FHWA-Indiana Environmental Document CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

## Road No./County:

Designation Number:

Project Description/Termini:

## US 24 / Miami County

Des. No. 1700089
Intersection Improvements / Approximately 2,000 feet East and 760 feet West of the US 24 and SR 19 Intersection.
After completing this form, I conclude that this project qualifies for the following type of Categorical Exclusion (FHWA must review/approve if Level 4 CE ):

|  | Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 - The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual <br> Level 2-table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Categorical Exclusion, Level 3 - The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual <br> Level 3-table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division) |
| $\mathbf{X}$ | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 - The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual <br> Level 4-table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA |
|  | Environmental Assessment (EA) - EAs require a separate FONSI. Additional research and documentation <br> is necessary to determine the effects on the environment. Required Signatories: ES, FHWA |

Note: For documents prepared by or for Environmental Services Division, it is not necessary for the ESM of the district in which the project is located to release for public involvement or sign for approval.

Approval $\qquad$
ESM Signature
Date
ES Signature
Date
$\overline{\text { FHWA Signature } \quad \text { Date }}$

## Release for Public Involvement



## Certification of Public Involvement <br> Office of Public Involvement <br> Date

Note: Do not approve until after Section 106 public involvement and all other environmental requirements have been satisfied. INDOT ES/District Env.
Reviewer Signature: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: Aaron Grisel, HNTB Indiana, Inc.
County Miami

Route US 24
Des. No. 1700089

## Part I - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Every Federal action requires some level of public involvement, providing for early and continuous opportunities throughout the project development process. The level of public involvement should be commensurate with the proposed action.

|  | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Does the project have a historic bridge processed under the Historic Bridges PA*? If No, then: |  | X |
|  |  |  |
| Opportunity for a Public Hearing Required? | X |  |

*A public hearing is required for all historic bridges processed under the Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement between INDOT, FHWA, SHPO, and the ACHP.

Discuss what public involvement activities (legal notices, letters to affected property owners and residents (i.e. notice of entry), meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc.) have occurred for this project.

Construction activities associated with the project will occur within existing right-of-way. No permanent or temporary right-of-way acquisition will be required for this project. Therefore, Notice of Entry letters were not required for this project.

The project will meet the minimum requirements described in the current Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Manual which requires the project sponsor to offer the public an opportunity to submit comment and/or request a public hearing. Therefore, a legal notice will appear in a local publication contingent upon the release of this document for public involvement. This document will be revised after the public involvement requirements are fulfilled.


Remarks:
At this time, there is no substantial public controversy concerning impacts to the community or to natural resources.

Des. No

# Part II - General Project Identification, Description, and Design Information 

Sponsor of the Project: Local Name of the Facility:

| INDOT | INDOT District: |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ft. Wayne |  |


*If other is selected, please indentify the funding source:

## PURPOSE AND NEED:

Describe the transportation problem that the project will address. The solution to the traffic problem should NOT be discussed in this section. (Refer to the CE Manual, Section IV.B.2. Purpose and Need)

## Need

The need for this project is the safety issues that exist on the current facility. This safety concern is demonstrated through the baseline condition of high right-angle crash rates due to multiple conflict points associated with left-turn movements at the intersection of United States Highway (US) 24 and State Road (SR) 19, when compared to similar facilities in Indiana. According to available crash data, there were a total of 26 crashes, including two fatalities, from January 1, 2010 to February 23, 2019. Of the 26 crashes, approximately 81 percent were right-angle or turn crashes.

A Road Hazard Analysis was conducted to determine the Index of Crash Frequency (ICF) and Index of Crash Cost (ICC) at the existing facility. The ICF measures the difference between expected and reported number of crashes divided by the standard deviation of the difference in the estimate. A facility with an ICF value of 2 or greater is considered a high crash location. The output of the analysis returned an ICF value of -0.09 indicating the existing facility demonstrates a crash frequency slightly below what is expected. The ICC measures the difference between expected and reported crash costs. The output of the analysis returned an ICC value of 1.8 indicating the severity of crashes at the existing facility is much higher than normal. The results of the Road Hazard Analysis demonstrate the existing facility experiences a low frequency of crashes; however, due to an increased severity of crashes, design solutions should be evaluated to reduce the severity of future crashes.

Safety concerns at the US 24 and SR 19 intersection are documented in the INDOT Engineer's Report dated November 14, 2019 (Appendix I, pages 1-9).

## Purpose

The purpose of the project is to reduce the severity of future crashes at the existing facility.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):

County: Miami Municipality: Peru
Limits of Proposed Work: Approximately 2,000 feet east and 760 feet west of the US 24 and SR 19 intersection
Total Work Length: $\quad 0.53$ Mile(s) Total Work Area: 4.1 Acre(s)

${ }^{1}$ If an IMS or IJS is required; a copy of the approved CE/EA document must be submitted to the FHWA with a request for final approval of the IMS/IJS.

In the remarks box below, describe existing conditions, provide in detail the scope of work for the project, including the preferred alternative. Include a discussion of logical termini. Discuss any major issues for the project and how the project will improve safety or roadway deficiencies if these are issues.

## Location:

INDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) intend to proceed with an intersection improvement project at the intersection of US 24 and SR 19 in Miami County, Indiana. The project is in Sections 14-16, Township 27 North, and Range 4 East in Peru Township, as shown on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 Minute Peru, Indiana Topographic Quadrangle Map (Appendix B, page 3). More specifically, the project is located 3.7 miles east of US 31.

## Existing Conditions:

The existing US 24 and SR 19 intersection is a stop-controlled intersection controlled by an overhead flashing beacon. At the intersection, SR 19 northbound and southbound traffic is stopped, while eastbound and westbound US 24 traffic is unobstructed. The US 24 and Lovers Lane Road intersection is an unsignalized, stop-controlled divided highway crossing. Lovers Lane Road connects commercial facilities south of US 24 to SR 19 north of US 24. At the intersection, left hand and through traffic flow is accommodated by the median crossover.
The existing US 24 and SR 19 intersection deficiency is a result of multiple conflict points associated with left-turn movements, resulting in a high percentage of right-angle crashes.
Land cover within the project area is primarily maintained roadside (Appendix B, page 2).
The existing US 24 typical section consists of two 12-foot lanes in each direction, with four-foot inside shoulders and 12foot outside shoulders (Appendix B, pages 37-39). Variable right and left-turn lanes on eastbound and westbound US 24 are 12 feet wide and begin approximately 685 feet from the intersection with SR 19. The posted speed limit on US 24 is 60 miles per hour (MPH) through the project area. US 24 is classified as a Principal Arterial.

## Preferred Alternative:

The preferred alternative will reconfigure the intersection of US 24 and SR 19 by constructing a restricted crossing Uturn (RCUT) intersection with a median closure. The RCUT intersection is referred to as a "J-turn with Median Closure" in the INDOT Engineer's Report dated November 14, 2019 (Appendix I, pages 1-9). The reconfigured intersection will direct through traffic on SR 19 to make a right onto US 24 and utilize a U-turn across the US 24 median before making a right-turn back onto SR 19. Median delineators will be constructed at the US 24 and SR 19 intersection to prevent traffic from cutting through the median. In addition, Lover's Lane Road within the US 24 median and north of US 24 will be closed to prevent traffic from bypassing the median U-turns and moving the safety concern to the US 24 and Lovers Lane Road intersection. Therefore, the southern Lovers Lane Road access to US 24 will be converted to a "right-in, right-out" access point.

Construction activities will include the following:

- Removal of existing pavement for the closure of the US 24 median at the SR 19 and Lovers Lane Road intersections. The existing shoulder and pavement edges US 24 will be closed at the existing location of the intersection.
- Construction of 15 -foot wide median U-turns with 4 -foot wide outside shoulders and 10 -foot wide inside shoulders within the US 24 median. Median U-turns will be constructed approximately 665 feet northeast and 702 feet southwest of the existing US 24 and SR 19 intersection.
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- Construction of concrete median delineators spaced 5 to 6 feet apart at the US 24 and SR 19 intersection.
- Reconstruction of the existing US 24 inside pavement edges to accommodate the left-turn lane.
- Removal of existing pavement for the closure of the northern portion of Lovers Lane Road between SR 19 and US 24. The existing shoulder and pavement edges of SR 19 and US 24 will be closed at the existing location of Lovers Lane Road.
- Addition of new roadway signage throughout the project area.

The logical termini are approximately 2,000 feet east and 760 feet west of the US 24 and SR 19 intersection. The logical termini are considered appropriate as they provide a sufficient area for median construction, closure of the northern Lovers Lane Road access point, and roadway grading. See Appendix B, pages 24-50, for preliminary roadway design plans.
The project will require temporary lane and shoulder closures through the construction site during phased construction. Details of the lane restrictions are included in the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) During Construction section of this CE document and Appendix B, pages 28-36.

The proposed project will address the purpose and meet the need for the US 24 and SR 19 intersection improvement project by eliminating left-turn movements at the intersection. Elimination of the left-turn movements at this location will reduce the number of conflict points, thus improving safety. The work being completed for this project is a standalone project that is specific to safety improvements at the US 24 and SR 19 intersection; therefore, the project has independent utility.

## OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

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

## Alternative 1 - Roundabout:

INDOT considered reconstructing the existing US 24 and SR 19 intersection as a roundabout. Traffic on SR 19 is a small percentage of the intersection's total traffic therefore, the roundabout alternative will cause undue delays for those traveling on US 24. The roundabout alternative does meet the purpose and need; however, due to the potential for increased traffic delays this alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.

## Alternative 2-RCUT - Unsignalized:

INDOT considered reconstructing the existing US 24 and SR 19 intersection as an unsignalized RCUT intersection. The unsignalized RCUT alternative would only allow for left-turn movements from US 24 to SR 19 at the intersection. Traffic would no longer be able to make a left-turn movement from SR 19 to US 24. The unsignalized RCUT alternative improves overall traffic safety; therefore, this alternative meets the purpose and need. Although this alternative meets the purpose and need, the left-turns at the US 24 and SR 19 intersection still include potential conflict points that are not present with the preferred alternative. Therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.

## Alternative 3-RCUT - Signalized:

INDOT considered reconstructing the existing US 24 and SR 19 intersection as a signalized RCUT intersection. The signalized RCUT alternative would only allow for left-turn movements from US 24 to SR 19 at the intersection. Traffic would no longer be able to make a left-turn movement from SR 19 to US 24. A Signal Warrant Analysis was performed to determine if the amount of traffic at the intersection would require a traffic signal. The eastern median U-turn was also considered for a traffic signal since traffic volumes are higher at this location in comparison to the western median U-turn. The results of the Signal Warrant Analysis determined that traffic volumes at both locations would not warrant the use of a traffic signal. In addition, a traffic signal on a high-speed divided highway would likely result in an increase of rear-end crashes. Due to the potential for increased rear-end crash rates, the signalized RCUT alternative does not meet the purpose and need; therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.

## Alternative 4 - Signalized Intersection:

INDOT considered maintaining the existing intersection geometry with the addition of a permanent traffic signal. A Signal Warrant Analysis was performed to determine if the amount of traffic at the intersection would require a traffic signal. The results of the Signal Warrant Analysis determined that traffic volumes at the intersection would not warrant the use of a traffic signal. A traffic signal at a location that does not have the appropriate traffic volumes may cause additional safety concerns as vehicles on US 24 would need to stop from a speed limit of 60 mph . In addition, this area of US 24 has very few stops, so motorists would not be expecting to stop for a traffic signal. These factors may lead to an increase in rear end crashes or running red light crashes. Due to the potential for increased crash rates, the signalized intersection alternative does not meet the purpose and need; therefore, this alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.

## Alternative 5 - No-Build:

The No-Build alternative would make no physical changes to the existing intersection. This alternative would have no effect on environmental resources. Without improvements, the intersection would maintain the "high crash" designation and the risk of injury or fatality at this intersection would remain. The No-Build alternative was not selected because it fails to meet the purpose and need of the project.

The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable because (Mark all that apply):
It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies;
It would not correct existing safety hazards;
It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies;
It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems; or
It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy.
Other (Describe)


## ROADWAY CHARACTER:

Functional Classification:

## Current ADT:

Design Hour Volume (DHV):
Designed Speed (mph):


Existing Proposed

| Number of Lanes: | 2-4 |  | 2-4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of Lanes: | Two, 12-foot through lanes with variable 12 -foot right/left turn lanes |  | Two, 12-foot through lanes with 12-foot right turn lanes and 12 -foot left turn/median U-turn lanes |  |
| Pavement Width: | 40-64 | ft . <br> ft. <br> ft . <br> ft . | 40-64 | ft . <br> ft . <br> ft . <br> ft . |
| Shoulder Width: | Inside: 4 Outside: 12 |  | Inside: 4 Outside: 12 |  |
| Median Width: | 38 |  | 18-36 |  |
| Sidewalk Width: | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| Setting: | Urban Level | Suburban Rolling | X ${ }_{\text {Rural }} \begin{aligned} & \text { Rilly }\end{aligned}$ |  |
| Topography: |  |  |  |  |  |

Functional Classification:
Current ADT:
SR 19 - Minor Arterial/Principal Arterial

| N/A | VPD | Design Year ADT: | N/A | VPD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

County Miami
Route US 24
Des. No. $\qquad$

| Design Hour Volume (DHV): | N/A | Truck Percentage (\%) | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 45 | Legal Speed (mph): | 45 |

$\qquad$

Proposed


Functional Classification:
Current ADT:
Design Hour Volume (DHV):
Designed Speed (mph):
Lovers Lane Road - Local

| N/A | VPD D | Design Year ADT: | N/A | VPD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N/A | Truck Percentage (\%) | ) N/A |  |  |
| N/A | Legal Speed (mph): | N/A |  |  |

## Existing Proposed



If the proposed action has multiple roadways, this section should be filled out for each roadway.

## DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES:

Structure/NBI Number(s):
024-52-07579
Sufficiency Rating:
96.5; November 14, 2019 INDOT

Bridge Inspection Report
(Rating, Source of Information)

Existing Proposed

| Bridge Type: | 8-foot, Triple-Barrel Corrugated Metal Pipe Culvert |  | N/A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Spans: | 3 |  | N/A |  |
| Weight Restrictions: | N/A | Ton <br> ft . <br> ft . <br> ft . <br> ft . | N/A | ton |
| Height Restrictions: | N/A |  | N/A | ft . |
| Curb to Curb Width: | N/A |  | N/A | ft . |
| Outside to Outside Width: | 274 |  | N/A | ft . |
| Shoulder Width: | Inside: 4 Outside: 12 |  | N/A | ft . |
| Length of Channel Work: |  |  | N/A | ft . |

US 24 Intersection Improvement Project $\qquad$ Date: February 5, 2020

Describe bridges and structures; provide specific location information for small structures.
Remarks:
The existing structure is a 274 -foot long and 8 -foot wide triple-barrel, corrugated metal pipe (CMP) culvert. This structure carries Prairie Ditch beneath US 24. The roadway fill slope above the existing structure will be re-graded as part of this project; however, the existing structure will not be replaced or rehabilitated.

## Additional Small Structures:

Four additional small structures are located within the project area. None of the structures have been assigned an INDOT Structure Number. Proposed construction activities do not include replacement or rehabilitation of these structures. See the table below for details of each structure.

| Station Number <br> (Appendix B, pages 37- <br> 39) | Structure Type <br> and Size | Roadway <br> Crossing | Feature <br> Carried | Replaced/ <br> Rehabilitated? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $249+50$ | 48-inch Reinforced <br> Concrete Pipe with <br> 24-inch HDPE liner | US 24 | Roadside <br> Ditch | No |
| $260+70$ | 15-inch Corrugated <br> Metal Pipe | Lovers <br> Lane Road | UNT-1 to <br> Prairie Ditch | No |
| $261+30$ | 18 -inch Corrugated <br> Metal Pipe | US 24 | Roadside <br> Ditch | No |
| $525+55$ | 18 -inch Corrugated <br> Metal Pipe | SR 19 | Roadside <br> Ditch | No |

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?


N/A
If the proposed action has multiple bridges or small structures, this section should be filled out for each structure.

## MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (MOT) DURING CONSTRUCTION:

Is a temporary bridge proposed?
Is a temporary roadway proposed?
Will the project involve the use of a detour or require a ramp closure? (describe in remarks)
Provisions will be made for access by local traffic and so posted.
Provisions will be made for through-traffic dependent businesses.
Provisions will be made to accommodate any local special events or festivals.
Will the proposed MOT substantially change the environmental consequences of the action? Is there substantial controversy associated with the proposed method for MOT?
Yes

|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
|  |
|  |


| No |
| :---: |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
|  |
|  |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |
| $\mathbf{X}$ |

County
Miami
Route US 24

Des. No. 1700089

## Remarks:

The MOT for the project will allow US 24 to remain open during construction. Construction activities will be phased with temporary lane and shoulder closures (Appendix B, pages 28-36). During the phased construction, traffic will be maintained with construction signage, barricades, and drums. Temporary lane restrictions will be in place for nine months. Access for local traffic will be provided during construction per INDOT Standard Specification 107.08(e).

The phased construction with temporary lane and shoulder closures will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists (including school buses and emergency services); however, no significant delays are anticipated, and all inconveniences will cease upon project completion. Delays may occur during construction but will cease with project completion.

## ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:



Anticipated Start Date of Construction: June 2020
Date project incorporated into STIP November 15, 2019

|  | Yes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Is the project in an MPO Area? | $\square$ |
|  |  |

If yes,
Name of MPO N/A
Location of Project in TIP N/A
Date of incorporation by reference into the STIP N/A
*Engineering and construction costs were programmed into the STIP for fiscal year 2020 and 2022, respectively. The project has been placed on an accelerated schedule with engineering beginning in 2019 and construction beginning in 2020. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-2024 STIP will be updated to include the up-to-date project costs and to appropriate engineering and construction costs to the correct fiscal year.

## RIGHT OF WAY:

| Land Use Impacts |  | Permanent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Temporary (acres) |
| Residential | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural | 0 | 0 |
| Forest | 0 | 0 |
| Wetlands | 0 | 0 |
| Other: | 0 | 0 |
| Other: | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 |

[^0]Right-of-way plans and grants at the location of this project have been obtained. Apparent existing right-ofway widths extend approximately 104 feet to 122 feet south of the US 24 centerline. Apparent existing right-of-way widths extend approximately 88 feet to 314 feet north of US 24 . The roadway plan set depicting the apparent existing right-of-way limits is in Appendix B, pages 37-39.
This project will occur within existing right-of-way. No permanent or temporary right-of-way will be required for this project.

## Part III - Identification and Evaluation of Impacts of the Proposed Action

## SECTION A - ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Streams, Rivers, Watercourses \& Jurisdictional Ditches<br>Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers<br>State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers<br>Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed<br>Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana<br>Navigable Waterways



Remarks:
Based on a desktop review, a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), and the water resources map in the Red Flag Investigation (RFI) report (Appendix E, page 8 ), there are 10 streams located within the 0.5 -mile search radius. There are two streams present within the project area.

A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was approved by the INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office (EWPO) on January 6, 2019 (Appendix F, pages 1-13). It was determined that two jurisdictional streams, Prairie Ditch and unnamed tributary (UNT) 1 to Prairie Ditch, are present within the investigated area. The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

Prairie Ditch is mapped as a blue-line, perennial stream on the Peru, Indiana USGS Topographic Quadrangle Map (Appendix B, page 3). Prairie Ditch is carried beneath US 24 by three, 96 -inch CMP structures (INDOT Structure No. 024-52-07579). Prairie Ditch exhibited a 36 -foot wide by 0.75 -foot deep ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) during the site visit. Per the USGS Streamstats Database (https://water.usgs.gov/ osw/streamstats/indiana.html), accessed on December 4, 2019, the upstream drainage area of Prairie Ditch is 1.84 square mile. Prairie Ditch is not listed as a Federal Wild and Scenic River, a State Natural, Scenic and Recreational River, Indiana Register's listing of Outstanding Rivers and Streams, navigable waterway, or a National Rivers Inventory waterway.

UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch is not mapped as a blue-line stream on the Peru, Indiana USGS Topographic Quadrangle Map (Appendix B, page 3). UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch exhibited a 10 -foot wide by 0.33 -foot deep ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) during the site visit. UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch is not noted within the USGS StreamStats website database; therefore, the drainage area of this stream is considered to be $<0.01$ square mile. UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch is not listed as a Federal Wild and Scenic River, a State Natural, Scenic and Recreational River, Indiana Register's listing of Outstanding Rivers and Streams, navigable waterway, or a National Rivers Inventory waterway.
Miami
$\qquad$ Des. No.

Proposed construction activities will be confined to the roadway medians and will not result in permanent or temporary impacts to Prairie Ditch or UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch. No rehabilitation or replacement activities to INDOT Structure No. 024-52-07579 will occur.

Early coordination letters were sent to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Indiana Department of Natural Resources Division of Fish and Wildlife (IDNR-DFW), and the USACE on October 28, 2019 (Appendix C, pages 1-3). No response was received from USACE.

USFWS responded on November 18, 2019, stating that a comment letter would not be provided due to minor impacts to natural resources and the absence of federally-endangered species (Appendix C, page 7). No recommendations pertaining streams were provided.
IDNR-DFW responded on December 13, 2019, but did not provide recommendations pertaining to in-stream impacts; however, if work will take place within a stream further coordination with IDNR-DFW will be necessary (Appendix C, pages 10-11). IDNR-DFW stated that formal approval by the agency under regulatory programs administered by the Division of Water may be required for this project.

An automated letter was generated from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management's (IDEM) website on December 17, 2019 recommending appropriate storm water quality measures to be implemented during construction and after project completion (Appendix C, pages 14-20).
All applicable IDNR-DFW, USFWS, and IDEM recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

## Other Surface Waters

Reservoirs
Lakes
Farm Ponds
Detention Basins
Storm Water Management Facilities
Other:


## Remarks:

Based on a desktop review, a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), and the water resources map in the RFI report (Appendix E, page 8), there is one lake within the 0.5 -mile search radius. This lake is not located within or adjacent to the project area.
A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was approved by the INDOT EWPO on January 6, 2019 (Appendix F, pages 1-13). No other surface waters were identified. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

No early coordination response letters expressed concerns regarding lakes, ponds, or other surface waters.
County Miami
$\qquad$ Des. No.

(If a determination has not been made for non-isolated/isolated wetlands, fill in the total wetland area impacted above.)

| Wetland No. | Classification | Total Size <br> (Acres) | Impacted <br> Acres | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Wetland A | PEM1B | 0.007 | 0 | Wetland A is located approximately 62 feet north of the US <br> 24 edge of pavement within the northeast quadrant of the <br> US 24 and SR 19 intersection. No permanent or temporary <br> impacts to Wetland A are anticipated. |

Wetlands (Mark all that apply)
Wetland Determination
Wetland Delineation
USACE Isolated Waters Determination
Mitigation Plan

Documentation


ES Approval Dates

| January 6, 2019 |
| :--- |
| January 6, 2019 |
|  |
|  |

Improvements that will not result in any wetland impacts are not practicable because such avoidance
would result in (Mark all that apply and explain):
Substantial adverse impacts to adjacent homes, business or other improved properties;
Substantially increased project costs;
Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems;
Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts, or The project not meeting the identified needs.


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), a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, the USGS topographic map (Appendix B page 2), and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 8 ) there are six wetlands located within the 0.5 -mile search radius. There is one wetland present within or adjacent to the project area.
A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was approved by the INDOT EWPO on January 6, 2019. Please refer to Appendix F, pages 1-13 for the Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report. It was determined there is one wetland, Wetland A, within the investigated area. Wetland A is a roadside wetland with connectivity to a jurisdictional feature via overland flow and roadside drainage. Therefore, Wetland A is likely a jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.
Wetland A is classified as a palustrine, emergent, persistent, saturated (PEM1B) wetland according the classifications defined by Cowardin et al. (1979). Wetland A measures 0.007 acre and has formed in the northeast quadrant of US 24 and SR 19 as a result of local drainage ponding within a depressional area (Appendix B, page 5). Based on a qualitative analysis, Wetland A is of poor quality based on the lack of vegetative species richness and presence of invasive species. Construction will occur within the US 24 median; therefore, Wetland A will not be permanently or temporarily impacted. Wetland A will be marked on the roadway plans as "Do Not Disturb" and protected with temporary wetland fencing and fiber roll during construction.

USFWS responded on November 18, 2019, but did not provide recommendations pertaining to wetlands
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(Appendix C, page 7).
IDNR-DFW responded on December 13, 2019, but did not provide recommendations pertaining to wetlands (Appendix C, pages 10-11).
An automated letter was generated from the IDEM website on December 17, 2019 recommending appropriate storm water quality measures to be implemented during construction and after project completion (Appendix C, pages 14-20).

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

|  | Presence | Impacts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No |
| Terrestrial Habitat | X |  | X |
| Unique or High Quality Habitat |  |  |  |

Use the remarks box to identify each type of habitat and the acres impacted (i.e. forested, grassland, farmland, lawn, etc). Remarks:

Based on a desktop review, a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), there are primarily maintained state highway right-of-way and successional riparian habitats within the project area. Vegetation within the project area consists primarily of Schedonorus arundinaceus (tall false rye grass), Typha angustifolia (narrowleaf cattail), Dipsacus fullonum (Fuller's teasel), Lonicera japonica (Japanese honeysuckle), and Solidago altissima (tall goldenrod). Construction activities will result in approximately 2.55 acre of terrestrial habitat impacts within maintained state highway right-of-way. Avoidance alternatives are not practicable as construction equipment access to state highway right-of-way outside of the US 24 edge of pavement is necessary to complete the closure of Lovers Lane Road and the construction of median U-turns. No tree clearing is anticipated; therefore, mitigation is not required.

USFWS responded on November 18, 2019, but did not provide recommendations pertaining to terrestrial habitat (Appendix C, page 7).
IDNR-DFW responded on December 13, 2019, providing recommendations to minimize potential effects to terrestrial habitat within the project area (Appendix C, pages 10-11). These recommendations include postconstruction revegetation measures including terrestrial habitat mitigation, time of year restrictions for tree removal, and erosion and sediment control measures.
An automated letter was generated from the IDEM website on December 17, 2019 recommending appropriate storm water quality measures to be implemented during construction and after project completion (Appendix C, pages 14-20).

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

If there are high incidences of animal movements observed in the project area, or if bridges and other areas appear to be the sole corridor for animal movement, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be taken.

## Karst

Is the proposed project located within or adjacent to the potential Karst Area of Indiana?
Are karst features located within or adjacent to the footprint of the proposed project?

| Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | X |
|  | X |
|  |  |

Route US 24
Des. No.
1700089

Use the remarks box to identify any karst features within the project area. (Karst investigation must comply with the Karst MOU, dated October 13, 1993)
Remarks:
Based on a desktop review, the project is located outside the designated karst region of Indiana as outlined in the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). According to the topo map of the project area (Appendix B, page 3), the RFI report (Appendix E, page 8), and the site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, there are no karst features identified within or adjacent to the project area.
An automated letter was generated from the Indiana Geological Survey (IGS) website on December 16, 2019 indicating that there is a high liquefaction potential, presence of a floodway, high potential for bedrock resources, low potential for sand and gravel resources, and the potential for abandoned petroleum wells in the area (Appendix C, pages 12-13). Response from IGS has been communicated with the designer on December 16, 2019. No impacts are expected.

IDNR Division of Oil and Gas responded on November 26, 2019, stating that one well, IDNR Well Permit No. 5603, is within the project area (Appendix C, page 9). IDNR Division of Oil and Gas indicated that an 8inch well casing associated with the identified well is present. The well has been filled with mud, which is not considered to be plugged well. IDNR Oil and Gas recommended that if this interferes with construction, IDNR Division of Oil and Gas should be contacted to create a plugging plan. This recommendation has been added as a firm commitment in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

No early coordination response letters expressed concerns regarding karst resources.

| Threatened or Endangered Species |
| :--- |
| Within the known range of any federal species |
| Any critical habitat identified within project area |
| Federal species found in project area (based upon informal consultation) |
| State species found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR) |
|  |
| Is Section 7 formal consultation required for this action? |

## Remarks:

Based on a desktop review and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 1-12), completed by HNTB on December 5, 2019, the IDNR Miami County Endangered, Threatened and Rare (ETR) Species List has been checked and is included in Appendix E, page 12. The highlighted species on the list reflect the federal and state identified ETR species located within the county. According to the IDNR-DFW early coordination response letter dated December 13, 2019, the Natural Heritage Program's Database has been checked and it was noted that no federally-endangered, threatened, or rare species have been reported within the project vicinity (Appendix C, page 10).

Project information was submitted through the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) portal, and an official species list was generated (Appendix C, pages 33-38). The project is within range of the federally-endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and the federally-threatened northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (Myotis septentrionalis). No additional species were found within or adjacent to the project area other than the Indiana bat and NLEB.

The project qualifies for the Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation for the Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB), dated May 2016 (revised February 2018), between FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and USFWS. An effect determination key was completed on December 6, 2019, and based on the responses provided, the project was found to "May Affect - Not Likely to Adversely Affect" the Indiana bat and/or the NLEB. INDOT reviewed and verified the effect finding on December 6, 2019 and requested USFWS's review of the finding (Appendix C, pages 39-49). No response was received
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from USFWS within the 14-day review period; therefore, it was concluded they concur with the finding. Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) are included as firm commitments in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

This precludes the need for further consultation on this project as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended. If new information on endangered species at the site becomes available, or if project plans are changed, USFWS will be contacted for 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)

Presence


Remarks:

## Sole Source Aquifer

The project is located in Miami 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/ Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Sole Source Aquifer MOU is not applicable to this project. No impacts are expected.

## Wellhead Protection Area

The Indiana Department of Environmental Management's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (http://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/pages/wellhead/) was accessed on October 23, 2019 by HNTB. This project is located within a Wellhead Protection Area.

An early coordination letter was sent on October 28, 2019, to the Peru Utilities Stormwater Coordinator. The Peru Utilities Stormwater Coordinator responded on December 31, 2019, stating that the standard spill prevention provisions in the IDEM Rule 5 will be sufficient (Appendix C, page 21). In addition, the Peru Utilities Stormwater Coordinator noted that any spills must be reported to Peru Utilities. This recommendation has been added as a firm commitment in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

## $\underline{\text { Water Wells }}$

The IDNR Water Well Record Database website (https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm) was accessed on October 23, 2019 by HNTB. No wells are located near this project. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

## Urban Area Boundary

Based on a desktop review of the INDOT MS4 website (https://entapps.indot.in.gov/MS4/) by HNTB on October 23, 2019 and the RFI report; this project is located in an Urban Area Boundary (UAB) location. An early coordination letter was sent on October 28, 2019, to the Peru, Indiana MS4 Coordinator. The MS4 Coordinator did not respond within the 30-day time frame.

## Public Water System

Based on a desktop review on October 23, 2019, a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), and the IDEM Indiana Public Water Supply Database website (https://myweb.in.gov/IDEM/DWW/) this project is not located where there will be public water system impacts. Therefore, no impacts are expected.


| Discuss impacts according to classification system described in the "Procedural Manual for Preparing Environmental Studies". |
| :--- |
| Remarks: |
| Based on a desktop review of The Indiana Department of Natural Resources Indiana Floodway Information <br> Portal website (http://dnrmaps. dnr.in.gov/appsphp/fdms/) by HNTB on December 5, 2019; this project is <br> located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from the approved IDNR floodplain maps (Appendix B, <br> page 6). An early coordination letter was sent on October 28, 2019, to the local Floodplain Administrator. <br> The floodplain administrator did not respond within the 30-day time frame. This project qualifies as a <br> Category 1 per the current INDOT CE Manual, which states: <br> "The modifications to drainage structures included in this project will result in an insubstantial change in |
| their 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; |
| therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not substantial". |



See CE Manual for guidance to determine which NRCS form is appropriate for your project.
Remarks:
Based on a desktop review, a site visit on October 19, 2019, by HNTB, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), there is no land that meets the definition of farmland under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) within or adjacent to the project area. The requirements of the FPPA do not apply to this project; therefore, no impacts are expected. An early coordination letter was sent on October 28, 2019, to Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS). The NRCS responded on November 21, 2019, stating that the project will not cause a conversion of prime farmland (Appendix C, page 8).
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## SECTION C - CULTURAL RESOURCES

Minor Projects PA Clearance

| Category | Type | INDOT Approval Dates | N/A |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A, B | A-2, B-3 | December 30, 2019 | $\square$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Results of Research

Archaeology
NRHP Buildings/Site(s)
NRHP District(s)
NRHP Bridge(s)

## Eligible and/or Listed Resource Present

## Project Effect

No Historic Properties Affected $\quad \square$ No Adverse Effect $\quad \square \quad$ Adverse Effect $\square$
( Documentation
Documentation (mark all that apply)
Historic Properties Short Report Historic Property Report Archaeological Records Check/ Review Archaeological Phase la Survey Report Archaeological Phase Ic Survey Report Archaeological Phase II Investigation Report Archaeological Phase III Data Recovery APE, Eligibility and Effect Determination 800.11 Documentation


Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)


Describe all efforts to document cultural resources, including a detailed summary of the Section 106 process, using the categories outlined in the remarks box. The completion of the Section 106 process requires that a Legal Notice be published in local newspapers. Please indicate the publication date, name of paper(s) and the comment period deadline. Likewise include any further Section 106 work which must be completed at a later date, such as mitigation or deep trenching.

Remarks: On December 30, 2019 the INDOT Cultural Resource Office (CRO) determined that this project falls within the guidelines of Category A, Type 2 and Category B, Type 3 under the Minor Projects Programmatic Agreement (MPPA) (Appendix D, pages 1-3). Category A, Type 2 projects include all work within interchanges and within medians of divided highways in previously disturbed soils. Category B, Type 3 projects include construction of added travel lane, turning, or auxiliary lanes, and shoulder widening within previously disturbed soils. All construction activities will occur within existing right-of-way where soils have been previously disturbed. No further consultation is required. This completes the Section 106 process and the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 have been fulfilled.

County
Miami
Route US 24
Des. No. $\qquad$

SECTION D - SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES/ SECTION 6(f) RESOURCES

Section 4(f) Involvement (mark all that apply)

Parks \& Other Recreational Land
Publicly owned park
Publicly owned recreation area
Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)

Programmatic Section 4(f)*
"De minimis" Impact* Individual Section 4(f)

Wildlife \& Waterfowl Refuges
National Wildlife Refuge
National Natural Landmark
State Wildlife Area
State Nature Preserve

Programmatic Section 4(f)*
"De minimis" Impact*
Individual Section 4(f)


Evaluations Prepared



FHWA
Approval date


FHWA
Approval date


FHWA
Approval date

*FHWA approval of the environmental document also serves as approval of any Section 4 Programmatic and/or De minimis evaluation(s) discussed below.

Discuss Programmatic Section 4(f) and "de minimis" Section 4(f) impacts in the remarks box below. Individual Section 4(f) documentation must be separate Draft and Final documents. For further discussions on Programmatic, "de minimis" and Individual Section 4(f) evaluations please refer to the "Procedural Manual for the Preparation of Environmental Studies". Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 4(f).
Remarks: $\quad$ Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act of 1966 prohibits the use of certain public and historic lands for federally funded transportation facilities unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. The law applies to significant publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife/waterfowl refuges, and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible or listed historic properties regardless of ownership. Lands subject to this law are considered Section 4(f) resources.

Based on a desktop review, a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 2) there are no Section 4(f) resources within or

County $\qquad$
Route US 24

Des. No. $\qquad$
adjacent to the project area. Therefore, no use is expected.

## Section 6(f) Involvement <br> Section 6(f) Property



Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 6(f). Discuss any Section 6(f) involvement.
Remarks: The US Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 established the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which was created to preserve, develop, and assure accessibility to outdoor recreation resources. Section 6(f) of this Act prohibits conversion of lands purchased with LWCF monies to a non-recreation use.

A review of $6(\mathrm{f})$ properties on the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) website at https://www.lwcfcoalition.com/tools revealed a total of three properties in Miami County (Appendix I, page 11). None of these properties are located within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, there will be no impacts to $6(\mathrm{f})$ resources as a result of this project.

## SECTION E - Air Quality

Air Quality

## Conformity Status of the Project

Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area? If YES, then:

Is the project in the most current MPO TIP?
Is the project exempt from conformity?
If the project is NOT exempt from conformity, then:
Is the project in the Transportation Plan (TP)?
Is a hot spot analysis required (CO/PM)?


Level of MSAT Analysis required?
Level 1a $\quad \mathbf{X}$ Level 1b $\square$ Level $2 \square$ Level 3 $\qquad$ Level 4 $\square$ Level 5 $\qquad$

Remarks:
This project is included in the INDOT FY 2020-2024 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (Appendix H, page 1).

This project is located in Miami County, which is currently in attainment for all criteria pollutants according to the IDEM Office of Air Quality. Therefore, the conformity procedures of 40 CFR Part 93 do not apply.
This project is of a type qualifying as a categorical exclusion (Group 1) under 23 CFR 771.117(c), or exempt under the Clean Air Act conformity rule under 40 CFR 93.126, and as such, a Mobile Source Air Toxics analysis is not required.

County
Miami $\qquad$ Des. No. $\qquad$

SECTION F - NOISE

| Noise | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is a noi |  | X |


|  | No | Yes/ Date |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ES Review of Noise Analysis |  |  |

Remarks:
This project is a Type III project. In accordance with 23 CFR 772 and the current Indiana Department of Transportation Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure, this action does not require a formal noise analysis.

## SECTION G - COMMUNITY IMPACTS

## Regional, Community \& Neighborhood Factors

Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area?
Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to community cohesion?
Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to local tax base or property values?
Will construction activities impact community events (festivals, fairs, etc.)?
Does the community have an approved transition plan?
If No, are steps being made to advance the community's transition plan?
Does the project comply with the transition plan? (explain in the remarks box)


Remarks:
The project is not anticipated to result in substantial impacts to community cohesion as it will not divide existing neighborhoods or change community access. No negative economic impacts to the community or impacts to the local tax base are anticipated.

Per the 2019 Indiana Festival Guide (https://issuu.com/propellermarketing/docs/in-festival-guide-windex? $\mathrm{e}=14720671 / 65923919$ ) accessed on December 17, 2019, the following community events occur in Peru, Indiana:

- Second Saturdays (April - November)
- Peru/Miami County Community Garage Sale (May - September)
- Cole Porter Festival (June)
- Miami County 4-H Fair (June)
- July $4^{\text {th }}$ Celebration and Firecracker Run (July)
- Circus City Festival (July)
- Hoosier Heritage Festival (July)
- Grissom Air Museum Warbird Cruise-In (August)
- Miami Days at the Pillars (August)
- Mississinewa Triathlon (September)
- McClure's Orchard and Winery Fall Festival (October)
- Quigley Jazz Jam Festival (November)
- Downtown Peru Christmas Open House (November)

The proposed project is not anticipated to adversely affect any of these community events. The MOT for the project will allow US 24 to remain open during construction. Construction activities will be phased with
temporary lane and shoulder closures (Appendix B, pages 28-36). During the phased construction, traffic will be maintained with construction signage, barricades, and drums. The MOT plan may cause minor delays or inconveniences to those traveling to all of the community events. The selected contractor will implement the MOT in accordance with the current Indiana Design Manual (IDM) and INDOT Standard Specifications.
Miami County has an approved Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan. However, the project is within a rural portion of Miami County and is not included in the ADA Transition Plan. There are no sidewalks or trails within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, there are no facilities in the project area that require ADA compliance.

Indirect and Cumulative Impacts
Will the proposed action result in substantial indirect or cumulative impacts?


Remarks: Indirect impacts are effects which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate. Cumulative impacts affect the environment which result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such actions.

This project is not of a type that is likely to cause substantial indirect or cumulative effects. This project is not expected to affect growth, changes in land use, or population density. The project will not add capacity to the existing roadway network or provide additional access to any currently undeveloped area. Therefore, the project is not expected to increase development in the area or result in substantial indirect or cumulative impacts.

Public Facilities \& Services
Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public and
 private utilities, emergency services, religious institutions, airports, public transportation or pedestrian and bicycle facilities? Discuss how the maintenance of traffic will affect public facilities and services.

Remarks:
Based on a desktop review, a site visit on October 19, 2019 by HNTB, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2), and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 2) there are no public facilities within or adjacent to the project area. Access to all properties will be maintained during construction. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
Early coordination letters were sent to the Miami County Surveyor, Miami County Sheriff, Miami County Highway Department, Miami County Commissioner's Office, Peru Mayor's Office, Peru Community Schools, Miami County Council, and the Miami County Emergency Management Department on October 28, 2019 (Appendix C, pages 1-3).

The Miami County Highway Engineer responded on November 18, 2019, stating recommendations to move the northeast median U-turn to a location approximately 650 feet northeast of Lovers Lane Road to include access for the commercial development east of US 24. It was noted that the recommended location of the median U-turn will eliminate the crossover at the intersection of the south leg of Lovers Lane Road and increase traffic safety at the two intersections. The recommended location of the northeast median U-turn was evaluated during design; however, due to a longer travel distance to the median U-turn and no known issue with access to the commercial development via Lovers Lane Road, this recommendation was not incorporated into the project design. No other responses were received from local officials.

It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to notify school corporations and emergency services at least two weeks prior to any construction that would block or limit access.

County
Miami

Route US 24
Des. No.

Environmental Justice (EJ) (Presidential EO 12898)
During the development of the project were EJ issues identified?
Does the project require an EJ analysis?


If YES, then:
Are any EJ populations located within the project area?
Will the project result in adversely high or disproportionate impacts to EJ populations?


Remarks:
Under FHWA Order 6640.23A, FHWA and the project sponsor, as a recipient of funding from FHWA, are responsible to ensure that their programs, policies, and activities do not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. Per the current INDOT Categorical Exclusion Manual, an Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis is required for any project that has two or more relocations or 0.5 acre of additional permanent right-of-way. This project will have fewer than two relocations and will require less than 0.5 acre of additional permanent right-of-way; therefore, an EJ analysis is not required.

## Relocation of People, Businesses or Farms

Will the proposed action result in the relocation of people, businesses or farms?
Is a Business Information Survey (BIS) required?
Is a Conceptual Stage Relocation Study (CSRS) required?
Has utility relocation coordination been initiated for this project?


Number of relocations: Residences: 0 Businesses: $\qquad$ Farms: $\qquad$ Other: $\qquad$ 0

If a BIS or CSRS is required, discuss the results in the remarks box.
Remarks:
No relocations of people, businesses, or farms will take place as a result of this project.

## SECTION H - HAZARDOUS MATERIALS \& REGULATED SUBSTANCES

Hazardous Materials \& Regulated Substances (Mark all that apply)
Red Flag Investigation
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA)
Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA)
Design/Specifications for Remediation required?

## Documentation



|  | No | Yes/ Date |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| ES Review of Investigations |  | December 5, 2019 |

Include a summary of findings for each investigation.
Remarks: Based on a review of GIS and available public records, an RFI was completed on December 5, 2019 by HNTB (Appendix E, pages 1-12). One National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Facility is located within 0.5 mile of the project area; however, no hazardous material sites were identified in or within 0.5 mile of the project area that will impact the project. The mapped NPDES Facility is 0.48 mile south of the project area. No impacts are expected because due to the distance of the facility form the project area. Further investigation for hazardous material concerns is not required at this time.
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SECTION I - PERMITS CHECKLIST

## Permits (mark all that apply)

## Likely Required

Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section10 Permit)
Individual Permit (IP)
Nationwide Permit (NWP)
Regional General Permit (RGP)
Pre-Construction Notification (PCN)
Other
Wetland Mitigation required
Stream Mitigation required
IDEM
Section 401 WQC
Isolated Wetlands determination
Rule 5
Other
Wetland Mitigation required
Stream Mitigation required
IDNR
Construction in a Floodway
Navigable Waterway Permit
Lake Preservation Permit
Other
Mitigation Required
US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit Others (Please discuss in the remarks box below)


Remarks:
An IDEM Rule 5 permit is likely required due to the amount of ground disturbance necessary for the project. An IDNR Construction in a Floodway (CIF) permit will likely be required for this project.
Applicable recommendations provided by IDNR and IDEM are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this document. If permits are found to be necessary, the conditions of the permit will be requirements of the project and will supersede these recommendations.

It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to identify and obtain all required permits.

## SECTION J- ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

The following information should be provided below: List all commitments, name of agency/organization requesting the commitment(s), and indicating which are firm and which are for further consideration. The commitments should be numbered. Remarks:

Firm:

1. If the scope of work or permanent or temporary right-of-way amounts change, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT Fort Wayne District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately. (INDOT)
2. It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to notify school corporations and emergency services at least two weeks prior to any construction that would block or limit access. (INDOT)
3. One well, IDNR Well Permit No. 5603, is present within the project area. This well has an 8 -inch casing and is not considered to be plugged well as it is filled with mud to 520 feet. If the remaining
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Des. No.
well casing interferes with construction, IDNR Division of Oil and Gas will be contacted to create a plugging plan (IDNR Oil and Gas).
4. If a spill occurs during construction, Peru Utilities will be contacted immediately at 765-473-6681 (Peru Utilities).
5. General AMM 1: Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs. (USFWS)
6. Lighting AMM 1: Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during the active season. (USFWS)
7. Lighting AMM 2: When installing or replacing existing permanent lights, use downward-facing, full cut-off lens lights (with same intensity or less for replacement lighting); or for those transportation agencies using the BUG system developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society, be as close to 0 for all three ratings with a priority of "uplight" of 0 and "backlight" as low as practicable. (USFWS)

## For Further Consideration:

8. Impacts to non-wetland forest of one (1) acre or more should be mitigated at a minimum $2: 1$ ratio. If less than one acre of non-wetland forest is removed in a rural setting, replacement should be at a $1: 1$ ratio based on area. Impacts to non-wetland forest under one (1) acre in an urban setting should be mitigated by planting five trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height (dbh), for each tree which is removed that is $10 " \mathrm{dbh}$ or greater ( $5: 1$ mitigation based on the number of large trees). (IDNR-DFW)
9. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat or Northern Long-eared bat roosting (greater than 5 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or with cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 through September 30. (IDNR-DFW)
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## SECTION K- EARLY COORDINATION

Please list the date coordination was sent and all agencies that were contacted as a part of the development of this Environmental Study. Also, include the date of their response or indicate that no response was received. INDOT and FHWA are automatically considered early coordination participants and should only be listed if a response is received.
Remarks:
Early coordination was initiated on October 28, 2019 with federal, state, and local resource agencies (Appendix C, pages 1-3).

| Agency | Response Received |
| :--- | :---: |
| Indiana Department of Transportation - Ft. Wayne District | November 18, 2019 |
| Miami County Highway Department | November 18, 2019 |
| US Fish and Wildlife Service | November 18, 2019 |
| USDA - Natural Resources Conservation Service | November 22, 2019 |
| Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil and Gas | November 26, 2019 |
| Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife | December 13, 2019 |
| Indiana Geological Survey | December 16, 2019 |
| Indiana Department of Environmental Management | December 17, 2019 |
| Peru Utilities Stormwater Coordinator (MS4 and Wellhead Protection <br> Area Coordinator) | December 31, 2019 |
| Indiana Department of Transportation - Utilities and Railroads Division | - |
| United States Army Corps of Engineers - Louisville District | - |
| Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil and Gas | - |
| Miami County Surveyor | - |
| Miami County Sheriff | - |
| Peru Community Schools | - |
| Miami County Commissioner's Office | - |
| Miami County Council | - |
| Miami County Emergency Management | - |
| Miami County Planning Department (Floodplain Administrator) | - |
| Peru Mayor's Office | - |
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## APPENDIX A: INDOT SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

|  | PCE | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level $4^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 106 | Falls within guidelines of Minor Projects PA | "No Historic Properties Affected" | "No Adverse Effect" | - | "Adverse Effect" Or Historic Bridge involvement ${ }^{2}$ |
| Stream Impacts | No construction in waterways or water bodies | $<300$ linear feet ofstream impacts | $\begin{gathered} \geq 300 \text { linear } \\ \text { feet ofstream } \\ \text { impacts } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | - | Individual 404 Permit |
| Wetland Impacts | No adverse impacts to wetlands | $<0.1$ acre | - | <1 acre | $\geq 1$ acre |
| Right-of-way ${ }^{3}$ | Property acquisition for preservation only or none | $<0.5$ acre | $\geq 0.5$ acre | - | - |
| Relocations | None | - | - | <5 | $\geq 5$ |
| Threatened/Endangered Species (Species Specific Programmatic for Indiana bat \& northern long eared bat) | "No Effect","Not likely to Adversely Affect" (Without AMMs ${ }^{4}$ or with AMMs required for all projects ${ }^{5}$ ) | "Not likely to Adversely Affect" (With any other AMMs) | - | "Likely to Adversely Affect" | Project does not fall under Species Specific Programmatic |
| Threatened/Endangered Species (Any other species) | Falls within guidelines of USFWS 2013 Interim Policy | "No Effect", ""Not likely to Adversely Affect" | - | - | "Likely to Adversely Affect" |
| Environmental Justice | No <br> disproportionately <br> high and adverse <br> impacts | - | - | - | Potential ${ }^{6}$ |
| Sole Source Aquifer | Detailed AssessmentNot Required | - | - | - | Detailed Assessment |
| Floodplain | No Substantial Impacts | - | - | - | Substantial Impacts |
| Coastal Zone Consistency | Consistent | - | - | - | Not Consistent |
| National Wildand Scenic River | Not Present | - | - | - | Present |
| New Alignment | None | - | - | - | Any |
| Section 4(f) Impacts | None | - | - | - | Any |
| Section 6(f) Impacts | None | - | - | - | Any |
| Added Through Lane | None | - | - | - | Any |
| Permanent Traffic Alteration | None | - | - | - | Any |
| Coast Guard Permit | None | - | - | - | Any |
| Noise Analysis Required | No | - | - | - | Yes |
| Air Quality Analysis Required | No | - | - | - | Yes ${ }^{7}$ |
| Approval Level <br> - District Env. Supervisor <br> - Env. Services Division <br> - FHWA | Concurrence by INDOT District Environmentalor Environmental Services | Yes | Yes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ |

[^1]
## APPENDIX B: GRAPHICS
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## Wetlands

$\square$ Estuarine and Marine DeepwaterEstuarine and Marine Wetland


## Freshwater Emergent Wetland



This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.

National Wetlands Inventory (NWI)
This page was produced by the NWI mapper

## Indiana Floodplain Information Portal Report

## Point of Interest

Effective Flood Zone:
AE
Preliminary Flood Zone:
N/A
Best Available Flood Zone:
AE
Approximate Flood Elevation:
660.6ft NAVD88

Source:
Zone A Model Delineation
Nearest Stream:
Prairie Ditch

## Map Legend

© Point of Interest
(A) Nearest Point on Stream

Best Available Flood Zone
FEMA Zone AE Floodway
DNR Detailed Floodway
DNR Approximate Floodway
FEMA Zone A
FEMA Zone AE
DNR Detailed Fringe
DNR Approximate Fringe
Additional Floodplain Area
FEMA Protected by Levee
FEMA Floodplain - Ponding (Depth)
FEMA Floodplain - Sheet Flow (Depth)

## Site Map with Best Available Flood Zone



Approximate scale 1:3,600



Photo 1: Facing northeast-view of the southwest quadrant of US 24 and SR 19.


Photo 2: Facing southwest-view of the southwest quadrant of US 24 and SR 19.


Photo 3: Facing southwest-view of RSD-6 within the US 24 median.


Photo 4: Facing northeast-view of RSD-6 within the US 24 median.


Photo 5: Facing southwest-view of RSD-7.


Photo 6: Facing northeast—view of RSD-7.


Photo 7: Facing southeast-view of UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch.


Photo 8: Facing north—view of UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch.


Photo 9: Facing northwest — view of UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch.


Photo 10: Facing southeast-view of UNT-1 to Prairie Ditch.


Photo 11: Facing northeast-view of the northeast quadrant of US 24 and Lovers Lane Road.


Photo 12:Facing southwest-view of the northeast quadrant of US 24 and Lovers Lane Road.


Photo 13: Facing east—view of downstream end of structures carrying Prairie Ditch beneath US 24.


Photo 14: Facing northwest-view of upstream end of structures carrying Prairie Ditch beneath US 24.


Photo 15: Facing northeast-view of RSD-2 within the US 24 median.


Photo 16: Facing northeast-view of RSD-1.


Photo 17: Facing southwest-view of RSD-1.


Photo 18: Facing southeast-view of RSD-1.


Photo 19: Facing northeast-view of RSD-1.


Photo 20: Facing northeast-view of RSD-3 within US 24 median.


Photo 21: Facing southwest-view of RSD-3.


Photo 22: Facing north—view of RSD-1 and RSD-4


Photo 23: Facing west-view of RSD-1 and RSD-4.


Photo 24: Facing northwest-view of Wetland A.


Photo 25: Facing southwest-view of Wetland A and RSD-1.


Photo 26: Facing south-view of Wetland A.


Photo 27: Facing west-view of Wetland A, RSD-1, and RSD-4.


Photo 28: Facing northeast-view of RSD-5.


Photo 29: Facing southwest-view of RSD-5.


Photo 30: Facing northeast-view of the southwest quadrant of US 24 and SR 19.


Photo 31: Facing southwest-view of the southwest quadrant of US 24 and SR 19.


| UTILIties |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| TELEPHONE/COMMUNICATIONS <br> AT\&T DAVID W. SMITH $765-454-5021$ <br> Ds8383@att.com 116 E. TAYLOR ST. KOKOMO IN 46901 <br> ELECTRIC <br> MIAMI CASS COUNTY REMC <br> STAKING TECHNICIAN $765-473-6658$ <br> jackk@mcremc.coop P.O. BOX 168 PERU, IN 46970 <br> PERU UTILITIES <br> MIKE WALSH PLANNING ENGINEER 765-473-6681 <br> mwalsh@peruutilities.com P.O. BOX 67 PERU, IN 46970 <br> GAS <br> NIPSCO (PERU) DEAN GARRETI $219-647-6260$ <br> dagarrett@nisource.com 801 E. 86 TH AVENUE MERRIUTLE 46410 |  |


| GENERAL NOTES |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | The final cross sections of the grading contract will be the original cross sections of the paving contract. However, partial or complete cross |
|  | The paper relcaction lines will be cross sectioned by the engineer before constuction. |
|  | Existing asphalt pavement located outside the constuction limits shall be removed as directed |
|  | Existing pccp sidewalks and curbs shall be removed from project right of way limits unless otherwise noted and shall be paid for under clearing right of way. |
| ** | All eatth shoulders, median areas, cut and fill slopes shall be plain or mulched seeded |
| ** | All existing storm drainae eipes, inlets, and manholes shall remin unless otherwise noted. |
|  | All limited access right of way is to be fenced with black vinyl coated chain link type fence ( b.v.c.l.t.f. ) unless otherwise noted. |
|  | All exsiting right of way fence shall be remove unless othewise noted. |
| ** | All disturbed areas shal be seeded w with seed mixtur "R" unless otherwise noted. |
| ** | All slopes are to be repaired with a minimum amount of grading so as not to disturb existing vegetation more than necessary. |
|  | All pipes that are to be removed which connect to existing sewers that are to remain in operation shall be sealed water tight |


| SHEET No. | designation |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | TTILE SHEET |
| 2 | INDEX AND GENERAL L Notes |
| 3-5 | ROADWAY TPPICAL CRoSS SECTIONS |
| 6 | MAITTENANCE OF TRAFFIC Deetour route Lovers Lane road |
| 7.15 | Maintenace of traffic |
| 16 | MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC Detalls |
| 17-19 | ROADWAY PLAN LINE $\mathrm{Al}^{\text {A" }}$ |
| $20-24$ | Construction detalls |
| 25 | SPOT ELEVATION DETALS |
| 26.30 | EROSION CONTROL PLANS |
| $31-33$ | Pavemevt Marking detall |
| 34-37 | SIGNING Plan |
| ${ }^{38-41}$ | SIGNING Detalls |
| $42-44$ | Cross sections gruund Mounted sicw panels |
| 45 | APPROACH SUMMARY TABLE |
| 46 | Structure data And Pipe materill table |
| 47-50 | SHEET SIGN AND PoSt SuMmarv Table Line 'A" |
| 51 | SHEET SIGN AND POST SUMMARY TABLE LINE "B" |
| 52 | SICN PANEL AND PAvenent marking summary tables |
| 53 | TEMPORARY ERSSION CONTROL TABLE |
| 54 | UNDERRDAII TABLE |
| 55-73 | Roadway Cross sections Line "A" |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |


|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SHET NO. DATE |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Inflanag






Legend



(N) Compacted Aggregate, No. 53

(26) Seed Mixtre, R
** Proposed Cross Slope to Match Exising Slope of Adjicent Lane.
$* *$ Cross Slope Varies. See Spot Elevation Details for Additional Information.

























[^0]:    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.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Coordinate with INDOT Environmental Services. INDOT will then coordinate with the appropriate FHWA Environmental Specialist.
    ${ }^{2}$ Any involvement with a bridge processed under the Historic Bridge Programmatic Agreement.
    ${ }^{3}$ Permanent and/or temporary right-of-way.
    ${ }^{4} \mathrm{AMMs}=$ Avoidance and Mitigation Measures.
    ${ }^{5}$ AMMs determined by the IPAC decision key to be needed that are listed in the USFWS User's Guide for the Range-wide Programmatic Consultation
    for Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat as "required for all projects".
    ${ }^{6}$ Potential for causing a disproportionately high and adverse impact.
    ${ }^{7}$ Hot Spot Analysis and/or MSAT Quantitative Emission Analysis.
    *Substantial public or agency controversy may require a higher-level NEPA document.

