

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

<b>Road No./County:</b>	State Road (SR) 912 / Lake County
<b>Designation Number(s):</b>	1703011, 1703012, 1700105, 1700359, 1700370, and 1703000
<b>Project Description/Termini:</b>	<p>SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges Project / Michigan Avenue Bridge over SR 912, ramps, and railroads (Michigan Avenue Bridge) and SR 912, from approximately 950 feet west to 1,545 feet southeast of the Michigan Avenue Bridge (Des. 1703011)</p> <p>SR 912 and Michigan Avenue Interchange, from the southwest side of the interchange, including the Ramp B over B Bridge (Des. 1703012) and the Ramp H over B Bridge (Des. 1700105), to approximately 215 feet north of the Michigan Avenue Bridge; including the westbound (WB) SR 912 off-ramp to northbound (NB) Michigan Avenue (Ramp I Bridge, Des. 1700359), the southbound Michigan Avenue to WB SR 912 on-ramp (Ramp NEC Bridge, Des. 1700370), and a closed Pedestrian Bridge over railroads (Closed Pedestrian Bridge, Des. 1703000).</p>

	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 2</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT DE and/or INDOT ESD
	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 3</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT ESD
<b>X</b>	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 4</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT ESD and FHWA
	<b>Environmental Assessment (EA)</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT ESD and FHWA
	<b>Additional Investigation (AI)</b> – The proposed action included a design change from the original approved environmental document. Required Signatories must include the appropriate environmental approval authority

**Approval**

<p>N/A</p> <p>_____ INDOT DE Signature and Date</p>	<p><i>Drew Passmore</i> February 2, 2023</p> <p>_____ INDOT ESD Signature and Date</p>
<p><i>[Signature]</i> 2/9/23</p> <p>_____ FHWA Signature and Date</p>	

**Release for Public Involvement**

<p>N/A</p> <p>_____ INDOT DE Initials and Date</p>	<p>ATR 9/1/2022</p> <p>_____ INDOT ESD Initials and Date</p>
--	--

**Certification of Public Involvement**

*Lisa Shrader* 10/26/2022  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Office of Public Involvement Signature and Date

**INDOT DE/ESD Reviewer Signature and Date:**

*Tomas J. Beaudiant* 02/02/2023  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer:** Juliet Port, LPG / Parsons Transportation Group

# Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

## 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*?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If No, then:		
Opportunity for a Public Hearing Required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*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.*

Notice of Entry letters were mailed to potentially affected property owners near the project area on July 5, 2021 notifying them about the project and that individuals responsible for land surveying and field activities may be seen in the area. A sample copy of the Notice of Entry letter is included in Appendix G-1 to G-2.

A *Public Involvement Plan* (PIP) was prepared by Parsons, and the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) concurred with the plan on November 23, 2021. The purpose of the PIP is to establish goals and strategies for engaging with the public and key stakeholders in accordance with the current INDOT *Project Development Public Involvement Procedures Manual*. A copy of the PIP is included in Appendix G-3 to G-12.

This project involves a historic bridge, known as the Ramp B over B Bridge, which is classified as "Non-Select" under the Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement, dated July 17, 2006 (Historic Bridges PA). Due to the proposed removal of this structure, the project team marketed the availability of the bridge for redevelopment in several ways. Specifically, a public notice was published in the *Indianapolis Star* on December 17, 2020 (Appendix D-64 to D-66); a public notice published in the *Northwest Indiana (NWI) Times* on December 18, 2020 (Appendix D-67 to D-68); the availability of the bridge was posted to the INDOT marketing website on December 17, 2020 (D-71 to D-72); and a bridge marketing sign was installed at the bridge site on January 19, 2021 (Appendix D-69 to D-70). The marketing period continued through the end of the public hearing comment period, discussed further below. No party contacted INDOT or the project team indicating an interest in assuming ownership of the bridge.

To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) finding of "No Adverse Effect" was published in the *NWI Times* on February 10, 2022 offering the public an opportunity to submit comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4). As advertised, the public comment period ended 30 days later on March 12, 2022. The texts of the public notices and affidavits of publication appear in Appendix D-77 to D-80. No comments were received.

The project meets the minimum requirements described in the current INDOT *Project Development Public Involvement Procedures Manual*, including Stipulation III.B. of the Historic Bridges PA, which requires the project sponsor to offer the public an opportunity to submit comments and/or request a public hearing. Following release of the draft environmental document for public involvement, copies were posted online and placed at the City of East Chicago Public Library, INDOT LaPorte District Office and online at: <https://www.in.gov/indot/about-indot/central-office/welcome-to-the-laporte-district/>. A Legal Notice of Public Hearing (Notice) was sent along with project maps to project stakeholders, including adjacent landowners, elected officials, regulatory agencies, schools, religious institutions, civic organizations, and consulting parties on September 13, 2022 (Appendix G-23 to G-26). The Notice was published in both the *Northwest Indiana Times* and *Indianapolis Star* on September 13 and 20, 2022 (Appendix G-15 to G-22). As advertised, the comment period ended on October 11, 2022.

A public hearing was held on September 27, 2022 at the Ivy Tech East Chicago Campus. Eleven people attended the public hearing, consisting of project team members and representatives from the adjacent fire station and East Chicago transit authority (Appendix G-48 to G-49). During the hearing, the project team gave a presentation that covered stakeholders, previous outreach, the project development process, the project's purpose and need, alternatives considered, details about the preferred alternative, and how to submit public comments (Appendix G-27 to G-42). At the hearing, attendees were provided a welcome letter and handouts (Appendix G-43 to G-47), project posterboards were presented, and project team members were available before and after the hearing to answer questions. Before the formal hearing procedures, team members discussed the project with attendees. No written or verbal comments were received at the hearing. During the advertised comment period that ended on October 11, 2022, no comments were received and no party contacted INDOT or the project team indicating an interest in assuming ownership of the

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

bridge. On October 24, 2022, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma responded that the project proposes No Adverse Effect or known endangerment to known sites of interest (Appendix G-50).

**Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds**

*Discuss public controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts, including what is being done during the project to minimize impacts.*

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

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

Sponsor of the Project: INDOT INDOT District: LaPorte

Local Name of the Facility: SR 912 (Cline Avenue) and Michigan Avenue Bridge (Inland Overpass)

Funding Source (mark all that apply): Federal  State  Local  Other\*

\*If other is selected, please identify the funding source: \_\_\_\_\_

**PURPOSE AND NEED:**

*The need should describe the specific transportation problem or deficiency that the project will address. The purpose should describe the goal or objective of the project. The solution to the traffic problem should NOT be discussed in this section.*

**Need:** The primary needs for the project stem from the deteriorated condition of six existing bridges and the roadway pavement within the interchange.

The condition of each of the bridges that make up the interchange was documented in INDOT's *Bridge Inspection Reports*, dated September 29, 2020 (Appendix I-1 to I-24). Per the INDOT *Bridge Inspection Manual*, bridge conditions are rated on a 0 to 9 numeric scale, with 0 representing "Failed Condition – out of service, bridge beyond corrective action" and 9 representing "Excellent Condition". These conditions are summarized in the table below.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

 County Lake

 Route SR 912

 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### Existing Conditions of the Six Bridges

INDOT Structure No.	Des.	Bridge Name Type	Rating			
			Deck	Wearing Surface	Superstructure	Substructure
912-45-02543 B	1703011	Michigan Avenue over SR 912, ramps, and three railroads (Michigan Avenue Bridge) 7-span rolled steel beams	6	6	5	5
			This bridge has extensive, wide cracks in the substructure abutments and pier walls; deck and steel superstructure members are deteriorated.			
912-45-06596 B	1703012	Ramp B over B 1-span 3-sided cast-in-place reinforced concrete rigid frame	5	4	5	5
			There is widespread cracking in the deck, bridge railing, and abutment walls. Spalling and rust staining of the deck underside at the longitudinal construction joint and coping. Map cracking of the deck and cracking of the walls are also indicated. There is wide vertical and horizontal cracking in the abutments.			
912-45-06596 JA	1700105	Ramp H over B 1-span adjacent prestressed concrete box beams	5	5	5	6
			There is underside slab cracking, spalling along coping, and cracking in the abutments. Additionally, the superstructure exhibits signs of collision damage.			
912-45-02543 A RI	1700359	Ramp I 12-span prestressed concrete girders	6	5	6	6
			Cracking, delamination, spalls, and exposed steel are noted.			
912-45-02543 A NEC	1700370	Ramp NEC over railroads and Ramp NER (Ramp NEC) 6-span steel plate girders	6	6	6	6
			The deck, wearing surface, and approaches are cracked.			
912-45-02545 ADJ	1703000	Closed Pedestrian Bridge over railroad (Closed Pedestrian Bridge) 6-span steel and concrete beams	NA	NA	NA	NA
			Both the superstructure and substructure are in poor condition with advanced deterioration (note, the numerical rating system does not apply to pedestrian bridges). This bridge is closed. The poor and unsafe condition of the bridge is a maintenance, safety, and liability concern.			

Source: *Bridge Inspection Reports*, September 29, 2020 (Appendix I-1 to I-24) NA = Not Applicable

According to the December 11, 2017 *Roadway Project Application*, the SR 912 interchange ramp pavement has joint distresses, mid-panel cracking, corner breaks, and surface spalling (Appendix I-25). Additionally, asphalt shoulders are significantly heaved. Other existing issues include retaining walls that are cracked and settling. Also, the SR 912 median barrier does not meet current standards.

Several secondary project needs are identified based on substandard geometric deficiencies that do not meet minimum requirements, as described in the current *Indiana Design Manual* (IDM). This includes inadequate inside and outside shoulder widths, substandard vertical clearances, and deviations for horizontal stopping sight distance, which has resulted in Ramp B over B being struck by vehicles multiple times. As Ramp B over B and Ramp H over B are directly abutting each other, these collisions affect both bridges. The bridge and approaches have been painted to provide motorists notice, but drivers continue to collide with the structure (Appendix D-86 to D-87).

**Purpose:** The primary purpose of the project is to extend the life of the interchange by:

- Providing condition rating of at least 7, good condition, for each bridge element (deck, wearing surface, superstructure, and substructure);
- Improving the condition and extending the service life of roadway and bridge approach pavement by at least 20 years;
- Correcting cracked/settled retaining walls and providing a median barrier along SR 912 that meets current standards; and,
- Reducing the maintenance, safety, and liability concerns associated with the Closed Pedestrian Bridge.

The secondary purpose of the project would increase the safety of the interchange by providing adequate horizontal stopping sight distances, improve or alleviate unsafe merge points within curves, and improve inside and outside shoulder widths.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):

County: Lake Municipality: City of East Chicago

Limits of Proposed Work: SR 912, from approximately 950 feet west to 1,545 feet southeast of the Michigan Avenue Bridge. SR 912 and Michigan Avenue Interchange, from the southwest part of the interchange to approximately 215 feet north of the Michigan Avenue Bridge; including the WB SR 912 off-ramp to northbound (NB) Michigan Avenue (Ramp I Bridge), the WB SR 912 on-ramp from southbound (SB) Michigan Avenue (Ramp NEC Bridge), and a Closed Pedestrian Bridge.

Total Work Length: 0.33 Mile(s) Total Work Area: 15.96 Acre(s)

Is an Interstate Access Document (IAD)<sup>1</sup> required?  
 If yes, when did the FHWA provide a Determination of Engineering and Operational Acceptability?

Yes <sup>1</sup>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Date: <input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	

<sup>1</sup>If an IAD is required; a copy of the approved CE/EA document must be submitted to the FHWA with a request for final approval of the IAD.

*Describe location of project including township, range, city, county, roads, etc. Existing conditions should include current conditions, current deficiencies, roadway description, surrounding features, etc. Preferred alternative should include the scope of work, anticipated impacts, and how the project will meet the Purpose and Need. Logical termini and independent utility also need discussed.*

**Location:** INDOT, with funding from FHWA, is planning a bridges project along SR 912 at the Michigan Avenue Bridge interchange, in the City of East Chicago, Lake County, Indiana (Appendix B-1 and B-2). Specifically, the project is located approximately 1.34 miles west of US 12, as shown on the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic Whiting, Indiana Quadrangle Map. It is in Sections 15, 22, 23, 26, and 27 of Township 37 North, Range 9 West as well as Section 18 and 19 of Township 37 North, Range 10 West (Appendix B-3).

The project is located in a dense urban area surrounded by industrial, commercial, and residential properties. The project interchange is the main entrance into the Cleveland Cliffs steel mill and an alternate access to the Ameristar Casino and other lakefront facilities. The area contains two historic resources: the above-referenced Ramp B over B Bridge located within the project interchange, and the Inland Steel Office Building/ArcelorMittal Human Resources building located adjacent to the northwest (hereinafter referred to as the Inland Steel Office Building).

**Existing Conditions:** This section of SR 912 has three 12-foot wide travel lanes in each direction separated by concrete barrier, with 12-foot wide inside shoulders and 11-foot wide outside shoulders, plus auxiliary lanes for the interchange ramps. SB Michigan Avenue has three 11.8-foot wide travel lanes with a 5.9-foot wide outside shoulder. NB Michigan Avenue has two 11.8-foot wide through lanes and a 5.9-foot wide outside shoulder. Variable-width auxiliary lanes are separated by concrete barrier and there is a raised center concrete median. Existing conditions are shown on the Bridges Exhibit and Existing Conditions aerial photograph (Appendix B-3 and B-4), and project photographs (Appendix B-7 to B-8).

Existing stormwater facilities include curb and gutter, inlets, subgrade sewers, and roadside ditches. Overhead lighting is present throughout the project area. There are no existing pedestrian facilities within or adjacent to the interchange (except for the Closed Pedestrian Bridge, discussed further below).

The southside of the interchange includes the following ramps: NB Michigan Avenue to eastbound (EB) SR 912 (Ramp G and Ramp SEL), EB SR 912 to NB Michigan Avenue (Ramp SER), NB Michigan Avenue to NB Michigan Avenue (Ramp B), SB Michigan Avenue to SB Michigan Avenue (Ramp C), and SB Michigan Avenue to EB SR 912 (Ramp H). The northside of the interchange includes WB SR 912 to NB Michigan Avenue, the Ramp I Bridge, and SB Michigan Avenue to WB SR 912, the Ramp NEC Bridge. The ramps are labeled on the Existing Conditions aerial photograph (Appendix B-4).

As described in the Purpose and Need section, there are condition issues and safety concerns associated with the project's bridges and ramps (Appendix B-3). The project's bridges and their existing conditions are summarized in the Existing Conditions of the Six Bridges table in the Purpose and Need section, and further details are provided below in the Bridges and Small Structures section. The Ramp B over B bridge is a "Non-Select" historic bridge; see the Cultural Resources section for further discussion.

Project limits extend along SR 912 from approximately 950 feet west to 1,545 feet southeast of the Michigan Avenue Bridge over SR 912. At the interchange, the limits extend from the southwest side of the interchange to approximately 215 feet north of the Michigan

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Avenue Bridge over SR 912. The project limits also include Ramp I Bridge, Ramp NEC Bridge, and the Closed Pedestrian Bridge. Within the project area, SR 912, Michigan Avenue, and the associated ramps are classified as Principal Arterials. This project does not include the northwestern portion of the interchange, including Ramp 4A and the WB SR 912 off-ramp (Ramp NER).

As noted where applicable in the appendices, this project was initially bundled with other INDOT projects under Contract R-41441 and the "Mother Des" (aka lead Des) was 1800067 (e.g., Appendix D-1 to D-7). The project contract bundles were revised and 1703011 is now the lead Des for the SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges Project under Contract R-44264 (Appendix H-12 to H-13). As noted, some of the appended documents include study areas that were investigated for related projects that are covered under separate environmental documents (e.g., Appendix F-3).

**Preferred Alternative: Roundabout with One Bridge Replacement (Des. 1703011), Three Bridge Removals (Des. 1700105, 1703012, and 1703000), and Two Ramp Bridge Rehabilitations (Des. 1700359 and 1700370)**

The preferred alternative will replace the Michigan Avenue bridge and provide a new roundabout on the southern portion of the interchange. The southern ramps, Ramp G, Ramp H, and Ramp B, will be realigned. The redundant ramps, Ramp SEL and Ramp SER, and the Ramp H over B and Ramp B over Ramp B bridges, will be removed. The northern ramp bridges, Ramp NEC and Ramp I, and their bridges will be rehabilitated. Additionally, the Closed Pedestrian Bridge will be removed. A Proposed Conditions exhibit is provided in Appendix B-6, and project plan excerpts are provided in Appendix B-9 to B-32.

Along SR 912, the proposed work is limited to the removal of the EB auxiliary lane from the north approach of the SR 912 Bridge over Block Avenue/Callahan Place to Ramp SER. A portion of the existing lane will be reconstructed and/or re-striped to tie into the realigned exit ramp from EB SR 912. Pavement will be removed and replaced with paved shoulder or restored as soil planted with a standard seed mix. Guardrail will be removed and upgraded.

Within the southern portion of the interchange, the existing system of redundant ramps and bridges will be replaced with realigned ramps and a roundabout. The existing retaining walls and redundant ramps will be removed. The area will be regraded and all disturbed areas will be paved or restored with soil planted with a standard seed mix. All movements within the interchange will be maintained. Retaining walls will be added where needed.

The Michigan Avenue Bridge will be replaced with a 6-span, continuous composite steel plate girder and steel beam bridge. The new structure will be similar in width and height to the current structure (within two feet). Span lengths will vary from approximately 89 to 104 feet (see Appendix B-23 to B-25 for details). The approximate minimum vertical clearance over SR 912 and related ramps will be 19.6 feet and at least 22.2 feet of clearance will be provided for the railroads. Approaches will be reconstructed to tie into the existing northern roadway, ramps, and proposed southern roundabout.

The Ramp I bridge and its approaches will be rehabilitated by removing the existing overlay, replacing joints, patching and sealing concrete, placing fiber wraps, installing anodes, as well as grouting and sealing retaining wall (Appendix B-26 to B-29). A new rigid deck overlay is proposed. Approach slabs and the deck drainage system will be replaced. Additionally, new revetment riprap is proposed at the end of an impact attenuator.

The Ramp NEC bridge and its approaches will be rehabilitated by removing the existing overlay and unsound concrete, full depth deck patching, replacing joints, concrete patching, barrier patching and sealing, as well as cleaning and coating the existing steel plate girders (Appendix B-30 to B-32). Approach slabs and the deck drainage system will be replaced, as well as guardrail transitions.

Existing curb and gutter and stormwater inlets will be repaired or replaced as needed. Additionally, drainage issues south of SR 912 will be addressed including regrading and the extension or replacement of several small structures (under 36-inch diameter). Existing overhead sign structures will be replaced, and a new roundabout lighting system will be installed.

The proposed project will occur almost entirely within existing, previously disturbed right-of-way (ROW). This will require approximately 4.83 acres of temporary ROW, including "right-of-entry" ROW (Appendix B-12 and B-15). During construction, the proposed maintenance of traffic (MOT) will maintain traffic along SR 912, and it will include ramp and bridge closures. Phased construction and nearby interchanges will be used to maintain access to all residences and businesses throughout construction. See the ROW and MOT sections for further discussion.

This project will remove the "Non-Select" historic Ramp B over B bridge, and it will have No Adverse Effect to the historic Inland Steel Office Building (see the Cultural Resources and Section 4(f) sections of this CE for further discussion). This project will not impact natural resources except for approximately 7.5 acres of terrestrial habitat and 0.072 acre of wetlands.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

The preferred alternative will meet the purpose and need of the project by extending the life of the interchange by providing condition rating of at least 7, good condition, for each bridge element; improving the condition and extending the service life of roadway and bridge approach pavement by at least 20 years; correcting cracked/settled retaining walls and providing a median barrier along SR 912 that meets current standards; and reducing the maintenance, safety, and liability concerns associated with the Closed Pedestrian Bridge. Additionally, the preferred alternative will increase the safety of the interchange by providing adequate horizontal stopping sight distances, improving or alleviating unsafe merge points within curves, and improving inside and outside shoulder widths.

**Logical Termini/Independent Utility:** The termini of the SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges Project, described above under Limits of Proposed Work, include the project bridges, their approaches, and portions of the SR 912 Michigan Avenue interchange. This includes areas that will be impacted by this project to meet the purpose and need and construct the preferred alternative, which will connect to the existing network of roadways. Therefore, this project has rational endpoints. This project is a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made, and it should not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements. Therefore, this project meets FHWA criteria for independent utility and logical termini ([www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/legislation/nepa/guidance\\_project\\_termini.aspx](http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/legislation/nepa/guidance_project_termini.aspx)).

### OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Provide a header for each alternative. Describe all discarded alternatives, including the No Build Alternative. Explain why each discarded alternative was not selected. Make sure to state how each alternative meets or does not meet the Purpose and Need and why.

Alternatives considered for the SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges Project were evaluated under a variety of scenarios. Due to the historic Ramp B over B Bridge, multiple alternatives were considered as documented in the *Historic Bridge Alternatives Analysis* (HBAA), prepared by Parsons and ASC Group, Inc. (ASC), and concurred by INDOT on November 2, 2021 (Appendix D-81 to D-95). Alternatives for the interchange and the associated five project vehicular bridges were evaluated in the *Final Engineer's Report - SR 912 Interchange Improvement*, October 2020 (Appendix I-28 to I-40). Additionally, alternatives for the Closed Pedestrian Bridge were evaluated in a *Call Application Report* dated June 29, 2018 (Appendix I-26 to I-27). These alternatives are summarized below and further details are provided in the referenced appendices.

#### **HISTORIC RAMP B OVER B BRIDGE (DES. 1703012)**

In accordance with the INDOT Historic Bridges PA, this bridge was determined to be a "Non-Select" historic bridge. According to the INDOT *Cultural Resources Manual*, "Non-Select Bridges may be replaced if no avoidance alternative is determined to be feasible and prudent or no alternative that poses the least harm to the bridge is determined to be feasible and prudent".

The alternatives evaluated under the Historic Bridges PA process were documented in the HBAA and are summarized below. When evaluating rehabilitation options, the HBAA report noted that the Ramp B over B structure is a 63-year old, cast-in-place reinforced concrete, three-sided rigid frame structure that is difficult to repair and includes an outdated type of rebar that corrodes and deteriorates. The current conditions, summarized in the Purpose and Need section, are consistent with heavy truck traffic, heavy chloride use, and long-term settlement and consolidation. Further details are provided in the HBAA (Appendix D-81 to D-95). See Appendix D-95 for a summary table that compares alternatives, including estimated costs (except the No Build, which was also considered).

#### **Alternative A - No Build:**

This alternative would leave the structure in its current deteriorating and substandard condition. While this alternative would incur no costs and is considered feasible, the structure would continue to deteriorate, and the substandard and dangerous conditions would persist. This alternative would not meet the project's purpose and need, and is not prudent; therefore, it was dismissed from further consideration.

#### **Alternative B1 - Rehabilitation for Continued Vehicular Use (Two-Lane or One-Lane Option) Meeting the Secretary of Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation:**

This alternative would require major rehabilitation of the existing bridge, including pavement overlay removal and replacement, partial depth patching, full depth repair at longitudinal joints, partial depth repair on abutment and wing walls, and anode treatments. This alternative is not prudent as it would not provide a condition rating of at least 7, good condition, for each bridge element. Furthermore, it would require three Level 1 design exceptions: inadequate shoulder width, inadequate clear roadway width, and inadequate vertical clearance. While this alternative is considered feasible, it would not meet the project's purpose and need and it is not prudent; therefore, it was dismissed from further consideration.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### **Alternative B2 - Rehabilitation for Continued Vehicular Use (Two-Lane or One-Lane Options) Not Meeting the Secretary of Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation:**

This alternative proposes to replace the entire structure, replicating the historic design. Although this alternative is considered feasible, it would not maintain the structure's status as a "Non-Select" historic bridge. This alternative would cost significantly more than rehabilitation or replacement with a modern structure. Additionally, geometric deficiencies would remain so it would require three Level 1 design exceptions: inadequate shoulder width, inadequate clear roadway width, and inadequate vertical clearance. Although this alternative would meet the project's purpose and need, it is not prudent because it would cost significantly more than the preferred alternative (almost double), and not preserve the historic structure. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

### **Alternatives C1 and C2 - Rehabilitation for Continued Vehicular Use (One-Way Pair Option) Meeting (and NOT Meeting) the Secretary of Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation:**

These alternatives, required by the Historic Bridges PA, are based on the assumption the existing bridge carries a typical two-way road. However, this structure carries a one-way ramp, Ramp B, and it is paired with the Ramp H over B Bridge, which is also one-way. These alternatives would include rehabilitation of the existing bridge, and construction of a new bridge, to create a "one-way pair option". An additional lane cannot be engineered to act as a "one-way pair" option. Therefore, these alternatives are not feasible or applicable to this structure, and they were dismissed from further consideration.

### **Alternative D - Bypass (Non-Vehicular Use)/ Build New Structure:**

This alternative proposes to rehabilitate the historic bridge for non-vehicular use and the construction of a new bridge, which is not feasible or applicable to this structure because it is situated within an interchange. The project area lacks usable pedestrian facilities and interchanges are not conducive to pedestrian use. Additional ROW and pedestrian facilities to connect to (i.e., logical termini) would be required to create a non-vehicular facility. According to the HBAA, this alternative could be considered prudent if someone steps forward before the end of the public hearing comment period to assume ownership of the structure. This alternative has been dismissed from further consideration because it is not feasible.

### **Alternative E - Relocation of Historic Bridge and New Bridge Construction:**

This alternative proposes to move the historic bridge to a new location for some other use and the construction of a new bridge in its place. This alternative would meet the project's purpose and need. However, due to the type of bridge (cast in place reinforced concrete three-sided rigid frame structure), the structure would not likely survive intact if relocation is attempted. None-the-less, this alternative would be prudent if someone steps forward before the end of the public hearing comment period to assume ownership of the structure. Since, this alternative is not likely feasible and may not be prudent, it was not selected as the preferred alternative. As discussed in the Public Involvement section, no party contacted INDOT or the project team indicating an interest in assuming ownership of the bridge.

### **Alternative F - Replacement - Demolition of Historic Bridge and New Bridge Construction:**

This alternative proposes demolition of the historic bridge and the construction of a new bridge in its place that would replicate the current structure, including its geometry. Therefore, this alternative would address structural issues but not correct the geometric deficiencies, and the previously-described design exemptions would be required. Although this alternative could be considered feasible (if design exemptions were approved), it would not meet the project's secondary purpose and need. Therefore, it was dismissed from further consideration.

### **SR 912 INTERCHANGE / FIVE VEHICULAR BRIDGES (DES. 1703011, 1703012, 1700105, 1700359, and 1700370)**

Based on the *Final Engineer's Report - SR 912 Interchange Improvement*, several alternatives, including the No Build and the preferred alternative, "Alternative 2" - Roundabout with One Bridge Replacement, Three Bridge Eliminations, and Two Bridge Rehabilitations, were considered for the interchange improvements. The other alternatives are summarized below. Details including maps are provided in Appendix I-28 to I-40.

#### **No Build**

This alternative would leave the bridges and interchange ramps in their current condition. This alternative would incur no costs, and it would not impact any historic or water resources. However, the bridges and ramp pavement would continue to deteriorate, and safety and geometric deficiencies would remain. Since this alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project, it was dismissed from further consideration.

#### **Base Scope and "Alternative 1" - Three Bridge Replacements Along the Same Alignment and Two Bridge Rehabilitations**

These alternatives would replace the Michigan Avenue, Ramp B over H, and Ramp B over B bridges along the same approximate alignments, and they would rehabilitate the Ramp I and Ramp NEC bridges (Appendix I-29 to I-33). The primary difference between the two alternatives is "Alternative 1" would replace the closed wall abutment and an eastern retaining wall with embankment slopes.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Since the overall interchange configuration would remain unchanged, these alternatives would require several Level 1 design exemptions, such as inadequate shoulder widths and substandard vertical clearances. Since these alternatives would not meet the secondary purpose and need of the project, they were dismissed from further consideration.

**“Alternative 3” - Ramp Re-Alignment, Collector-Distributor, Three Bridge Replacements, and Two Bridge Rehabilitations**

This alternative would realign Ramps SEL, SER, B, and H. A collector-distributor ramp would accommodate the SR 912 on and off ramps to and from Michigan Avenue (Appendix I-36 to I-37). Based on the qualitative safety analysis, this alternative did not perform as well compared to the preferred alternative (Appendix I-38). Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

**CLOSED PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE OVER RAILROADS (DES. 1703000)**

Based on the *Call Application Report* dated June 29, 2018 (Appendix I-26 to I-27), two alternatives were considered for this structure, demolition/elimination (preferred alternative), and the No Build, described below.

**No Build**

This alternative would leave this structure in its current unsafe and deteriorating condition. This alternative would incur no costs, and it would not require any ROW or impacts to natural resources. However, the bridge would continue to deteriorate, and safety issues would remain. Since this alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project, it was dismissed from further consideration.

**The No Build 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):

X
X
X

**ROADWAY CHARACTER:**

*If the proposed action includes multiple roadways, complete and duplicate for each roadway.*

Name of Roadway	<u>SR 912 (EB)</u>			
Functional Classification:	<u>Freeway</u>			
Current ADT:	<u>20,180</u>	VPD (2022)	Design Year ADT:	<u>20,772</u> VPD (2042)
Design Hour Volume (DHV):	<u>3,816</u>	Truck Percentage (%)	<u>10</u>	
Designed Speed (mph):	<u>60</u>	Legal Speed (mph):	<u>55</u>	

	Existing		Proposed	
Number of Lanes:	3		2	
Type of Lanes:	Through and Auxiliary		Through	
Pavement Width:	40-56	ft.	36-56	ft.
Shoulder Width:	10-12	ft.	10-12	ft.
Median Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.

Setting:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban	<input type="checkbox"/> Suburban	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural
Topography:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level	<input type="checkbox"/> Rolling	<input type="checkbox"/> Hilly

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Name of Roadway Michigan Avenue  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 5,288 VPD (2022) Design Year ADT: 5,317 VPD (2042)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 606 Truck Percentage (%) 18  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	5	5
Type of Lanes:	Through and Auxiliary	Through and Auxiliary
Pavement Width:	17-32 ft.	17-32 ft.
Shoulder Width:	5.9 ft.	5.9 ft.
Median Width:	2.5 ft.	2.5 ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway Ramp B / "Line PR-B" (EB SR 912/NB Michigan Avenue to NB Michigan Avenue)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 3,917 VPD (2023) Design Year ADT: 4,685 VPD (2043)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 722 Truck Percentage (%) 15  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	1	1
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width:	16-36 ft.	16 ft.
Shoulder Width:	2 ft.	N/A* ft. *2-ft curb/gutter
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway Ramp C / "Line PR-C Rev" (SB Michigan Avenue to SB Michigan Avenue)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 756 VPD (2023) Design Year ADT: 905 VPD (2043)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 112 Truck Percentage (%) 10  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	1	1
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width:	16-36 ft.	16 ft.
Shoulder Width:	2 ft.	N/A* ft. *2-ft curb/gutter
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Name of Roadway Ramp G (NB Michigan Avenue to EB SR 912)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 5,865 VPD (2022) Design Year ADT: 5,826 VPD (2042)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 814 Truck Percentage (%) 9  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	1	N/A (redundant ramp to be removed)
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	N/A
Pavement Width:	30-36 ft.	N/A ft.
Shoulder Width:	4-10 ft.	N/A ft.
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway Ramp H / "Line PR-H" (SB Michigan Avenue to EB SR 912)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 7,343 VPD (2023) Design Year ADT: 8,783 VPD (2043)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 1,255 Truck Percentage (%) 11  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	2	2
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width:	40-50 ft.	44-52 ft.
Shoulder Width:	4-10 ft.	10 ft.
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway Ramp I (WB SR 912 to NB Michigan Avenue)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 6,648 VPD (2022) Design Year ADT: 6,890 VPD (2042)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 3,547 Truck Percentage (%) 51  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	1	1
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width:	25 ft.	25 ft.
Shoulder Width:	2.5-6.5 ft.	2.5-6.5 ft.
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Name of Roadway Ramp NEC (SB Michigan Avenue to WB SR 912)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 5,865 VPD (2022) Design Year ADT: 5,826 VPD (2042)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 530 Truck Percentage (%) 9  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

Existing			Proposed		
Number of Lanes:	1		1		
Type of Lanes:	Ramp		Ramp		
Pavement Width:	25	ft.	25		ft.
Shoulder Width:	2.5-6.5	ft.	2.5-6.5		ft.
Median Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A		ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A		ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway Ramp SEL / "Line PR-SEC" (NB Michigan Avenue to NB Michigan Avenue/EB SR 912)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 5,201 VPD (2023) Design Year ADT: 6,221 VPD (2043)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 718 Truck Percentage (%) 12  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

Existing			Proposed		
Number of Lanes:	1-2		1-2		
Type of Lanes:	Ramp		Ramp		
Pavement Width:	20-32	ft.	16-32		ft.
Shoulder Width:	2-8	ft.	N/A*		ft. *2-ft curb/gutter
Median Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A		ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A		ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway Ramp "Line PR-SER" (EB SR 912 to NB Michigan Avenue)  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: 345 VPD (2023) Design Year ADT: 413 VPD (2043)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 36 Truck Percentage (%) 8  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

Existing			Proposed		
Number of Lanes:	N/A		1		
Type of Lanes:	Ramp		Ramp		
Pavement Width:	N/A	ft.	28-32		ft.
Shoulder Width:	N/A	ft.	4-8		ft.
Median Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A		ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A		ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Name of Roadway Roundabout ("RAB")  
 Functional Classification: Freeway (Ramp)  
 Current ADT: N/A VPD (2023) Design Year ADT: N/A VPD (2043)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): N/A Truck Percentage (%) N/A  
 Designed Speed (mph): 25 Legal Speed (mph): 25

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	N/A	1
Type of Lanes:	N/A	Roundabout
Pavement Width:	N/A	28-43
Shoulder Width:	N/A	10.7
Median Width:	N/A	N/A*
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	N/A

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

The following roadways are within the project area, situated beneath project bridges, and no work is proposed: WB SR 912, Ramp NER, and Block Avenue.

### BRIDGES AND/OR SMALL STRUCTURE(S):

*If the proposed action includes multiple structures, complete and duplicate for each bridge and/or small structure. Include both existing and proposed bridge(s) and/or small structure(s) in this section.*

#### Michigan Avenue Bridge

Structure/NBI Number(s): Existing: 912-45-02543 B / 33032 Sufficiency Rating: 77.3 (September 29, 2020 Bridge Inspection Report, Appendix I-4)  
 Proposed: 912-45-02815/ (TBD) (Rating, Source of Information)

	Existing	Proposed
Bridge/Structure Type:	Rolled Steel Beams	Rolled Steel Beams
Number of Spans:	7	6
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	N/A
Height Restrictions:	N/A	N/A
Curb to Curb Width:	61.8-121.5	61.5-146.5
Outside to Outside Width:	64.1-122.5	59.5-148.5
Shoulder Width:	N/A	N/A

#### Ramp B over B Bridge

Structure/NBI Number(s): Existing: 912-45-06596 B / 033035 Sufficiency Rating: 82.6 (September 29, 2020 Bridge Inspection Report, Appendix I-8)  
 Proposed: N/A (Rating, Source of Information)

	Existing	Proposed
Bridge/Structure Type:	3-Sided Cast-In-Place Rigid Frame	N/A (will be eliminated/replaced by roundabout)
Number of Spans:	1	N/A
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	N/A
Height Restrictions:	N/A	N/A
Curb to Curb Width:	37.0	N/A
Outside to Outside Width:	40.3	N/A
Shoulder Width:	N/A	N/A

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### **Ramp H over Ramp B Bridge**

Structure/NBI Number(s): Existing: 912-45-06596 JA/ 33036 Sufficiency Rating: 71.4 (September 29, 2020 Bridge Inspection Report, Appendix I-11)  
 Proposed: N/A (Rating, Source of Information)

	Existing		Proposed	
Bridge/Structure Type:	Adjacent Prestressed Concrete Box Beams		N/A (will be eliminated/replaced by roundabout)	
Number of Spans:	1		N/A	
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	ton	N/A	ton
Height Restrictions:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.
Curb to Curb Width:	33.1	ft.	N/A	ft.
Outside to Outside Width:	36.2	ft.	N/A	ft.
Shoulder Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.

### **Ramp I Bridge**

Structure/NBI Number(s): Existing: 912-45-02453 A RI / 033037 Sufficiency Rating: 92.8 (September 29, 2020 Bridge Inspection Report, Appendix I-16)  
 Proposed: N/A (Rating, Source of Information)

	Existing		Proposed	
Bridge/Structure Type:	Prestressed Concrete Girders		Prestressed Concrete Girders	
Number of Spans:	12		12	
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	ton	N/A	ton
Height Restrictions:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.
Curb to Curb Width:	25.0	ft.	25.0	ft.
Outside to Outside Width:	28.5	ft.	28.5	ft.
Shoulder Width:	2.5-6.5	ft.	2.5-6.5	ft.

### **Ramp NEC Bridge**

Structure/NBI Number(s): Existing: 912-45-02543 A NEC/ 33034 Sufficiency Rating: 31.6 (September 29, 2020 Bridge Inspection Report, Appendix I-20)  
 Proposed: N/A (Rating, Source of Information)

	Existing		Proposed	
Bridge/Structure Type:	Rolled Steel Beams		Steel Plate Girder	
Number of Spans:	6		6	
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	ton	N/A	ton
Height Restrictions:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.
Curb to Curb Width:	25.0	ft.	25.0	ft.
Outside to Outside Width:	28.4	ft.	28.4	ft.
Shoulder Width:	2.5 to 6.5	ft.	2.6 to 6.6	ft.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### Closed Pedestrian Bridge

Structure/NBI Number(s): Existing: 912-45-02543 ADJ/ 33033 Sufficiency Rating: N/A (September 29, 2020 Bridge Inspection Report, Appendix I-24)  
 Proposed: N/A (Rating, Source of Information)

	Existing		Proposed	
Bridge/Structure Type:	Steel and Concrete Beams		N/A	
Number of Spans:	6		N/A	
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	ton	N/A	ton
Height Restrictions:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.
Curb to Curb Width:	6.0	ft.	N/A	ft.
Outside to Outside Width:	7.0	ft.	N/A	ft.
Shoulder Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A	ft.

Describe impacts and work involving bridge(s), culvert(s), pipe(s), and small structure(s). Provide details for small structure(s): structure number, type, size (length and dia.), location and impacts to water. Use a table if the number of small structures becomes large. If the table exceeds a complete page, put it in the appendix and summarize the information below with a citation to the table.

This project involves six bridges that are summarized in the above- and below-tables. Current and proposed structure locations are shown on the exhibits in Appendix B-3 to B-6.

INDOT Structure No. NBI No.	Des. No.	Bridge Name Historic Status	Summary of Work*	Impacts to Water Resources or Cultural Resources
912-45-02543 B 33032	1703011	Michigan Avenue not historic	Bridge Replacement	0.072 acre of wetlands (see the Wetlands section for further discussion)
912-45-06596 B 33050	1703012	Ramp B over B "Non-Select" historic	Bridge Removal	Bridge will be demolished (see Cultural Resources and Section 4(f) Sections for further discussion)
912-45-06596 JA 33036	1700105	Ramp H over B not historic	Bridge Removal	None
912-45-02543 A RI 007200	1700359	Ramp I not historic	Bridge Rehabilitation	None
912-45-02543 A NEC 33034	1700370	Ramp NEC not historic	Bridge Rehabilitation	None
912-45-02545 ADJ 33033	1703000	Closed Pedestrian Bridge not historic	Bridge Removal	None

\* Refer to the Project Description (Preferred Alternative) section and the Project Plans in Appendix B-9 to B-32 for further details.

Additionally, several existing drainage culverts (less than 36-inches in diameter) will be extended and/or replaced within the southern portion of the interchange, and drainage inlets will be replaced/upgraded as needed. This drainage work will connect to the existing subgrade storm sewer system. Therefore, it will not impact water resources.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

<b>MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (MOT) DURING CONSTRUCTION:</b>
--

	Yes	No
Is a temporary bridge proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is a temporary roadway proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the project involve the use of a detour or require a ramp closure? (describe below)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provisions will be made for access by local traffic and so posted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provisions will be made for through-traffic dependent businesses.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provisions will be made to accommodate any local special events or festivals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will the proposed MOT substantially change the environmental consequences of the action?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there substantial controversy associated with the proposed method for MOT?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Discuss closures and/or facilities (if any) that will be provided for maintenance of traffic. Any known impacts from these temporary measures should be quantified to the extent possible, particularly with respect to properties such as Section 4(f) resources and wetlands. Any local concerns about access and traffic flow should be detailed as well.*

The MOT for the project will be conducted in two, year-long phases (Appendix B-5, and B-13 to B-18). At least one EB lane along SR 912 will be maintained throughout construction, as well as both WB lanes of SR 912. The first year-long phase will allow Ramps I and NEC to remain open, while the south side of the SR 912 Michigan Avenue interchange and the Michigan Avenue bridge will be closed. During the second year phase the Michigan Avenue bridge and all of the project ramps will be closed. The MOT will be implemented per *Indiana Design Manual (IDM)* guidelines.

In accordance with the IDM, the proposed closure of Michigan Avenue does not require an official detour, because it is not a state or federal facility. There are nearby, well-signed, redundant ramps and bridges that will continue to provide access to both sides of SR 912 during construction (see Photo 2, Appendix B-7 and Photo 7, Appendix B-8 for example signs). Specifically, there is an overpass bridge located approximately 0.4-mile southeast of the Michigan Avenue Bridge at the "Ameristar Interchange", INDOT Structure No. 912-45-12001 A (Appendix B-5). This structure carries ramps to and from SR 912 over the railroad tracks to Aldis Street, where motorists can access the public marina and beach park, casino, steel mill, and other amenities located northeast of SR 912 and the railroads (and southwest of Lake Michigan). Motorists (including public transit) needing to cross SR 912 and the railroads from the residential/commercial area south of the project interchange will be able to access this area via ramps at the SR 912 and Guthrie Street interchange, located approximately 1.0-mile southeast of the Michigan Avenue bridge.

Two public transit authorities operate in the project area, Gary Public Transportation Corporation and East Chicago Bus Transit (Appendix J-11 to J-13). The East Chicago Bus Transit "West Calumet" route utilizes the Michigan Avenue bridge (Appendix J-13). Early coordination letters (ECLs) were sent to the transit authorities on March 30, 2022 (Appendix C-1 to C-3). No response was received. A representative of the East Chicago transit authority attended the public hearing held on September 27, 2022 and discussed the project with team members (Appendix G-48). No comments were received within the comment period that ended on October 11, 2022. Coordination with the two transit authorities and City of East Chicago officials will be required prior to Ready for Contracts (RFC) stage. The contractor will be required to notify transit authorities at least 30 days prior to closures. This is included in the Environmental Commitments section of this document.

The proposed closures of the ramps and bridges will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists (including school buses, public transit, and emergency services); however, no significant delays are anticipated, and all inconveniences and delays will cease upon project completion.

On June 18, 2021, ECLs were sent to local stakeholders including schools and emergency services (Appendix C-1 to C-3), see the Early Coordination section for details. No comments regarding the proposed MOT were received.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:

Engineering: \$ 93,320 (2022)  
 Engineering: \$ 50,000 (2024) Right-of-Way: \$ 9,500\* (2022) Construction: \$ 36,877,437 (2024)

(Appendix H-12 to H-13)

\* ROW for FY 2023 was switched to state funding.

Anticipated Start Date of Construction: Spring 2024

### RIGHT OF WAY:

Land Use Impacts	Amount (acres)	
	Permanent	Temporary
Residential	N/A	N/A
Commercial	N/A	N/A
Agricultural	N/A	N/A
Forest	N/A	N/A
Wetlands	N/A	N/A
Other: Industrial	N/A	4.83
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>4.83</b>

\*

*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, reacquisition or easements, either known or suspected, and their impacts on the environmental analysis should be discussed.*

The existing ROW primarily consists of the project roadways and ramps, the project bridges, and the maintained grassy infields in the southern portion of the interchange. There is also shared ROW beneath the Michigan Avenue, Ramp I, and Ramp NEC bridges, consisting of INDOT ramps, local streets, and the railroad corridor that is "shared" by INDOT with the applicable entity (City of Chicago and/or railroads). The existing ROW averages approximately 1,200 to 1,500 feet wide at the interchange. This project includes approximately 0.11 acre of reacquisition of existing apparent ROW, which is already in a transportation use as the embankments at the north end of the Michigan Avenue Bridge (Appendix B-12 and J-14).

The project requires approximately 2.81 acres of temporary ROW, plus 2.02 acres of "right-of-entry" ROW. The 2.81 acres of temporary ROW is needed from industrial landowners for work along the north side of the Michigan Avenue Bridge abutment and approach, and the foundations of the Closed Pedestrian Bridge (Appendix B-12 and J-14). This project also requires 2.02 acres of restricted, temporary "right-of-entry" ROW to allow contractors access to the project area. This area consists of an existing, paved private drive owned by an industrial entity. No construction work will be allowed within this area, including but not limited to staging, excavating, etc. Since this area was not included in the initial environmental study area (including Section 106), a firm commitment is included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

The ECLs sent during preliminary project development under-estimated the amount of temporary ROW that would be required (specifically, 0.79 acre) (Appendix C-2). Further coordination with resource agencies was not needed because it is limited to temporary ROW from the adjacent steel mill and railroad that is already functioning as maintained roadside embankment or paved private drives (see Appendix B-6). The increase in temporary ROW amount was communicated to the INDOT Cultural Resources Office (CRO) on February 8, 2022 and further action was not required (Appendix D-101 to D-102).

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

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County     Lake    

Route     SR 912    

Des. No.     1703011 (lead)    

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

#### SECTION A - EARLY COORDINATION:

List the date(s) coordination was sent and all resource 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.

ECLs were sent on June 18, 2021 (Appendix C-1 to C-3).

Agency	Dates Sent	Date Response Received	Appendix
FHWA	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
Indiana Geological and Water Survey (IGWS)*	June 18, 2021	June 18, 2021	C-8 to C-10
Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife (IDNR-DFW)	June 18, 2021	July 16, 2021	C-4 to C-5
Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM)*	June 18, 2021	N/A*	N/A
National Park Service	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
US Department of Housing & Urban Development (US HUD)	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
INDOT LaPorte District	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
INDOT Environmental Services	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
INDOT Office of Aviation	June 18, 2021	June 21, 2021	C-11
US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Chicago District	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	June 18, 2021	July 1, 2021	C-6 to C-7
Lake County Council	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
Lake County Highway Department	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
Lake County Surveyor	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
Lake County Commission	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
City of East Chicago Police Department	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
City of East Chicago Fire Department	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC)	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
School City of East Chicago	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
City of East Chicago Marina	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
City of East Chicago Mayor's Office	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
City of East Chicago Common Council	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
City of East Chicago Parks and Recreation	June 18, 2021	No response received	N/A
Gary Public Transportation Corp	March 30, 2022	No response received	N/A
East Chicago Bus Transit	March 30, 2022	No response received	N/A

\* Electronic coordination (The IDEM electronic-coordination letter was omitted per recent INDOT guidance)

All applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

**SECTION B – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

**Streams, Rivers, Watercourses & Other Jurisdictional Features**

- Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers
- State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers
- Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed
- Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana
- Navigable Waterways

Presence


Impacts

Yes	No

Total stream(s) in project area: N/A Linear feet      Total impacted stream(s): N/A Linear feet

Stream Name	Classification	Total Size in Project Area (linear feet)	Impacted linear feet	Comments (i.e. location, flow direction, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Describe all streams, rivers, watercourses and other jurisdictional features adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts (both permanent and temporary) will occur to the features identified. Include if the streams or rivers are listed on any federal or state lists for Indiana. Include if features are subject to federal or state jurisdiction. Discuss measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.*

Based on the desktop review, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), and the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11), there are three streams, rivers, watercourses, or other jurisdictional features within the 0.5 mile search radius. There are no streams, rivers, watercourse, or other jurisdictional features within or adjacent to the project area, which was confirmed by the site visits on July 14, 15, and 16, 2021, and October 5, 2021, by Parsons (hereinafter referred to as the 2021 site visits). Therefore, no impacts are expected.

A *Waters of the US (WOUS) Report* was approved by the INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office (EWPO) on January 26, 2022. Please refer to Appendix F-3 to F-24 for the WOUS. It was determined that there are no streams, rivers, watercourse, or other jurisdictional features within or adjacent to the project area. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

IDNR-DFW responded to early coordination on July 16, 2021 with standard recommendations to protect water resources, such as erosion control and revegetating disturbed areas (Appendix C-4 to C-5). All applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

**Open Water Feature(s)**

- Reservoirs
- Lakes
- Farm Ponds
- Retention/Detention Basin
- Storm Water Management Facilities
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Presence


Impacts

Yes	No

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

*Describe all open water feature(s) identified adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts (both permanent and temporary) will occur to the features identified. Include if features are subject to federal or state jurisdiction. Discuss measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.*

Based on the desktop review, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), and the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11) there are four open water features within the 0.5-mile search radius, including Lake Michigan. There are no open water features within or adjacent to the project area. That number was confirmed by the 2021 site visits. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Responses to early coordination did not contain recommendations applicable to open water features, except IDNR-DFW stated a Lake Michigan Coastal Program Federal Consistency review may be required (Appendix C-4 to C-5). Based on INDOT's October 2019, *Lake Michigan Coastal Zone Guidance* (<https://www.in.gov/indot/engineering/files/LMCP-guidance-October-2019.pdf>) this project is exempt because it will have a USACE Section 404 Nationwide General Permit and further coordination is not required.

	<b>Presence</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	
<b>Wetlands</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Total wetland area: <u>0.072</u> Acre(s)	Total wetland area impacted: <u>0.072</u> Acre(s)		

(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 (Acres)	Impacted Acres	Comments (i.e. location, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
Wetland 1	Emergent	0.042	0.042	Located south of SR 912 and north of Michigan Avenue/Ramp C (Appendix F-15). Likely a Water of the State; however, INDOT is requesting USACE take jurisdiction.
Wetland 2	Emergent	0.030	0.030	Located east of, and partially underneath, the Michigan Avenue Bridge (Appendix F-18). Likely a Water of the State; however, INDOT is requesting USACE take jurisdiction.

**Wetlands** (Mark all that apply)

Wetland Determination  
Wetland Delineation  
USACE Isolated Waters Determination

**Documentation**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

**ESD Approval Dates**

<b>January 18, 2002</b>
<b>January 18, 2022</b>

**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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

*Describe all wetlands identified adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts (both permanent and temporary) will occur to the features identified. Include if features are subject to federal or state jurisdiction. Discuss measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.*

Based on the desktop review, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), and the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11) there are two wetlands within the 0.5-mile search radius. There are no mapped wetlands within or adjacent to the project area. That number was updated to two by the 2021 site visits.

A WOUS Report was approved by the INDOT EWPO on January 26, 2022. Please refer to Appendix F-3 to F-24 for the WOUS report. As previously discussed, some of the appended documents, including the WOUS Report, include study areas that were investigated for related projects that are covered under separate environmental documents. It was determined that there are two likely jurisdictional wetlands present within or adjacent to the project area totaling 0.072 acre. The wetlands are summarized in the above table and shown on the figures in Appendix F-7 to F-12. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

Wetland 1 is classified as an emergent wetland that is approximately 0.042 acre in size. It is located south of SR 912 and north of Michigan Avenue/Ramp C (Appendix F-15). Wetland 1 is a poor quality wetland that is likely a water of the State. All of Wetland 1, 0.042 acre, will be impacted by this project.

Wetland 2 is classified as an emergent wetland that is approximately 0.030 acre in size. It is located east of, and partially underneath, the Michigan Avenue Bridge (Appendix F-18). Wetland 2 is classified as an average-quality wetland. All of Wetland 2, 0.030 acre, will be impacted by this project.

Impacts to Wetlands 1 and 2 cannot be avoided because they are present within the portion of the interchange that needs to be regraded and reconfigured, and the Michigan Avenue Bridge needs to be replaced (see the Purpose and Need section for further discussion). The project will require a USACE Section 404 permit and an IDEM Section 401 Water Quality Certification before impacting these resources. Mitigation for wetlands impacts is not anticipated. There is no practicable alternative to the proposed new construction in wetlands and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use. FHWA approval of this document will constitute approval of the adverse impacts to wetlands.

IDNR-DFW responded to early coordination on July 16, 2021, with a recommendation to contact and coordinate with the IDEM 401 program and the USACE 404 program since there are wetlands in the project area (Appendix C-4 to C-5).

	<b>Presence</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	
<b>Terrestrial Habitat</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Total terrestrial habitat in project area: 7.5 Acre(s) Total tree clearing: 0.00 Acre(s)

*Describe types of terrestrial habitat (i.e. forested, grassland, farmland, lawn, etc.) adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts will occur to habitat identified. Include total terrestrial habitat impacted and total tree clearing that will occur. Discuss measure to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.*

Based on a desktop review, a site visit on March 12, 2020 by Parsons, and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), habitats within the project area consist of maintained grassy infield and roadside. Dominant species include common species of grasses (*Festuca arundinacea* and *Setaria pumila*), clover (*Trifolium repens*), and broadleaf plantain (*Plantago major*). Much of the project area is paved.

A total of approximately 7.5 acres of terrestrial habitat will be disturbed by this project, primarily within the southern interchange where the existing ramps will be reconfigured. All disturbed areas will be paved or completed with soil and a standard seed mix. Therefore, this project should provide a net benefit to terrestrial habitat by removing redundant ramps and replacing them with maintained vegetation. Avoiding impacts to terrestrial habitat is not feasible because it is present within existing ROW, and the bridge and sidewalks need to be replaced. There are no trees within the project area; therefore, no tree trimming or clearing will occur. Mitigation is not anticipated.

Based on the site visits, common wildlife such as small mammals, reptiles, birds (including migratory birds), and amphibians likely inhabit isolated portions of the project area as the majority of the project area is industrial land. Work on the Michigan Avenue interchange should not create conditions that are less favorable to wildlife compared to current conditions. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

IDNR-DFW responded to early coordination on July 16, 2021, with recommendations to consider wildlife crossings, minimize lighting impacts, and revegetate disturbed surfaces (Appendix C-4 to C-5). Applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

**Protected Species**

**Federally Listed Bats**

Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) determination key completed  
 Section 7 informal consultation completed (IPaC cannot be completed)  
 Section 7 formal consultation Biological Assessment (BA) required

Yes	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Determination Received for Listed Bats from USFWS:      NE       NLAA       LAA

**Other Species not included in IPaC**

Additional federal species found in project area (based on IPaC species list)  
 State species (not bird) found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR)

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Migratory Birds**

Known usage or presence of birds (i.e. nests)  
 State bird species based upon coordination with IDNR

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Discuss IDNR coordination and species identified. Describe USFWS Section 7 consultation and determination received for Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat impacts. Discuss if other federally listed species were identified. If so, include consultation that has occurred and the determination that was received. Discuss if migratory birds have been observed and any impacts.*

Based on a desktop review and the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11) approved by INDOT on January 19, 2022, the IDNR Lake County Endangered, Threatened and Rare (ETR) Species List has been checked and is provided at [https://www.in.gov/dnr/nature-preserves/files/np\\_Lake.pdf](https://www.in.gov/dnr/nature-preserves/files/np_Lake.pdf). According to the IDNR-DFW early coordination response letter dated July 16, 2021 (Appendix C-4 to C-5), the Natural Heritage Program's Database has been checked, and no plant or animal species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been reported to occur in the project vicinity. An INDOT 0.5-mile bat review occurred on March 16, 2022, which did not indicate the presence of endangered bat species.

Project information was submitted through the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) portal, and an official species list was generated (Appendix C-12 to C-24). The project is within range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (*Myotis septentrionalis*).

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, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and USFWS. Bridge inspections occurred on July 14 and 15, 2021, and no evidence of migratory birds or bats were observed at the structures. An effect determination key was completed on March 28, 2022, and based on the responses provided, the project was found "Not Likely To Adversely Affect" the Indiana bat and/or the NLEB (Appendix C-25 to C-36). INDOT reviewed and concurred with the effect finding on March 29, 2022, and requested USFWS's review of the finding. No response was received from USFWS within the 14-day review period; therefore, it was concluded they concur with the finding. Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs) for this project include Lighting AMM1, Lighting AMM 2, and General AMM 1. They are included as firm commitments in the Environmental Commitments section of this document.

The official species list generated from IPaC indicated three other species present within the project area, the federally endangered piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and federally threatened red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*) and pitcher's thistle (*Cirsium pitcheri*). This project will not impact the types of habitat typically associated with these species (e.g., lakeshore dunes), and it falls under the 2013 USFWS Interim Policy ([https://www.in.gov/indot/engineering/files/USFWS-Interim-Policy\\_2013.pdf](https://www.in.gov/indot/engineering/files/USFWS-Interim-Policy_2013.pdf)). The official species list also mentions the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) as a candidate species, but currently there is no guidance on this species. Therefore, no further coordination is needed with USFWS.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

IDNR-DFW's response to early coordination dated July 16, 2021 did not include applicable recommendations related to protected species (Appendix C-4 to C-5). USFWS responded to early coordination on July 1, 2021, stating there is no habitat for the piping plover, Rufa red knot, and pitcher's thistle within the proposed project area, so the project is not likely to adversely these species (Appendix C-6 to C-7).

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.

### Geological and Mineral Resources

Project located within the Potential Karst Features Area of Indiana  
 Karst features identified within or adjacent to the project area  
 Oil/gas or exploration/abandoned wells identified in the project area

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Date Karst Study/Report reviewed by INDOT EWPO (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

*Discuss if project is located in Potential Karst Features Area of Indiana and if any karst features have been identified in the project area (from RFI). Discuss response received from IGWS coordination. Discuss if any mines, oil/gas, or exploration/abandoned wells were identified and if impacts will occur. Describe if any impacts will occur to any karst features. Include discussion of karst study/report was completed and results. (Karst investigation must comply with the current Karst MOU and coordinated and reviewed by INDOT EWPO)*

Based on a desktop review, the project is located outside the designated karst region of Indiana as outlined in the October 13, 1993, MOU. According to the topo map of the project area (Appendix B-2), the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11), and IndianaMap (<http://www.indianamap.org/>), there are no karst features identified within or adjacent to the project area.

In the early coordination response dated February 14, 2022, IGWS did not indicate that karst features exist within the project area (Appendix C-8 to C-10). Their response noted that the project area has a high liquefaction potential, a high potential for bedrock resources, a low potential for sand and gravel resources, a 1% annual chance flood hazard, and that there are documented active mineral resources extraction sites in the area (Appendix C-8). Response from IGWS has been communicated with the designer on February 14, 2022. No impacts are expected.

### SECTION C – OTHER RESOURCES

#### Drinking Water Resources

Wellhead Protection Area(s)  
 Source Water Protection Area(s)  
 Water Well(s)  
 Urbanized Area Boundary  
 Public Water System(s)

<u>Presence</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	
	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Is the project located in the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer (SSA):

If Yes, is the FHWA/EPA SSA MOU Applicable?

If Yes, is a Groundwater Assessment Required?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

*Check the appropriate boxes and discuss each topic below. Provide details about impacts and summarize resource-specific coordination responses and any mitigation commitments. Reference responses in the Appendix.*

The project is located in Lake 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 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not applicable to this project, a detailed groundwater assessment is not needed, and no impacts are expected.

The IDEM's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (<http://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/pages/wellhead/>) was accessed on January 10, 2022, by Parsons. This project is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area, but it is within a Source Water Area (SWA) for City of East Chicago Water. The SWA cannot be avoided because it is located throughout the project area. Coordination with City of East Chicago Water is ongoing (see Utility Log, Appendix J-1). Based on the IDEM Ground Water website, community public water systems are responsible for defining their SWA, identifying potential sources of contaminants, and creating contingency plans, among other responsibilities (<https://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/2456.htm>). This project requires an IDEM Rule 5 Construction Stormwater General Permit (Rule 5 permit) for stormwater management and erosion control measures, including a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). This project will comply with the SWA because any potential sources of contamination will be addressed by INDOT's standard specifications and the project's Rule 5 permit. Therefore, no impacts to the SWA are expected.

The IDNR Water Well Record Database website (<https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm>) was accessed on February 10, 2022, by Parsons. No wells are located near this project. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Based on a desktop review of the INDOT Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) website (<https://entapps.indot.in.gov/MS4/>) by Parsons on January 10, 2022, and the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11), this project is located within the City of East Chicago's Urban Area Boundary (UAB). An ECL was sent to the local MS4 Coordinator on June 18, 2021 (Appendix C-1 to C-3). A response was not received. Utility coordination for this project is ongoing and includes the City of East Chicago. A copy of the Utility Coordination Log is provided in Appendix J-1. The project includes storm water system improvements that will comply with 327 IAC 15-13 (Rule 13). Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Based on a desktop review, the 2021 site visits, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), and utility coordination, this project is located where there is a public water system, operated by the City of East Chicago. Although there are conflicts to resolve, the public water supply will not be affected because utility coordination is occurring and there will be no disruption to service (Appendix J-1). The City of East Chicago did not respond to early coordination (Appendix C-1 to C-3).

<b>Floodplains</b>	<u>Presence</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Project located within a regulated floodplain	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Longitudinal encroachment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transverse encroachment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Homes located in floodplain within 1000' up/downstream from project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If applicable, indicate the Floodplain Level?

Level 1  Level 2  Level 3  Level 4  Level 5

*Use the IDNR Floodway Information Portal to help determine potential impacts. Include floodplain map in appendix. Discuss impacts according to the classification system. If encroachment on a flood plain will occur, coordinate with the Local Flood Plain Administrator during design to insure consistency with the local flood plain planning.*

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources Indiana Floodway Information Portal website (<http://dnrmmaps.dnr.in.gov/appsphp/fdms/>) was accessed on February 12, 2022 by Parsons. This project is not located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from approved IDNR floodplain maps (Appendix F-2). Therefore, it does not fall within the guidelines for the implementation of 23 CFR 650, 23 CFR 771, and 44 CFR. No impacts are expected.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Farmland	Presence	Impacts	
		Yes	No
Agricultural Lands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prime Farmland (per NRCS)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Total Points (from Section VII of CPA-106/AD-1006\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
*\*If 160 or greater, see CE Manual for guidance.*

Discuss existing farmland resources in the project area, impacts that will occur to farmland, and mitigation and minimization measures considered.

Based on a desktop review, the 2021 site visits, and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), 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.

### SECTION D – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Minor Projects PA Category(ies) and Type(s)  INDOT Approval Date(s)  N/A

**Full 106 Effect Finding**  
 No Historic Properties Affected  No Adverse Effect  Adverse Effect

**Eligible and/or Listed Resources Present**  
 NRHP Building/Site/District(s)  Archaeology  NRHP Bridge(s)

Documentation Prepared (mark all that apply)	ESD Approval Date(s)	SHPO Approval Date(s)
APE, Eligibility and Effect Determination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	February 17, 2022
800.11 Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	February 17, 2022
Historic Properties Report or Short Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	June 16, 2021
Archaeological Records Check and Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	June 16, 2021
Archaeological Phase Ia Survey Report		
Archaeological Phase Ic Survey Report		
Other: Historic Bridge Alternatives Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	December 3, 2021
Other:		

Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)  **MOA Signature Dates** (List all signatories)  
(Not required under the Historic Bridge PA)

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

If the project falls under the MPPA, describe the category(ies) that the project falls under and any approval dates. If the project requires full Section 106, use the headings provided. The completion of the Section 106 process requires that a Legal Notice be published in local newspapers. Please indicate the publication date, name of the paper(s) and the comment period deadline. Include any further Section 106 work which must be completed at a later date, such as mitigation from a MOA or avoidance commitments.

Per the terms of the Historic Bridges PA, the FHWA will satisfy its Section 106 responsibilities involving "Select" and "Non-Select" bridges through the Project Development Process (PDP) of the Historic Bridges PA (Stipulation III). Since the Ramp B over B Bridge is "Non-Select", the procedures outlined in Stipulation III.B. of the Historic Bridges PA will be followed to fulfill FHWA's Section 106 responsibilities for the bridge. A copy of the Historic Bridges PA can be downloaded here: <http://www.in.gov/indot/2530.htm>.

**Area of Potential Effect (APE):** Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.16(d), the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for aboveground resources was determined by sight lines and extends approximately 370 to 1,115 feet from the project area. The APE for archaeology was the project footprint.

**Coordination with Consulting Parties (CPs):** Early coordination was initiated on December 10, 2020 with a letter inviting organizations and individuals to become CPs (Appendix D-28 to D-34). The Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) from IDNR-Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) is a designated CP. The following is a list of the organizations and individuals formally invited to become a CP (those organizations who accepted the invitation to become a CP are identified by bold text):

- Mayor, City of East Chicago
- East Chicago Common Council Members
- City Engineer, City of East Chicago
- Planning and Economic Development, City of East Chicago
- Lake County Commissioners
- Lake County Highway Department
- Indiana Landmarks
- Northwest Indiana Regional Planning
- Lake County Historical Society and Museum
- East Chicago Historical Society
- Indiana Historic Spans Task Force
- Historic Hoosier Bridges
- Historic Bridge Foundation
- Historic Bridges.org
- DePauw University
- Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
- **Miami Tribe of Oklahoma**
- Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
- **Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians**
- Shawnee Tribe
- Forest County Potawatomi Community

The SHPO responded to the early coordination letter on December 28, 2020 (Appendix D-39 to D-40). The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi accepted consulting party status on January 8, 2021 (Appendix D-41 and D-42). The responses to early coordination did not identify potential resources; they requested stop-work and immediate consultation if any archaeological resources are discovered (Appendix D-41 to D-42).

**Archaeology:** Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(b), staff from ASC conducted a project review and records check, which did not identify potential resources (Appendix D-9). No further work was recommended. The results of the archaeology review were distributed to CPs on May 18, 2021 (Appendix D-43 to D-49). The Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians responded on June 14, 2021, indicating the project should have No Adverse Effect on significant resources (Appendix D-50). The SHPO responded on June 16, 2021, and did not identify known archaeological resources within the project area (Appendix D-51 to D-52). No further responses were received.

**Historic Properties:** ASC prepared the *Historical Properties Report* (HPR) on May 18, 2020 (Appendix D-24 to D-25). The following two resources within the APE are listed in, or are eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP):

Inland Steel Office Building/ArcelorMittal Human Resources (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory [IHSSI] No. 089-679-35181): This seven-story Art Deco office building was built circa 1930 and designed by the noted Chicago architectural firm of Graham, Anderson, Probst, and White, who designed a variety of notable buildings in the early twentieth century. The building was

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

determined eligible under Criteria A and C for its significance as a component of Inland Steel's East Chicago complex and as a good example of Art Deco architecture (Appendix D-20).

Ramp B over B Bridge (Structure No. 912-45-06596 B; National Bridge Inventory [NBI] No. 33035): The bridge is a reinforced concrete rigid frame bridge built in 1959, with horizontal curved decks that represent an important bridge construction technique and exemplifies an uncommon highway bridge type in Indiana. The structure is eligible under Criteria C as it represents an early or distinctive phase in bridge construction, design, or engineering and it retains historic integrity (Appendix D-18 to D-19). This structure was classified as a "Non-Select" bridge by the INDOT *Historic Bridge Inventory*.

The HPR was distributed to CPs on May 18, 2021 (Appendix D-43 to D-49). The Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians responded on June 14, 2021, indicating the project should have No Adverse Effect on significant resources (Appendix D-50). The SHPO responded on June 16, 2021 concurring with the findings of the HPR (Appendix D-51 to D-53). No further responses were received.

As described in the Other Alternatives Considered section, an HBAA was prepared for this project to fulfill FHWA's Section 106 responsibilities for the bridge and any effect to the bridge through the Historic Bridges PA. The HBAA was distributed to CPs on November 8, 2021 (Appendix D-54 to D-59). Based on the HBAA, no reasonable and prudent alternative would result in the salvage of the historic bridge, and replacing the bridge in its current location would leave in place geometric deficiencies outlined in the purpose and need. The SHPO responded on December 3, 2021, concurring that there is no alternative that meets the project's purpose and need that is both feasible and prudent (Appendix D-60 to D-62). No other responses were received.

Pursuant to the Historic Bridges PA, several steps were undertaken to market the Ramp B over B Bridge. The marketing measures that have occurred include:

- A public notice published in the *Indianapolis Star* on December 17, 2020 (Appendix D-64 to D-66);
- A public notice published in the *NWI Times* on December 18, 2020 (Appendix D-67 to D-70);
- Availability of the bridge posted to the INDOT marketing website on December 17, 2020 (D-71 to D-72); and
- A bridge marketing sign was installed at the bridge site on January 19, 2021 (Appendix D-69 to D-70).

As discussed in the Public Involvement section, no party contacted INDOT or the project team indicating an interest in assuming ownership of the bridge.

**Documentation Findings:** INDOT, acting on behalf of FHWA, issued the following findings on February 3, 2022 (Appendix D-5 to D-15):

Inland Steel Office Building/ArcelorMittal Human Resources (IHSSI No. 089-679-35181): "No Adverse Effect"

The project will have no direct effects on this structure. The existing interchange is in the view shed of the office building, and when complete, the preferred alternative's roundabout and its approaches will be in approximately the same location. The nearest component of the project is 0.07 mile (365 feet) south of the office building. The project will not physically impact, remove, or cause neglect to the building. The undertaking will not introduce an intrusive new visual element that will diminish the integrity of setting of the structure, and it will not introduce new atmospheric or audible elements to the resource's setting. Additionally, there will be no change in ownership of the building.

Pursuant to 800.5(c), the SHPO concurred with these findings on February 17, 2022 (Appendix D-74 to D-76). On April 14, 2022, INDOT CRO requested that the Division Director issue a letter of clearance exempting this project from obtaining a Certificate of Approval under IC 14-21-1-18 (Appendix D-96 to D-98). On April 27, 2022, SHPO issued a letter stating "since there will be no adverse impact to the...[Inland Steel Office Building], we have determined, pursuant to 312 IAC 20-4-11.5(f), that with a finding of 'No Adverse Effect' under 36 C.F.R. 800, a certificate of approval from the Review Board is not necessary. Accordingly, this letter serves as a director's letter of clearance" (Appendix D-99 to D-100). Interested persons have 15 days to request a member of the Review Board to provide a hearing and review, otherwise then the division director's letter of clearance is affirmed. Additionally, a public hearing was held on September 27, 2022, see the Public Involvement section for further discussion.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Ramp B over B Bridge Structure No. 912-45-06596 B; NBI No. 33035)

The preferred alternative will eliminate this resource. As previously stated, this structure was classified as a “Non-Select” bridge by the INDOT *Historic Bridge Inventory* and thus the Stipulation III procedures outlined in the Historic Bridges PA are being followed.

SHPO’s February 17, 2022 letter requested 90% final bridge plans for the bridge replacement and photographic documentation prior to demolition (Appendix D-74 to D-76). On April 14, 2022, INDOT CRO submitted the requested photographic documentation to IDNR-DHPA (Appendix D-96 to D-98). Furthermore, INDOT CRO clarified the request for final plans is not applicable since the preferred alternative includes demolition of the historic structure.

On April 27, 2022, the SHPO responded that the documentation is acceptable (Appendix D-99 to D-100). The photographic documentation will be stored at the State Archives and East Chicago Public Library. Further mitigation is not required.

**Public Involvement:** A public notice of the “No Adverse Effect” finding was advertised in the *NWI Times* on February 10, 2022. As advertised, the public comment period ended 30 days later on March 12, 2022. The text of the public notice and affidavit of publication are provided in Appendix D-77 to D-80. No comments were received.

Regarding non-historic bridge resources, the Section 106 process has been completed, and the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 have been fulfilled. In order to fulfill the requirements of the Historic Bridges PA, a public hearing was held on September 27, 2022. Details are discussed in the Public Involvement section of this CE document. During the comment period that ended on October 11, 2022, no comments were received and no party contacted INDOT or the project team indicating an interest in assuming ownership of the bridge. On October 24, 2022, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma responded that the project proposes No Adverse Effect or known endangerment to known sites of interest (Appendix G-50).

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

<b>SECTION E – SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES/ SECTION 6(f) RESOURCES</b>
---

	<u>Presence</u>	<u>Use</u>	
		Yes	No
<b>Parks and Other Recreational Land</b>			
Publicly owned park	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publicly owned recreation area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges</b>			
National Wildlife Refuge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National Natural Landmark	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State Wildlife Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State Nature Preserve	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Historic Properties</b>			
Site eligible and/or listed on the NRHP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NRHP Bridge(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluations Prepared**

Programmatic Section 4(f)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
“De minimis” Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual Section 4(f)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any exception included in 23 CFR 774.13	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Discuss Programmatic Section 4(f) and “de minimis” Section 4(f) impacts in the discussion below. Individual Section 4(f) documentation must be included in the appendix and summarized below. Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 4(f). FHWA has identified various exceptions to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval. Refer to 23 CFR § 774.13 - Exceptions.*

Section 4(f) of the U.S. 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 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, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), Section 106 Documentation (Appendix D), and the RFI report (Appendix E), there are 13 potential Section 4(f) resources located within the 0.5 mile search radius. According to Section 106 Documentation (Appendix D), and the 2021 site visits, there are three Section 4(f) resources located within or adjacent to the project area, the two previously-described aboveground historic resources, the Inland Steel Office Building and the Ramp B over B Bridge, discussed further below, and the East Chicago Marina and Jerose Park Beach.

Regarding the East Chicago Marina and Jerose Park Beach properties, these are a Section 4(f) resource because they are a publicly-owned recreational facility and park. These properties are located adjacent to the northeast of project area (Appendices B-4 and E-8). As discussed in the MOT section, construction will not block or limit access because the nearby Ameristar interchange will remain open. The project will not use recreational and park resources by taking permanent ROW (i.e., permanent incorporation) and will not indirectly use the resources in such a way that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the resources for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired (i.e., constructive use). Therefore, no Section 4(f) use is expected. ECLs were sent to City of East Chicago Marina and Parks and Recreation departments (Appendix C-1 to C-3) and no response was received.

As discussed in the Cultural Resources section, the Inland Steel Office Building and the Ramp B over B Bridge are eligible for listing in the NRHP. See the Cultural Resources section and Appendix D for a discussion of each resource’s characteristics.

According to the FHWA *Section 4(f) Policy Paper*, Section 4(f) applies to “all historic sites that are listed, or eligible for inclusion, in the...[NRHP] at the local, state, or national level of significance regardless of whether or not the historic site is publicly owned or open to the public.” Therefore, Section 4(f) applies to both resources.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

According to 23 CFR 774.17, a Section 4(f) "Use" is defined as

Except as set forth in §§ 774.11 and 774.13, a "use" of Section 4(f) property occurs: (1) When land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility; (2) When there is a *temporary occupancy* of land that is adverse in terms of the statute's preservation purpose as determined by the criteria in § 774.13(d); or (3) When there is a *constructive use* of a Section 4(f) property as determined by the criteria in § 774.15.

Per 23 CFR 774.17, the SHPO is considered the official with jurisdiction (OWJ) for historic properties for the purposes of Section 4(f).

### Inland Steel Office Building/ArcelorMittal Human Resources (IHSSI No. 089-679-35181): No Use

The project will not use this resource by taking permanent ROW (i.e., permanent incorporation) and will not indirectly use the resource in such a way that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired (i.e., constructive use). Therefore, no use is expected. Per the 800.11 Documentation, no Section 4(f) evaluation was required (Appendix D-4 to D-5). The SHPO concurred with these findings on February 17, 2022 (Appendix D-74 to D-76).

### Ramp B over B Bridge Structure No. 912-45-06596 B; NBI No. 33035): Use

This structure is already in a transportation use. The proposed removal of the Ramp B over B Bridge is evaluated through the *Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges* (Appendix D-4) (hereinafter referred to as the Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation). According to the Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation, a proposed action will "use" a historic bridge when the action impairs the historic integrity of the bridge either by rehabilitation or demolition.

The Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation may be applied to projects which meet the following criteria:

- *The bridge is to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds.*  
As stated in the Project Description (Preferred Alternative) section this project involves FHWA funds.
- *The project will require the use of a historic bridge structure which is on or is eligible for listing on the NRHP.*  
As discussed in the Cultural Resources section, the Ramp B over B Bridge is eligible for the NRHP.
- *The bridge is not a National Historic Landmark.*  
The Ramp B over B Bridge is not on the NPS list of National Historic Landmarks (<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalhistoriclandmarks/list-of-nhls-by-state.htm>)
- *The FHWA Division Administrator determines that the facts of the project match those set forth in the sections of this document labeled Alternatives, Findings, and Mitigation.*  
FHWA final approval of this CE document will affirm that all programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation requirements have been fully addressed, serve to confirm that FHWA has concluded its responsibilities under Section 106, and serve as FHWA approval of the Historic Bridge Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation and the preferred alternative.
- *Agreement among the FHWA, the SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has been reached through procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA.*  
As discussed in the Cultural Resources section, the procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA were followed, and the No Adverse Effect finding was concurred by SHPO on February 22, 2022 (Appendix D-74 to D-76). Since the finding was No Adverse Effect and the ACHP is a signatory to both the Historic Bridge PA and the Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation, further coordination with the ACHP is not required.

To apply the Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation, three alternatives that avoid any use of the historic bridge must be examined. These alternatives were considered in the HBAA and are listed below. For further details, see the Other Alternatives section and the HBAA excerpts provided in Appendix D-81 to D-95.

- *a) No Build/ Do Nothing*  
The No Build alternative was examined and it does not meet the project's purpose and need, and it is not prudent.
- *b) build a new structure at a different location without affecting the historic integrity of the historic bridge*  
This alternative was examined under Alternative D, which is not feasible due to the existing bridge's location within an interchange.
- *c) rehabilitate the historic bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the structure*  
This alternative was examined under Alternative B1, which would not meet the primary purpose and need, as well as Alternative C1, which was not feasible.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

The HBAA fulfills the requirements of the Historic Bridges PA and the Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation. The SHPO concurred with the HBAA that the avoidance and minimization options are not feasible or prudent in their letter dated February 17, 2022 (Appendix D-74 and D-77).

The Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation may be used only for projects where the FHWA Division Administrator ensures that the proposed action includes all possible planning "Measures to Minimize Harm". For bridges that are to be replaced, the existing bridge is made available for an alternative use, provided a responsible party agrees to maintain and preserve the bridge. The bridge marketing efforts previously discussed in the Public Involvement and Cultural Resources sections fulfills this requirement.

A public hearing was held on September 27, 2022, see the Public Involvement section for details. As advertised, the comment period ended on October 11, 2022 (Appendix G-15 to G-22). No comments were received and no party contacted INDOT or the project team indicating an interest in assuming ownership of the bridge.

FHWA final approval of this CE document will affirm that all Historic Bridges PA requirements have been fully addressed, serve to confirm that FHWA has concluded its responsibilities under Section 106, and serve as FHWA approval of the Historic Bridge Programmatic 4(f) and the preferred alternative.

**Section 6(f) Involvement**

**Presence**

**Use**

**Section 6(f) Property**

**Yes**

**No**




*Discuss Section 6(f) resources present or not present. Discuss if any conversion would occur as a result of this project. If conversion will occur, discuss the conversion approval.*

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 Section 6(f) properties on the INDOT ESD website revealed a total of 49 properties in Lake County (Appendix J-16). None of these properties are located within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, there will be no impacts to 6(f) resources.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### SECTION F – Air Quality

**STIP/TIP and Conformity Status of the Project**

	Yes	No
Is the project in the most current STIP/TIP?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the project located in an MPO Area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, then:		
Is the project in the most current MPO TIP?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the project exempt from conformity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If No, then:		
Is the project in the Transportation Plan (TP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a hot spot analysis required (CO/PM)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Location in STIP: Modifications 01 and 05 (Appendix H-12 to H-13)

Name of MPO (if applicable): NIRPC

Location in TIP (if applicable): Amendment #20-22.05 (Appendix H-1 to H-11)

Level of MSAT Analysis required?

Level 1a  Level 1b  Level 2  Level 3  Level 4  Level 5

*Describe if the project is listed in the STIP and if it is in a TIP. Describe the attainment status of the county(ies) where the project is located. Indicate whether the project is exempt from a conformity determination. If the project is not exempt, include information about the TP and TIP. Describe if a hot spot analysis is required and the MSAT Level.*

This project is included in the Fiscal Year (FY) (2022-2026) NIRPC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the FY 2022-2026 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (Appendix H-1 to H-13). According to IDEM (<https://www.in.gov/idem/sips/nonattainment-status-of-counties/>), the project is within the following non-attainment and/or maintenance areas:

- This project is located in Lake County, which is currently a nonattainment area for Ozone under the 1997 Ozone 8-hour standard which was revoked in 2015 but is being evaluated for conformity due to the February 16, 2018, *South Coast Air Quality Management District V. Environmental Protection Agency, Et.Al. Decision*.
- This project is in Lake County, which received attainment status for the 8-Hour Ozone (2008) standard on July 20, 2021, but was reclassified to attainment with a maintenance plan on May 20, 2022.
- The project is within North Township, which is a nonattainment area for the 8-Hour Ozone (2015) standard, with an effective date of November 7, 2022.

The project's design concept and scope are accurately reflected in both the NIRPC Transportation Plan (TP) and the TIP, and both conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Therefore, the conformity requirements of 40 CFR 93 have been met. This project has been identified as being exempt from air quality analysis in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93.126 and this project is not of air quality concern (40 CFR Part 93.123). Therefore, the project will have no significant impact on air quality.

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.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### SECTION G - NOISE

**Noise**

**Yes      No**

Is a noise analysis required in accordance with FHWA regulations and INDOT's traffic noise policy?       

Date Noise Analysis was approved/technically sufficient by INDOT ESD: \_\_\_\_\_

*Describe if the project is a Type I or Type III project. If it is a Type I project, describe the studies completed to date and if noise impacts were identified. If noise impacts were identified, describe if abatement is feasible and reasonable and include a statement of likelihood.*

This project is a Type III project. In accordance with 23 CFR 772 and the current INDOT *Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure*, this action does not require a formal noise analysis.

### SECTION H – 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 discussion below)

Yes	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Discuss how the project complies with the area's local/regional development patterns; whether the project will impact community cohesion; and impact community events. Discuss how the project conforms with the ADA Transition Plan.*

The SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges Project is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans, including the NIRPC 2040 Comprehensive Regional Plan, <https://nirpc.org/2040-plan/plan-documents/>, the 2008 City of East Chicago Comprehensive Plan (<https://www.eastchicago.com/DocumentCenter/View/314/Comprehensive-Plan-PDF>), and the Northwest Indiana Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan of 2010 (<https://nirpc.org/wp-content/uploads/2010-Ped-Pedal-Plan.pdf>). There will be no change in access, therefore impacts to community cohesion is not expected. Based on the minimal proposed ROW, no impacts to the tax base or property values are expected.

Coordination with local stakeholders including Cleveland Cliffs, City of East Chicago, and Ameristar Casino has been ongoing during preliminary planning and selection of the preferred alternative. Regarding community events, no comments concerning potential impacts to fair, festivals, etc., have been received. As described in the MOT section, phased construction and nearby exits will provide alternative access during construction.

The contractor will be required to coordinate with Cleveland Cliffs, Ameristar Casino, City of East Chicago, Marina/ Parks Department, Gary Public Transportation Corporation, and East Chicago Bus Transit regarding the MOT, which is included in the Environmental Commitments section. Therefore, impacts to community events are not expected.

The City of East Chicago has an *Americans with Disability Act (ADA) Transition Plan for Public Right-of-Ways 2016* (<https://www.eastchicago.com/DocumentCenter/View/164/2016-Americans-With-Disabilities-Act-Transition-Plan-PDF?bidId=>). This project is coordinating with public transit, it will not impact any pedestrian facilities because there are none located within the project area (except for the Closed Pedestrian Bridge which did not meet current standards). Therefore, this project will comply with the community's transition plan.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### Public Facilities and Services

*Discuss what public facilities and services are present in the project area and impacts (such as MOT) that will occur to them. Include how the impacts have been minimized and what coordination has occurred. Some examples of public facilities and services include health facilities, educational facilities, public and private utilities, emergency services, religious institutions, airports, transportation or public pedestrian and bicycle facilities.*

Based on a desktop review, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B-4), and the RFI report (Appendix E-1 to E-11), there are 17 religious facilities, two schools, two airports, seven recreational facilities, one trail, and three managed lands located within 0.5 mile of the project. None of these facilities are adjacent to the project area except Eugene Field Elementary (school and recreational facility), and the previously-discussed East Chicago Mariana and Jerose Park Beach properties (see the Section 4(f) section). There will be no change to these properties, and access to all properties will be maintained during construction. Responses to early coordination did not generate responses regarding these facilities. Therefore, no impacts are expected

Due to the multiple railroads, pipelines, and utilities within the project area, the project team, in conjunction with the INDOT Utilities and Rail Office, have ongoing utility engineering and coordination (Appendix J-1). There will be no disruption in services. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

INDOT Aviation's June 21, 2021 response to early coordination stated if any object, obstruction, or equipment will exceed 100 ft. in height, further coordination will be required with our office and the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) (Appendix C-11). This is due to the close proximity of Gary Airport and the need for any obstructions within 5 miles to meet a 100:1 glideslope to the nearest runway according to 14 CFR Part 77 standards. This is included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

As previously discussed in the Purpose and Need and Project Description sections, the Closed Pedestrian Bridge and the associated former industrial parking lot have not been in-use for over 10 years. There are no public pedestrian facilities associated with this project.

The proposed project should not impact property values or the local tax base. There should be no impacts to community cohesion. Therefore, no significant economic or community impacts are expected to develop as a result of the project.

### 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 and disproportionate impacts to EJ populations?

Yes	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

Indicate if EJ issues were identified during project development. If an EJ analysis was not required, discuss why. If an EJ analysis was required, describe how the EJ population was identified. Include if the project has a disproportionately high and adverse effect on EJ populations and explain your reasoning. If yes, describe actions to avoid, minimize and mitigate these effects.

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 EJ Analysis is required for any project that has two or more relocations or 0.5 acre of additional permanent ROW. This project is in a disadvantaged area, and will require approximately 2.81 acres of temporary ROW, as well as 2.02 acres of temporary "right of entry" ROW. Furthermore, this project involves the proposed removal of the historic Ramp B over B Bridge. Therefore, INDOT determined an EJ analysis was warranted.

### Identification of Populations

Potential EJ impacts are detected by locating minority and low-income populations relative to a reference population to determine if populations of EJ concern exist, and whether there could be disproportionately high and adverse impacts to them. The reference population may be a county, city or town and is called the community of comparison (COC). In this project, the COC is Lake County. The community that overlaps the project area is called the affected community (AC). In this project, the ACs are the following Census Tract (CT) Block Groups (CTBGs): Block Group 2, CT 303 (AC-A), Block Group 1, CT 302 (AC-B), and Block Group 1, CT 301 (AC-C).

An AC has a population of concern for EJ if the population is more than 50% minority or low-income or if the low-income or minority population is 125% of the COC. Data from the Census.gov 2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year Estimates were obtained from the census.gov website on February 10, 2022. The data collected for minority and low-income populations within the AC are summarized in the below table.

### Minority and Low-Income Data (2019 ACS 5-Year Estimates)

	COC Lake County	AC-A	AC-B	AC-C
Percent Minority	38.1	91.5	84.2	98.2
125% of COC	47.6	AC > 125% COC?		
EJ Population of Concern?		Yes	Yes	Yes
Percent Low-Income	15.6	54.7	42.8	72.2
125% of COC	19.5	AC > 125% COC?		
EJ Population of Concern?		Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: [census.gov](https://census.gov)

AC-A has a percent minority of 91.5, which is above 50% and the 125% COC threshold. Therefore, AC-A does contain a minority population of EJ concern. AC-A has a percent low-income of 54.7, which is above 50% and the 125% COC threshold. Therefore, AC-A does contain a low-income population of EJ concern.

AC-B has a percent minority of 84.2, which is above 50% and the 125% COC threshold. Therefore, AC-B does contain a minority population of EJ concern. AC-B has a percent low-income of 42.8, which is below 50%, but is above the 125% COC threshold. Therefore, AC-B does contain a low-income population of EJ concern.

AC-C has a percent minority of 98.2, which is above 50% and the 125% COC threshold. Therefore, AC-C does contain a minority population of EJ concern. AC-C has a percent low-income of 72.2, which is above 50% and the 125% COC threshold. Therefore, AC-C does contain a low-income population of EJ concern.

The census data sheets, maps, and calculations can be found in Appendix J-2 to J-8.

### Impact Analysis

**US HUD Resources:** The US HUD Resource Locator (<https://resources.hud.gov/>) was researched to identify potential EJ resources and/or populations. Sixty-one HUD resources were identified within 0.5 mile of the project area (Appendix J-9 to J-10). US HUD did not respond to early coordination. No impacts are expected.

**ROW / RELOCATIONS:** The proposed temporary ROW is contained within AC-A, which does contain EJ populations. The proposed ROW will be acquired from industrial properties. These areas are on the north side of the project area, adjacent to the Michigan Avenue bridge and the railroad (Appendix B-12 and J-14). There are no relocations resulting from the project. Therefore, the proposed acquisition of ROW is not anticipated to disproportionately impact EJ populations.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake Route SR 912 Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

**Maintenance of Traffic (MOT):** As discussed further in the MOT section, the proposed MOT will maintain traffic along SR 912 and will include ramp and bridge closures. Motorists will still be able to access both sides of SR 912 due to the redundant system of ramps and bridges located within a mile of the interchange, shown on the Maintenance of Traffic graphic in Appendix B-6. The local detours will temporarily increase traffic along local roadways, primarily Guthrie Street. This two-lane, two-way road with sidewalk is a Minor Arterial in an area with EJ populations and resources. The MOT will pose a temporary inconvenience; however, no significant delays are anticipated, and all inconveniences and delays will cease upon project completion. Access to all residences and businesses will be maintained throughout construction. Therefore, the proposed MOT is not anticipated to disproportionately impact EJ populations.

**Transit Service:** As previously-discussed, Gary Public Transportation Corporation and East Chicago Bus Transit operate in the project area. Currently, there is one route that will be directly impacted by this project. The West Calumet route utilizes the Michigan Avenue bridge and has stops on both sides of the project area. Stop 9 is near the intersection of Aldis Street and Michigan Avenue near the entrance to the casino, and Stop 10 is on the south side, at the intersection of Guthrie Street and Michigan Avenue (Appendix J-13). Transit authorities did not respond to early coordination. A representative of East Chicago transit authority attended the public hearing held on September 27, 2022 and discussed the project with team members (Appendix G-48). No comments were received.

Coordination with the two transit authorities and City of East Chicago officials will be required prior to RFC. The contractor will be required to notify transit authorities at least 30 days prior to closures. This is included in the Environmental Commitments section of this document. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to impact transit service.

**Pedestrian Facilities:** As previously-discussed, this project does not involve pedestrian facilities, except removal of the Closed Pedestrian Bridge which is unsafe and does not meet current standards.

**Community Access/Barriers:** This project will maintain the Michigan Avenue Bridge over SR 912. Therefore, it will not create community barriers or divisions. For further discussion see the Project Description (Preferred Alternative), MOT, Community Services, and Public Facilities and Services sections of this environmental document.

**Conclusion**

The project area contains EJ populations of concern. This project will address maintenance concerns associated with the project bridges and will eliminate safety concerns associated with the Closed Pedestrian Bridge. There will be no change in access for motorized vehicles and pedestrians. Therefore, the SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges project should provide a benefit to the community. The proposed ROW impacts are limited to acquisitions from industrial properties (Appendix J-14). Potential impacts to public transit during construction will be minimized through coordination with transit authorities and local governmental officials (firm commitment). Based on this analysis, there does not appear to be disproportionately high and adverse impacts to EJ populations in or near the project area.

The project's public hearing was held at a nearby accessible location, the Ivy Tech East Chicago Campus, and stakeholders who represent EJ populations such as elected officials, transit, local housing authorities, adjoining landowners, public schools, religious institutions, and civic organizations were invited (Appendix G-23 to G-26). The project team who attended the meeting included a Spanish language speaker, which was noted on their name tag and on project handouts (Appendix G-45 to G-46). Further details about the hearing are provided in the Public Involvement section. As advertised, the comment period ended on October 11, 2022 and no comments were received.

On April 6, 2022, INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) stated, "With the information provided, INDOT ESD would not consider the impacts associated with this project as causing a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and/or low-income populations of EJ concern relative to non EJ populations in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12898 and FHWA Order 6640.23a. No further EJ Analysis is required." (Appendix J-15).

**Relocation of People, Businesses or Farms**

Will the proposed action result in the relocation of people, businesses or farms?  
Is a BIS or CSRS required?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Number of relocations:      Residences:   0        Businesses:   0        Farms:   0        Other:   0  

*Discuss any relocations that will occur due to the project. If a BIS or CSRS is required, discuss the results in the discussion below.*

No relocations of people, businesses, or farms will take place as a result of this project.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

<b>SECTION I – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS &amp; REGULATED SUBSTANCES</b>
---

**Hazardous Materials & Regulated Substances** (Mark all that apply)

- Red Flag Investigation (RFI)
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA)
- Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA)
- Design/Specifications for Remediation required?

**Documentation**

X
X

Date RFI concurrence by INDOT SAM (if applicable): January 19, 2022

*Include a summary of the potential hazardous material concerns found during review. Discuss in depth sites found within, directly adjacent to, or ones that could impact the project area. Refer to current INDOT SAM guidance. If additional documentation (special provisions, pay quantities, etc.) will be needed, include in discussion. Include applicable commitments.*

Based on a review of GIS and available public records, an RFI was approved by INDOT Site Assessment & Management (SAM) on January 19, 2022 (Appendix E-1 to E-11). Four Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) generator sites, and one RCRA Corrective Action site, are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Two State Cleanup sites, seven underground storage tank (UST) sites, and six leaking UST (LUST) sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Thirteen brownfield sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Nineteen institutional controls (IC) sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Additionally, there are 11 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) facilities and 17 NPDES pipe location within 0.5 mile of the project area. The RFI identified one hazmat site that could affect the project area: Arcelormittal USA, AID 11557, 3210 Watling Street.

Arcelormittal USA (currently Cleveland Cliffs), AID 11557, 3210 Watling Street, has offices adjacent to the northwest of the project area. The steel mill begins north of the project area and extends over hundreds of acres. This facility has multiple solid waste management areas (SWMAs) under the closure process in RCRA Corrective Action. The nearest is SWMA 14, the "Former Coal Tar Plant Area", located adjacent to the north of the project area. Based on the July 24, 2020 *Second Quarter RCRA Corrective Action Status Report*, dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) monitoring and recovery continues in SWMA 14, and the organic dissolved phase plume contaminants of concern remain non-detect in downgradient wells. In the figure entitled "2nd Quarter 2020 Quarterly Report - Identified Areas of Separate Phase and Summary of Stabilization Measures" the "discontinuous coal tar DNAPL" plume appears to extend beneath the northern Michigan Avenue Bridge approach, approximately 0.03 mile north of the northern limits of work. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment is recommended to occur before RFC. Prior to any investigation activities, a scope of work plan will be prepared and submitted to INDOT SAM for review and approval. In addition, coordination will be conducted with the IDEM Project Manager identified in the Virtual File Cabinet (VFC) documentation, Chris Myers, and the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Project Manager, Mr. Brandon Pursel, before further site activities occur.

This is included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

**Part IV – Permits and Commitments**

<b>PERMITS CHECKLIST</b>
--------------------------

**Permits** (mark all that apply)

**Likely Required**

**Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section10 Permit)**

Nationwide Permit (NWP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Regional General Permit (RGP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual Permit (IP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**IN Department of Environmental Management (401/Rule 5)**

Nationwide Permit (NWP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Regional General Permit (RGP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual Permit (IP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Isolated Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rule 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**IN Department of Natural Resources**

Construction in a Floodway	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigable Waterway Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Mitigation Required**

US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Others (Please discuss in the discussion below)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*List the permits likely required for the project and summarize why the permits are needed, including permits designated as "Other."*

More than one acre of land will be disturbed; therefore, an IDEM Rule 5 permit is anticipated.

A USACE Section 404 Nationwide General Permit and an IDEM Section 401 Water Quality Certification are required. IDNR-DFW's response to early coordination discussed these permit requirements (Appendix C-4 to C-5). Mitigation is not anticipated.

If any object, obstruction, or equipment will exceed 100 feet in height, further coordination will be required with INDOT Aviation and the FAA (Appendix C-11). This is due to the close proximity of Gary Airport and the need for any obstructions within 5 miles to meet a 100:1 glideslope to the nearest runway according to 14 CFR Part 77 standards. This is included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

Applicable recommendations provided by resource agencies 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.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

### ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

List all commitments and include the name of agency/organization requesting/requiring the commitment(s). Listed commitments should be numbered.

#### 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 District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately. (INDOT ESD and INDOT District)
- 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 ESD)
- 3) 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)
- 4) Lighting AMM 1: Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during the active season. (USFWS)
- 5) Lighting AMM 2: When installing new 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)
- 6) The "Right-of-Entry" ROW area is labeled "Temp. R/W for Drive Access" on project plans and will be used for access only. No construction work is allowed, including but not limited to staging, ground disturbance, excavations, etc. (INDOT ESD and CRO)
- 7) Coordination with Gary Public Transportation Corporation, East Chicago Bus Transit, Cleveland Cliffs, Ameristar Casino, and the City of East Chicago (Departments of Public Works, Parks, and Marina) regarding the proposed MOT will occur prior to RFC. The contractor will be required to notify these entities at least 30 days prior to any roadway, bridge or ramp closures. (INDOT ESD)
- 8) Arcelormittal USA (currently Cleveland Cliffs), AID 11557, 3210 Watling Street, is adjacent to the northwest of the project area. The steel mill extends over hundreds of acres. This facility has multiple solid waste management areas (SWMAs) under the closure process in RCRA Corrective Action. The nearest is SWMA 14, the "Former Coal Tar Plant Area", located adjacent to the north of the project area. Based on the July 24, 2020 Second Quarter RCRA Corrective Action Status Report, dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL) monitoring and recovery continues in SWMA 14, and the organic dissolved phase plume contaminants of concern remain non-detect in downgradient wells. In the figure entitled "2nd Quarter 2020 Quarterly Report - Identified Areas of Separate Phase and Summary of Stabilization Measures" the "discontinuous coal tar DNAPL" plume appears to extend beneath the northern Michigan Avenue Bridge approach, approximately 0.03 mile north of the northern limits of work. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment is recommended to occur before RFC. Prior to any investigation activities, a scope of work plan will be prepared and submitted to INDOT Site Assessment and Management (SAM) for review and approval. In addition, coordination will be conducted with the IDEM Project Manager identified in the VFC documentation, Chris Myers, and the USEPA Project Manager, Mr. Brandon Pursel, before further site activities occur. (INDOT SAM)
- 9) If any object, obstruction, or equipment will exceed 100 feet in height, further coordination will be required with INDOT Aviation and the FAA. This is due to the close proximity of Gary Airport and the need for any obstructions within 5 miles to meet a 100:1 glideslope to the nearest runway according to 14 CFR Part 77. (INDOT Aviation)

#### For Further Consideration:

- 10) Improving wildlife passage at existing or proposed bridge locations is a priority for the DFW to reduce wildlife mortality along roadways. The new, replacement, or rehabbed structure, and any bank stabilization under the structure, should not create conditions that are less favorable for wildlife passage under the structure compared to current conditions. For crossing replacements, the new structure should include wildlife passage appropriate for the type of replacement structure being proposed. (IDNR-DFW)
- 11) The International Dark-Sky Association (IDA) states that, to minimize the negative impacts of artificial lighting on wildlife, "lighting should only be on when needed, only light the area that needs it, be no brighter than necessary, minimize blue light emissions, [and] be fully shielded (pointing downward)". The IDNR-DFW strongly encourages visiting the IDA's website to learn more about selecting lighting fixtures that minimize the harmful effects of lighting on humans and wildlife: <http://darksky.org/lighting/lighting-basics/>. (IDNR-DFW)

This is page 39 of 40 Project name: SR 912 Michigan Avenue Bridges Project Date: February 1, 2023

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Lake

Route SR 912

Des. No. 1703011 (lead)

12) Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat or Northern Long-eared bat roosting (greater than 5 inches diameter-at-breast-height (dbh), living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or with cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 through September 30. (IDNR-DFW)

# Table of Contents

---

## Appendix A: INDOT Supporting Documentation

Categorical Exclusion Level Thresholds Table ..... A-1

## Appendix B: Graphics

Project Location Map ..... B-1  
USGS Topographic Map ..... B-2  
Bridges Exhibit ..... B-3  
Existing Conditions ..... B-4  
Proposed Conditions ..... B-5  
Maintenance of Traffic ..... B-6  
Project Photographs ..... B-7  
Project Plans (Excerpts) ..... B-9

## Appendix C: Early Coordination

Sample Early Coordination Letter ..... C-1  
List of Agencies ..... C-3  
IDNR-DFW Letter ..... C-4  
USFWS Early Coordination Response ..... C-6  
IGWS Electronic Letter ..... C-8  
INDOT Office of Aviation ..... C-11  
USFWS Official Species List ..... C-12  
USFWS Concurrence Verification Letter ..... C-25  
BIAS Reports (Excerpts) & Bridge/Small Structure Assessment Forms ..... C-37

## Appendix D: Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Signed Finding and 800.11 Documentation ..... D-1  
Affidavit of Public Notice ..... D-64  
Proof of Publication ..... D-77  
Historic Bridge Alternative Analysis ..... D-81  
INDOT-CRO Letter ..... D-96  
SHPO Letter (Director’s Letter of Clearance) ..... D-98  
INDOT CRO Email ..... D-101

## Appendix E: Red Flag and Hazardous Materials

Red Flag Investigation (RFI) ..... E-1

## Appendix F: Water Resources

National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Map ..... F-1  
IDNR Floodplain Information Portal Map ..... F-2  
Waters of the US Report (Excerpts) ..... F-3

## Appendix G: Public Involvement

Sample Notice of Entry Letter Parsons .....	G-1
Public Involvement Plan (PIP) .....	G-3
Legal Notice .....	G-13
Publishers' Affidavits .....	G-15
Mailing List.....	G-23
Hearing Presentation .....	G-27
Hearing Handouts.....	G-43
Attendance Records .....	G-48
Response letter .....	G-50

## Appendix H: Air Quality

NIRPC TIP (Excerpts).....	H-1
STIP (Excerpt).....	H-12

## Appendix I: Engineering Documents

BIAS Reports (Excerpts) .....	I-1
Roadway Project Application (Excerpt).....	I-25
Abbreviated Engineering Assessment Report (Excerpts) .....	I-26
Final Engineering Assessment Report (Excerpts).....	I-28

## Appendix J: Additional Studies/Reports

Utility Log.....	J-1
Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis.....	J-2
US HUD Resource Locator .....	J-9
Gary Public Transportation Corp Map .....	J-11
East Chicago Bus Transit Map .....	J-12
Proposed Right-of-Way (ROW) Map .....	J-14
No Further EJ Analysis Email .....	J-15
LWCF List for Lake County .....	J-16

# Appendix A

## INDOT Supporting Documentation

### Categorical Exclusion Level Thresholds

	PCE	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4 <sup>1</sup>
<b>Section 106</b>	Falls within guidelines of Minor Projects PA	"No Historic Properties Affected"	"No Adverse Effect"	-	"Adverse Effect" Or Historic Bridge involvement <sup>2</sup>
<b>Stream Impacts<sup>3</sup></b>	No construction in waterways or water bodies	< 300 linear feet of stream impacts	≥ 300 linear feet of stream impacts	-	USACE Individual 404 Permit <sup>4</sup>
<b>Wetland Impacts<sup>3</sup></b>	No adverse impacts to wetlands	< 0.1 acre	-	< 1.0 acre	≥ 1.0 acre
<b>Right-of-way<sup>5</sup></b>	Property acquisition for preservation only or none	< 0.5 acre	≥ 0.5 acre	-	-
<b>Relocations<sup>6</sup></b>	None	-	-	< 5	≥ 5
<b>Threatened/Endangered Species (Species Specific Programmatic for Indiana bat &amp; northern long eared bat)<sup>6</sup></b>	"No Effect", "Not likely to Adversely Affect" (With select AMMs <sup>7</sup> )	"Not likely to Adversely Affect" (With any AMMs or commitments)	-	"Likely to Adversely Affect"	Project does not fall under Species Specific Programmatic <sup>8</sup>
<b>Threatened/Endangered Species (Any other species)<sup>6</sup></b>	Falls within guidelines of USFWS 2013 Interim Policy or "No Effect"	"Not likely to Adversely Affect"	-	-	"Likely to Adversely Affect"
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	No disproportionately high and adverse impacts	-	-	-	Potential <sup>9</sup>
<b>Sole Source Aquifer</b>	No Detailed Groundwater Assessment	-	-	-	Detailed Groundwater Assessment
<b>Floodplain</b>	No Substantial Impacts	-	-	-	Substantial Impacts
<b>Section 4(f) Impacts</b>	None	-	-	-	Any <sup>10</sup>
<b>Section 6(f) Impacts</b>	None	-	-	-	Any
<b>Permanent Traffic Alteration</b>	None	-	-	-	Any
<b>Noise Analysis Required</b>	No	-	-	-	Yes
<b>Air Quality Analysis Required</b>	No	-	-	-	Yes <sup>11</sup>
<b>Approval Level</b>	Concurrence by				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Env. (DE)</li> <li>• Env. Serv. Div. (ESD)</li> <li>• FHWA</li> </ul>	DE or ESD	DE or ESD	DE or ESD	DE and/or ESD	DE and/or ESD; and FHWA

<sup>1</sup> Coordinate with INDOT Environmental Services Division. INDOT will then coordinate with the appropriate FHWA Environmental Specialist.

<sup>2</sup> Any involvement with a bridge processed under the Historic Bridge Programmatic Agreement.

<sup>3</sup> Total permanent impacts to streams (linear feet) and wetlands (acres).

<sup>4</sup> US Army Corps of Engineers Individual 404 Permit

<sup>5</sup> Total permanent and temporary right-of-way. This does not include reacquisition of existing apparent right-of-way.

<sup>6</sup> If any relocations are within an area with a known or suspected Environmental Justice (EJ) or disadvantaged population, or has greater than 5 relocations, a conversation with FHWA, through INDOT ESD, is needed to confirm NEPA classification and outreach plan for the project.

<sup>7</sup> Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) determined by the IPAC determination key to be required that are not tree AMMs, bridge AMMs, or structure AMMs.

<sup>8</sup> Projects that do not fall under a Species Specific Programmatic and results in a "Likely to Adversely Affect". Other findings can be processed as a lower-level CE.

<sup>9</sup> Potential for causing a disproportionately high and adverse impact.

<sup>10</sup> Section 4(f) use resulting in an Individual, Programmatic, or *de minimis* evaluation. The only exception is a *de minimis* evaluation for historic properties (Effective January 2, 2020). If a historic property *de minimis* and no other use, mark the *None* column.

<sup>11</sup> Hot Spot Analysis and/or MSAT Quantitative Emission Analysis.

\* Includes the threatened/endangered species critical habitat

Note: Substantial public or agency controversy may require a higher-level NEPA document.