north of SR 2 to accommodate the majority of the roundabout footprint, 0.25 acre are required from the southwest quadrant of the intersection to accommodate roadway grading and drainage improvements extending up to 15 feet south of SR 2 and 30 feet west of Heavilin Road. 0.30 acre are required from the southeast quadrant to accommodate roadway grading and drainage improvements, which will include a stormwater detention basin in this area. Proposed right-of-way in this area will extend up to 80 feet south of SR 2 and up to 15 feet east of Heavilin Road. The project also requires approximately 0.25 acre of temporary right-of-way necessary for incidental grading work outside of the areas required for permanent right-of-way. The incidental grading work will ensure proper clear zones are established outside of the roadway edge and proper grading tie-ins are permitted.

Refer to Appendices B-7 through B-33 for the preliminary construction plans, Appendix B-13 for an exhibit illustrating the areas of anticipated right-of-way acquisition.

If the scope of work or permanent or temporary right-of-way amounts change, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately.

State Road 2 at Heavilin Road, Intersection Improvement	Date:	April 15, 2019

		· ·		
County Porter	Route SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913	

# <u>Part III – Identification and Evaluation of Impacts of the Proposed</u> <u>Action</u>

<u> </u>	<u> </u>	•	
SECTION	A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES		•
		Presence	Impacts
	,	,	Yes No
Federal Wil State Natur Nationwide	Rivers, Watercourses & Jurisdictional Ditches Id and Scenic Rivers Id, Scenic or Recreational Rivers Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed Ig Rivers List for Indiana Waterways	X .	x
Remarks:	Based on a desktop review, a site visit on August 23, 2017 by Cardno B-3), and the water resources map in the Red Flag Investigation (RFI located within the 0.5 mile search radius. Seven streams were identificated within the 0.5 mile search radius. Seven streams were identificated within the outlet project area.  A Regulated Waters Delineation Report was completed by Cardno In approved by INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office (EWFI for the Regulated Waters Delineation Report. It was determined the waters investigation survey area. The US Army Corps of Engineers (jurisdiction. Salt Creek is located in the far eastern portion of the surinvolves the installation of the outlet structure associated to a propose located approximately 20-ft. west of the Salt Creek Ordinary High WOHWM are anticipated. Silt fence or other appropriate erosion control Team, will be installed to separate the ground-disturbing construction firm project commitment. No indirect impacts to Salt Creek are antic will be designed to ensure that runoff from post-development 100-year a rate equal to runoff from a pre-development 10-year storm event. To outlets into Salt Creek. No impacts to jurisdictional streams or ditche Salt Creek is listed by the Indiana Department of Environmental Man work will take place within the waterway and there no impacts are an Creek should take care to wear appropriate personal protective equipar regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure.  Early Coordination letters were sent to environmental resource agenci response dated February 5, 2018 (Appendix C-14) the Unites States Fmention of potential impacts to streams or rivers.  Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR DFW) responded to	c) report (Appendix fied within 0.5 miles of area and Salt Crace. For the project of PO) on January 2, 2 at one jurisdictions (USACE) makes all vey area. The world detention basin, after Mark (OHWM of measures, as det activities from the cipated. The proposar storm event is refer are expected.  agement (IDEM) a ticipated. However ment, observe proposes on January 16, 2 is and Wildlife Saltin and Wildlife Saltin in the control of the saltin in the cipated.	is E-9), there are two streams is of project area. Block Ditch reck flows beneath SR 2,  In November 6, 2017 and 2018. Please refer to Appendix Fall stream is located within the ill final determinations regarding it is cocurring nearest Salt Creek. The outlet structure will be in the outlet structure will be in the ermined by INDOT Stormwater is Salt Creek OHWM. This is a sed stormwater collection system cleased from the outlet structure at the outlet struct
	(Appendix C-18) and mentioned potential impacts to Block Ditch, sor been the result of modifying the structure that carries Heavilin Road of	ith of the intersect	ion. Those impacts would have

and botanical resources. The recommendations within their letter were only for consideration. They may only become mandatory if the construction were to take place within a jurisdictional floodway.

Coordination with IDEM occurred by way of an auto-generated response letter in which IDEM provided a list of

proposed pedestrian improvements. Modifications to this structure are no longer necessary since the pedestrian improvements have been eliminated from the scope and the project terminates north of Block Ditch. IDNR provided additional recommendations that should be considered to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife,

considerations aimed at minimizing environmental impacts and ensuring compliance with relevant state laws.

All applicable USFWS, IDNR DFW, and IDEM recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

County	Porter	Ro	ute _	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913
Other Surf Reservoirs Lakes Farm Pond Detention E	Based on a desktop r (Appendix B-3), and located within the 0.	eview, a site visit on a the water resources n 5 mile search radius.	August 17 nap in the The neare	Presence  , 2018 by the Troyer Group RFI report (Appendix E-9) est other surface water is a presence of the surface water	yes No	e project area surface waters e east of the project
	The proposed improvements include the installation of a new detention basin immediately southeast of the proposed roundabout where stormwater will be collected. The storm sewer system will drain stormwater, generally from northwest to southeast into this proposed detention basin. The basin will then empty eastward into the existing stormwater drainage network. See Appendix B-26 for a plan sheet illustrating the proposed detention basin.  A Regulated Waters Delineation Report was completed for the project by Cardno on November 6, 2017 and approved by INDOT EWPO on January 2, 2018. Please refer to Appendix F-1 for the Regulated Waters Delineation Report. It was determined that no other surface waters besides streams and wetlands are present in the project area. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.  Early coordination letters were sent to environmental resource agencies on January 16, 2018. In their response dated February 5, 2018 (Appendix C-14) the USFWS made no mention of potential impacts to other surface waters.  IDNR DFW responded to early coordination on February 15, 2018 (Appendix C-18) and recommended contacting and coordinating with the IDEM 401 program and the USACE 404 program regarding potential wetland impacts. IDNR provided additional recommendations that should be considered to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources. The recommendations within their letter were only for consideration. They may only become mandatory if the construction were to take place within a jurisdictional floodway. All applicable USFWS and IDNR DFW recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.					
Wetlands  Total wetla		acre(s) made for non-isolate		Presence  x  etland area impacted: ed wetlands, fill in the total	Impact Yes  acre(see all wetland area impact)	No x
Wetland N	o. Classification		acted res	Comments		
1	Palustrine Emergent (PEM)	0.05	/A	Wetland 1 is located near north of SR 2. 0.05 acre and the wetland extends limit is approximately 45 limits, therefore no impa	of were surveyed in t further north. The wet -ft north of the propo	he investigation area land's southern

This is page 11 of 32 Project name: State Road 2 at Heavilin Road, Intersection Improvement Date: April 15, 2019

County Porter	Route SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No1600913
	<u>Documentation</u>	ES Approval Dates
Wetlands (Mark all that apply)	·	
Wetland Determination Wetland Delineation USACE Isolated Waters Determination Mitigation Plan	X	1/2/18
Improvements that will not result in any would result in (Mark all that apply and explanations Substantial adverse impacts to adjacent Substantially increased project costs; Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance Substantial adverse social, economic, or The project not meeting the identified near	ain): homes, business or other improved pro , or safety problems; environmental impacts, or	·

Measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate wetland impacts need to be discussed in the remarks box.

Remarks:

Based on a review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) online mapper (https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html) (Appendix F-36) and the water resources map in the RFI report (Appendix E-9), there are 27 wetland polygons located within the 0.5 mile search radius. The NWI wetland nearest the currently scoped project elements is located 0.04 miles north of SR 2 near the eastern limits of the project.

A site visit was conducted on August 23, 2017 by Cardno and one wetland was identified during their investigation of regulated waters resources. A Regulated Waters Delineation Report was completed for the project on November 6, 2017 and approved by INDOT EWPO on January 2, 2018. Please refer to Appendix F-1 for the Regulated Waters Delineation Report. It was determined that one wetland habitat is present near the project area. Identified as Wetland 1 (0.05 acre within the surveyed area), the wetland consists of a concave topographic relief with Palustrine Emergent (PEM) wetland habitat adjacent to existing road infrastructure. Invasive and aggressive species are dominant species present within the surveyed portion of the wetland. Wetland 1 is likely a jurisdictional resource under the Chicago District of USACE. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

Wetland 1 is located near the far eastern end of the project area, north of SR 2. 0.05 acre of it were surveyed in the investigation area, but the wetland extends further north. The wetland's southern limit is approximately 45-ft north of the proposed construction limits. Therefore, no impacts to wetland resources are anticipated.

The portions of Wetland 1 that occur nearest the construction activity will be clearly marked on the construction plan sheets and labeled as "Do Not Disturb", this is a firm commitment. Silt fence or appropriate erosion control measures, as determined by INDOT Stormwater Team, will be installed to separate the ground-disturbing construction activities from the wetland area. No construction activities will occur within said areas. This is a firm project commitment.

Early coordination letters were sent to environmental resource agencies on January 16, 2018. In their response dated February 5, 2018 (Appendix C-14) the USFWS made no mention of potential impacts to wetland resources.

IDNR DFW responded to early coordination on February 15, 2018 (Appendix C-18) and recommended contacting and coordinating with the IDEM 401 program and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) 404 program regarding potential wetland impacts. IDNR provided additional recommendations that should be considered to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources. The recommendations within their letter were only for consideration. They may only become mandatory if the construction were to take place within a jurisdictional floodway. All applicable USFWS and IDNR DFW recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

Project name:

This is page 12 of 32

County	Porter	Route	e SR 2 & Heavilin	_ De	es, No	1600913
			Presence	e Im	ipacts	
				Yes	No	,
Terrestria Unique or	<b>l Habitat</b> High Quality Habit	at	<u> </u>	X		
lse the rem	arks box to identif	veach type of habitat and	the acres impacted (i.e.	forested, grassl	and, farmla	and, lawn, etc).
Remarks:	Based on a deskt B-3), and the Reg shrub areas north	op review, a site visit on Augulated Waters Delineation I of SR 2 within the project li wever, small wooded areas a	gust 17, 2017 by Troyer Gr R <i>eport</i> prepared by Cardno imits. Much of the area wi	oup, the aerial ma on November 6, 2 thin the constructi	p of the pro 2017, there a on limits co	ject area (Appendix are some woody
	Morrow's honeys Stickseed (Hacke	se areas is predominated by nuckle (Lonicera morrowii), lia virginiana). Fauna speci gratorius). The project will	Garlic mustard (Alliaria pe les in the area squirrels (Sci	etiolate), False net iuridae) and birds,	tle <i>(Boehme</i> , predomina	eria cylindrica), ted by American
	existing SR 2 roa enter the roundab Department facili constructed while	areas are unavoidable becaus dway. This will help to ensu out. Shifting the roundabou ties on the intersection's sou SR 2 and Heavilin Road rea f the intersection and corres	re proper deflection of the t north also minimizes imp theast quadrant. This also main open to traffic., therel	approaches neces act to the existing allows for most o	sary to slow Porter Cou f the interse	v vehicles as the nty Highway ction to be
	proposed improve March 31 <sup>st</sup> ), when habitat present in	25 acres trees (suitable summents. All tree removal will be presented are not likely to be presented areas will involve the test to bat species can be found	I occur during the during the esent. Mitigation for impact payment of an in-lieu fee t	ne bat inactive sea cts to potential thre o a bat habitat con	son (Octobe eatened and servation fu	r 1st through endangered bat ind. More detail
	February 5, 2018 DFW responded regarding signific riparian habitat in coordinating with that the recomme construction were	n letters were sent to environ (Appendix C-14) the USFW o early coordination on Febrant terrestrial habitat but recapacts that will occur. Regathe IDEM 401 program and adations within their letter we to take place within a juriscare included in the Environ	'S recommended that tree a ruary 15, 2018 (Appendix of the commended a mitigation planting potential wetland half the US Army Corps of Envere only for consideration. dictional floodway. All app	and brush clearing C-18) and did not an be developed footat, IDNR DFW regineers (USACE). They may only belicable USFWS a	be kept to a provide any or any unavous recommend 404 progratecome man and IDNR D	minimum. IDNR comment bidable woody and led contacting and m. IDNR stated datory if the
here are hig imal moven	gh incidences of anin nent, consideration o	nal movements observed in th futilizing wildlife crossings sh	ne project area, or if bridges nould be taken.	s and other areas a	appear to be	the sole corridor for
			1.0			
Karst Is the p Are ka	proposed project lo rst features located	cated within or adjacent to I within or adjacent to the	o the potential Karst Area footprint of the proposed	a of Indiana? I project?	Yes	No x x
Is the	rst features located	cated within or adjacent to I within or adjacent to the oject impact any of these	footprint of the proposed	a of Indiana? I project?	Yes	x
Is the p Are ka	rst features located  If yes, will the properties of the propertie	I within or adjacent to the oject impact any of these any karst features within	footprint of the proposed karst features?	l project?		x x
Is the p Are ka	If yes, will the plants box to identify October 13, 1993  Based on a deskter B-2), and the RFI	I within or adjacent to the oject impact any of these any karst features within	footprint of the proposed karst features?  the project area. (Karst gust 17, 2018 by Troyer Groposed project is located or	investigation muoup, the topo map	ust comply	with the Karst

County	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913
	area (Appendix C-9). There high liquefaction potential. earthquake shaking or other moderate bedrock potential, raised by IGS. The designer listed as a firm commitment.	Liquefaction is a phe rapid loading. The prand has high sand ar of the project will b	nomenon in which the stre roject area is located near a ad gravel resource potential	ngth and stiffness of a so I 1% annual chance flood I. No concerns regarding	oil is reduced by I hazard area, has g these resources were
Threatene	d or Endangered Species			Presence	<u>Impacts</u> Yes No
Within to Any criti Federal	he known range of any feder ical habitat identified within p species found in project are becies found in project area (	roject area a (based upon info	rmal consultation) tation with IDNR)	x	x .
ls Section	n 7 formal consultation requ	ired for this action?	Yes	No x	•
Remarks:	Based on a desktop review a County Endangered, Threate highlighted species on the list the IDNR-DFW early coordinated are have been reported to occur and the second are have been reported to occur are have been reported to occur and the second are have been reported to occu	ned and Rare (ETR) at reflect the federal a nation response lette in checked and no plateur in the project victor resent to environme. C-14) the USFWS id a bat (Myotis sodalis), and the threatened curus catenatus). US grammatic Consultatore is no habitat for the cotthe piping plover, see removal will externation.	Species List has been checond state identified ETR sport dated February 15, 2018 on the original species listed simity.  Intelligent the proposed project, piping plover (Charadrin morthern long-eared bat (MFWS stated that the impaction process, as determined the other species within the Karner blue butterfly, or early dapproximately 200-ft no	ked and is included in (A cicies located within the control (Appendix C-18), the National State of federally three anuary 16, 2018. In their case being within the was melodus), and Karner (yotis septentrionalis) and the two bat species through Section 7 consuproposed project area. The astern massasauga.	Appendix E-12). The county. According to thural Heritage attened, endangered or response dated ithin the range of the blue butterfly deastern must be evaluated attation among the herefore, the project ment edge along SR
	and northern long-eared bat ( Project information was subman official species list was ge within the project area. Refer (Myotis sodalis) and the federeffect determination key was found to "Likely to Adversely avoided because the roundable deflection of the approaches a minimizes impact to the exist. This also allows for most of the thereby reducing the user cost.  Approximately 0.25 acres of	NLEB).  nitted through the US nerated (Appendix C to paragraph below. rally threatened north completed on February Affect" the Indiana out is ideally located necessary to slow vel ing Porter County Hi he intersection to be t that would be assoc	FWS's Information for Plate 20) and no additional spector Porter County is within ratern long-eared bat (NLEB ary 19, 2019, and based on bat and/or the NLEB (Approrth of the existing SR 2 nicles as the enter the round ighway Department facilitic constructed while SR 2 and iated to a full closure of the	anning and Consultation cies are within range of the federally end (Myotis septentrionalis) the responses provided, pendix C-26). Proposed roadway. This will help labout. Shifting the rouses on the intersection's sid Heavilin Road remains e intersection and corresponders.	(IPaC) portal, and he project area angered Indiana bat ). In addition, an the project was impacts cannot be to ensure proper adabout north also outheast quadrant. open to traffic, ponding detour.

This is page 14 of 32 Project name:

County	Porter	Route	SR 2 & Heavilin	Des. No.	1600913

INDOT verified the effect finding and submitted it to USFWS on February 20, 2019. On February 20, 2019, USFWS concurred with the "Likely to Adversely Affect" finding (Appendix C-42). USFWS confirmed that the proposed project's effects are consistent with those analyzed in the BO. The USFWS has determined that projects consistent with the conservation measures and scope of the program analyzed in the BO are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Indiana bat and/or the NLEB. Additionally, a "Reinitiation Notice" is required if: more than 0.16 acre of suitable habitat is to be cleared; new information about listed species is encountered; the project is modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species; or a new species or critical habitat is listed that the project may affect. Contractors must report the discovery of dead or injured bats to USFWS. These requirements, and the Avoidance and Minimizations Measures (AMMs) from the Project Submittal Form, are included as firm commitments for this project.

INDOT shall satisfy the compensatory mitigation requirements of the formal consultation with USFWS through payment to the Range-wide In-lieu Fee Program. The amount to be paid to the Range-wide In-lieu Fee Program, to be administered by The Conservation Fund, shall be \$2,971. This amount was determined by the Habitat Block Method. Payment into the Range-wide In-lieu Fee Program will be made by INDOT. Since there will be 0.16 acres of impact between 100-300 feet from the edge of the existing roadway, the fee will be as follows: 0.16 (acres between 100-300 feet) X 1.75 (Porter County multiplier) X \$10,609 = \$2,971

On January 11, 2018 Troyer Group reviewed the USFWS map Range Map for the Rusty Patch Bumble Bee (Bombus affinis) (https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/insects/rpbb/rpbbmap.html) and identified the project area is located outside a High Potential Zone for Rusty Patch Bumble Bee habitat. The RFI report was completed on January 30, 2018 (Appendix E) and INDOT confirmed this project is located outside a High Potential Zone for the Rusty Patch Bumble Bee.

This concludes the need for further consultation on this project under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. INDOT's approval of this environmental document also serves as its concurrence with the "Likely to Adversely Affect" finding. This precludes the need for further Section 7 consultation.

# **SECTION B - OTHER RESOURCES**

## **Drinking Water Resources**

Wellhead Protection Area Public Water System(s) Residential Well(s) Source Water Protection Area(s) Sole Source Aquifer (SSA)

If a SSA is present, answer the following:

Is the Project in the St. Joseph Aquifer System? Is the FHWA/EPA SSA MOU Applicable? Initial Groundwater Assessment Required? Detailed Groundwater Assessment Required?

# Presence Impacts Yes No x x x No Yes No

# Remarks:

The project is located in Porter County, which is not located within the area of the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state of Indiana. Therefore, the FHWA/EPA Sole Source Aquifer Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not applicable to this project. No impacts are expected.

The Indiana Department of Environmental Management's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (http://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/pages/wellhead/) was accessed on January 16, 2018 by Troyer Group. This project is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area. No impacts are expected.

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources Water Well Record Database website (https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm) was accessed on January 16, 2018 by Troyer Group. The nearest well is located approximately 45 feet south of the southern project termini. These features will not be affected because they are

This is page 15 of 32 Project name: State Road 2 at Heavilin Road, Intersection Improvement Date: April 15, 2019

County Porter Route SR 2 & Heavilin Des. No. 1600913

outside the proposed construction limits. The excavation related to the proposed storm sewer system will not occur near this well. Therefore, no impacts are expected. Should it be determined during the right-of-way phase that these wells are affected, a cost to cure will likely be included in the appraisal to restore the wells.

Based on a desktop review of the INDOT MS4 website (https://entapps.indot.in.gov/MS4/) by Troyer Group on January 16, 2018, and the RFI report; this project is located in an Urban Area Boundary (UAB) location. An MS4 early notification letter was sent on January 16, 2018, to the City of Valparaiso MS4 Coordinator (Appendix C-3). The MS4 coordinator did not respond within the 30-day time frame. Project plans will be provided to the MS4 coordinator during the Rule 5 Erosion Control Permit review process to ensure compliance with the City of Valparaiso/Porter County storm water quality management plan.

Based on a desktop review of the utility data collected in the project topographic survey, this project is located where there is a public water system. The public water system will be affected because a water line operated by Valparaiso City Utilities is located along the north side of SR 2 through the project area and will require relocation prior to commencement of the roundabout construction. Utility coordination is ongoing and relocations plans will be developed to ensure conflicts are kept to a minimum and the water line can be replaced in an appropriate location.

## Flood Plains

Longitudinal Encroachment Transverse Encroachment Project located within a regulated floodplain Homes located in floodplain within 1000' up/downstream from project

Presence	<u>Impacts</u>			
	Yes	No		
X	x			
х	x			

Discuss impacts according to classification system described in the "Procedural Manual for Preparing Environmental Studies".

Remarks:

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources Indiana Floodway Information Portal website (http://dnrmaps.dnr.in.gov/appsphp/fdms/) was accessed on January 16, 2018 by Troyer Group. The outlet structure related to the proposed project's stormwater collection system is located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from approved IDNR floodplain maps (Appendix F-37). An early coordination letter was sent on January 16, 2018, to the Porter County Director of Stormwater Management, who acts as the local floodplain administrator. The floodplain administrator did not respond within the 30-day time frame.

The work occurring within the Salt Creek floodway involves the installation of the outlet structure associated to a proposed detention basin. The outlet structure will be located approximately 20-ft, west of the Salt Creek OHWM, but approximately 40-ft, east of the western limit of the regulated floodway. The outlet structure will be designed to match the profile of the existing floodway to minimize any new flow impediment. The additional of this new drainage structure will result in an insubstantial change in the floodway's capacity to carry flood water. This change could cause a minimal increase in flood heights and flood limits. These minimal increases will not result in any substantial adverse impacts on the natural and beneficial floodplain values; they will not result in substantial change in flood risks or damage; and they do not have substantial potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency routes. Coordination with IDNR will occur to ensure this floodplain encroachment is not substantial.

IDNR administers the requirements of Indiana's floodplain management regulations and the state's floodway permitting program (as outlined in 23 CFR 650, 23 CFR 771, and 44 CFR). Due to the outlet structure's location within Salt Creek's regulated floodway, A Construction in a Floodway (CIF) permit from IDNR will be required. Due to the minimal change anticipated in the cross-section flow area, a non-modeling assessment approach will likely apply.

An early coordination letter was sent to IDNR DFW on January 16, 2018. In their response dated February 15, 2018 (Appendix C-18) they provided recommendations that should be considered to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources. The recommendations within their letter were only for consideration. They may become mandatory upon the issuance of a CIF permit. All applicable IDNR DFW recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document. All conditions associated to an approved CIF permit will observed and will become firm project commitments.

•			
State Road 2 at Heavilin Road,	Intersection Improvement	Date:	April 15, 2019