| Road No./County: |
| :--- |
| Designation Numbers): |

Project
Description/Termini:

| State Route (SR) 930 and Maplecrest Road / Allen County |
| :--- |
| 1900107 |
| SR $930 /$ Maplecrest Road intersection improvements. The SR 930 termini are <br> approximately 1,200 feet west and 1,600 feet east of the intersection. The <br> Maplecrest Road termini approximately 500 feet north and 1,400 feet south of the <br> intersection. |


|  | Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 - Required Signatories: INDOT DE and/or INDOT ESD |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | Categorical Exclusion, Level 3 - Required Signatories: INDOT ESD |
|  | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 - Required Signatories: INDOT ESD and FHWA |
|  | Environmental Assessment (EA) - Required Signatories: INDOT ESD and FHWA |
|  | Additional Investigation (AI) - The proposed action included a design change from the original approved <br> environmental document. Required Signatories must include the appropriate environmental approval <br> authority |


| Approval $\frac{\text { NA }}{\text { INDOT DE Signature and Date }}$ |  |
| :---: | :--- |

Release for Public Involvement

Certification of Public Involvement

INDOT DE/ESD Reviewer Signature and Date:

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer:

N/A
INDOT DE Initials and Date


Cindy Mauro 11-3-2023

Jason A. Stone / DLZ Indiana, LLC

ADWP
INDOT ESD Initials and Date
$\frac{\text { INDOT DE Initials and Date }}{\text { INDOT Consultant Services Signature and Date }}$

Note: Refer to the most current INDOT CE Manual, guidance language, and other ESD resources for further guidance regarding any section of this form.

## 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*? |  | x |
| If No, then: |  |  |
| Opportunity for a Public Hearing Required? | x |  |

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

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

Notice of Entry letters were mailed to potentially affected property owners near the project area on June 18, 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, page 1.

To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice of FHWA's finding of "No Adverse Effect" was published in the Journal Gazette newspaper on April 13, 2023 offering the public an opportunity to submit comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4). The public comment period closed 30 days later on May 15, 2023. The text of the public notice and the affidavit of publication appear in Appendix D, pages 164 and 165. No comments were received.

The project met the minimum requirements described in the current Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Manual which require the project sponsor to offer the public an opportunity to submit comments and/or request a public hearing. Therefore, legal notices advertising that a public hearing would be held at 6:00 P.M. on August 23, 2023, at the New Haven Junior/Senior High School were published in the Journal Gazette newspaper on August 8 and August 15, 2023. The publisher's affidavit for the legal notices is presented as Appendix G, page 2. The text of the legal notices is presented as Appendix G, page 3. The public hearing presentation slides are resented as Appendix G, pages 4-34. Twenty-eight people signed the public hearing sign-in sheets (Appendix G, pages 35 and 36 ). A number of comments were received, including spoken and written comments provided at the public hearing and additional written comments provided during the comment period following the hearing, which ended on September 6, 2023. A comment and response document is presented as Appendix G, pages $37-49$, and copies of the comments received are presented as Appendix G, pages 50-81. INDOT certified completion of the public involvement process for this project on October 3, 2023. Public Involvement activities for this project are complete.

## 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: Fort Wayne
Local Name of the Facility:
SR 930 and Maplecrest Road

*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.

## Project Need:

The project need relates to the intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road experiencing above average crash frequency and crash severity. Congestion at the intersection is evidenced by a high percentage of rear-end crashes.

A safety study was completed by Williams Sale Partnership (WSP) in 2017. According to that report, 62 crashes occurred from 2014 through 2016, the majority of which were rear-end crashes. A Hazard Assessment Tool (HAT) 3.0 analysis resulted in an Index of Crash Frequency of 1.75 and an Index of Crash Cost of 1.99 , indicating that this is likely a high-crash intersection in both frequency and severity (Appendix I, page 6). A value greater than zero indicates there is a higher than expected crash volume. Although this intersection does have a high number and severity of crashes, it is believed that the safety problem is a result of traffic congestion as opposed to roadway geometry or sight distances.

This intersection currently operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. Level of Service (LOS) is a measure of traffic flow conditions. LOS A equates to free-flowing conditions. LOS F equates to heavily congested conditions. The morning peak hour operates at a LOS D (high-density flow in which speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted), although the southbound right turn movement operates at LOS F. The evening peak hour operates at LOS E (unstable flow at or near capacity).

## Project Purpose:

The project purpose is to provide congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes by providing an intersection with a LOS of $C$ or better.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):



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.

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) intend to proceed with a project for improvements to the SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection in New Haven, Allen County, Indiana.

## Location:

The proposed undertaking is on SR 930 at the intersection of Maplecrest Road, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County, Indiana. It is within Adams Township, Fort Wayne East Quadrangle, in Sections 9 and 10, Township 30N, Range 13E. Project location graphics are provided as Appendix B, pages 1-3.

## Existing Conditions:

Within the project area, SR 930 is a five-lane Principal Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of four 12-foot travel lanes, a two-way left turn lane and variable-width paved shoulders. The typical roadway width is 88 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow. The apparent existing right-of-way is 125 to 140 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area.

North of the intersection, Maplecrest Road is a five-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of three 11 -foot lanes, an 11-foot right turn lane, a 16-foot left turn lane, curb and gutter, and a 10-foot shared-use path along the east side of the roadway. The typical roadway width is 60 feet. Roadway drainage is collected in curb and gutter and conveyed to an enclosed storm sewer. The apparent existing right-of-way is 185 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area. South of the intersection, Maplecrest Road is a four-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of three 12-foot travel lanes, a 15 -foot left turn lane, and curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 51 feet. Roadway drainage is collected in curb and gutter and conveyed to an enclosed storm sewer. The apparent existing right-of-way is 140 feet wide, centered on the roadway. Approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection, Maplecrest road narrows to a two-lane existing typical section consisting of two 12 -foot travel lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow. The apparent existing right-of-way is the edge of pavement. The existing conditions can be seen in the aerial photo graphics presented as Appendix B, page 3 and Appendix D, page 21.

According to the safety study completed by WSP in 2017, crash data was analyzed from January 2014 to January 2017. There was a total of 62 crashes at the intersection. Of the 62 crashes, approximately $69 \%$ were rear end, $11 \%$ were left turn, and $6 \%$ were same direction sideswipe.

This intersection currently operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. The morning peak hour operates at a LOS D, although the southbound right turn movement operates at LOS F. The evening peak hour operates at LOS E.

## Preferred Alternative:

The preferred alternative is for construction of a Quadrant Roadway (QR) in the southeast quadrant of the SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection. A quadrant roadway reroutes all four left-turn movements at a four-legged intersection onto a new roadway (along one of the intersection quadrants). Left turns are prohibited at the existing intersection and new signalized intersections are included at the connections to the quadrant roadway to provide left-turn movements. New signalized intersections will be added to SR 930 and Maplecrest Road, approximately 650 feet east and south of the intersection. Left turns will be accommodated on the QR and will not be permitted at the SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection. The QR will provide one 12-foot lane each direction, a 4 -foot curbed grass median and a left turn lane at the QR intersections with SR 930 and Maplecrest Road. The proposed vehicle turning movements are illustrated on Appendix B, pages 36-39.

The project includes some widening along SR 930 with the addition of curbed grass medians and widening along Maplecrest Road with the addition of concrete medians. An additional eastbound through lane will be added, starting approximately 700 feet west of the intersection. A right turn lane and an 8 -foot shoulder will also be added to the eastbound approach, beginning approximately 400 feet west of the intersection. A 19-foot curbed grass median will be added from the intersection to the west approximately 200 feet.

East of the intersection, SR 930 will have curb and gutter and a sidewalk on the south side. An eastbound right turn lane for the QR will be added, beginning at the intersection, and extending to the QR. The right turn lane will have curb and gutter until it ends approximately 330 feet east of the intersection. A curbed grass median will be added along SR 930 from the existing intersection and through the new intersection with the QR.

SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements
$\qquad$ Date:

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Allen
Route
SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No.
1900107

South of the intersection, Maplecrest Road will have added curb and gutter on both sides of the road and a 10-foot trail on the east side which will end at the new intersection with the QR. This trail will connect to the existing shared use path north of the intersection via a crosswalk. A right turn lane for the QR will also be constructed and will begin 500 feet south of the QR intersection. The west side of Maplecrest Road will be widened to provide a southbound left turn lane for the QR intersection. Maplecrest Road will taper down to two lanes at the south project terminus. A 2 -foot concrete median will be added between the existing intersection and the QR intersection.

North of the intersection, Maplecrest Road will be widened to the west to provide a second right turn lane with curb and gutter. The existing left turn lane will be converted to a second through lane.

The horizontal alignment and vertical profile of both SR 930 and Maplecrest Road will be maintained within the project limits. SR 930 will be milled and resurfaced within the project limits. The project will also include the upgrade of the signal at SR 930 and Maplecrest Road. New curb inlets along the south side of SR 930 east of the intersection with Maplecrest Road will drain to the proposed ditch line along the south side of SR 930. New and existing curb inlets on Maplecrest Road will convey storm water to an existing enclosed storm sewer system. A drainage basin will be added in the southeast quadrant of the intersection to store stormwater from the QR inlets. An existing 3-foot by 3-foot concrete box culvert east of the existing intersection will be extended to the south to meet the proposed ditch line along the south side of SR 930. The culvert in the southwest corner of the intersection will be shifted south to meet the proposed ditch line along the south side of SR 930. A new 3-foot by 3-foot box culvert under the QR along the south side of SR 930 will be added to carry water from the east to the extended box that runs under SR 930. Project plan sheets are provided as Appendix B, pages 8-35.

The project requires acquisition of approximately 3.52 acre of land for new permanent right of way. The project also requires acquisition of approximately 0.33 acre of land for temporary right of way. Refer to the Right of Way section of this document for additional information. The project will not impact waterways. The project will result in a total of approximately 0.319 acre of permanent wetland impacts. No temporary wetland impacts are proposed. Section 401/404 permitting is anticipated to be required. The project is not located within a floodway; therefore, Construction in a Floodway permitting is not anticipated to be required. The project will impact more than one acre of surface area; therefore, Construction Storm Water General permitting is anticipated to be required. Efforts to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate project impacts, such as limiting the project's construction footprint to the degree practicable, have been made.

Traffic through the intersection will be maintained during the phased construction of the project. Temporary traffic barriers will be used to separate construction activities from traffic during construction. Access to business and public approaches will be maintained. Refer to the Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) section of this document for additional information.

The preferred alternative will satisfy the purpose and need of providing congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes by providing an intersection with a LOS of C or better. The current SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection, with the QR in place, is predicted to have a LOS C in the Design Year (2044) morning and evening peak hours. The new SR 930/quadrant roadway intersection is predicted to have a LOS C in the Design Year morning and LOS B in the evening peak hours. The new Maplecrest Road/quadrant roadway intersection is predicted to have a LOS A in the morning and LOS B in the Design Year evening hours.

## Logical Termini/Independent Utility:

The project termini along each leg are logical because they encompass the proposed improvements and additional distance required to transition back to the existing roadways. The project does not rely on construction of any other project to satisfy its purpose and need; therefore, it has independent utility.

Route
SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No.
1900107

## 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.

## Do Nothing Alternative:

The Do Nothing Alternative was considered; however, this alternative was discarded as it would not meet the project purpose and need of providing congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes by providing an intersection with a LOS of C or better.

## Median U-turn Intersection Configuration:

Under this alternative, left turns would be moved to signalized median U-turn intersections along SR 930 on either side of the existing intersection. Of the alternatives considered, this alternative provided the least amount of improvement to traffic flow. Congestion would remain and the purpose of reducing crash frequency/severity would not be addressed. This alternative would result in similar natural resource impacts as compared to the preferred alternative but would also result in significant impacts to utilities and would negatively affect future access conditions for adjacent properties. This alternative would not meet the project purpose and need. For these reasons, this alternative was discarded from further consideration.

## Displaced Left Turn Intersection Configuration:

Under this alternative, left turns would be routed via an upstream intersection and channeled away from the through traffic movements at the existing intersection. This would allow for left turns to be made in conjunction with opposing through movements. This alternative would satisfy the project's purpose and need and would result in similar natural resource impacts as compared to the preferred alternative. However, this alternative had the highest construction cost and resulted in the worst impacts to right-of-way, utilities, and future access conditions for adjacent properties. For these reasons, this alternative was discarded 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): It would not satisfy the project's purpose and need.


## ROADWAY CHARACTER:

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

Name of Roadway
Functional Classification: Current ADT:
Design Hour Volume (DHV):
Designed Speed (mph):

| Urban Principal Arterial |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26,100 | VPD (2021) D | Design Year ADT: | 35,007 | VPD (2044) |
| 3,501 | Truck Percentage (\%) | ) 7 |  |  |
| 45 | Legal Speed (mph): | 45 |  |  |



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County

> Allen

Route
SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No. 1900107

Name of Roadway
Functional Classification:
Current ADT:
Design Hour Volume (DHV):
Designed Speed (mph):
Maplecrest Road

| Urban Minor Arterial |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20,250 | VPD (2021) | Design Year ADT: | 29,371 | VPD (2044) |


| 2,937 | Truck Percentage (\%) | 6 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 40 | Legal Speed (mph): | 40 |


| Existing |  |  | roposed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Lanes: |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| Type of Lanes: | 3-thru and 1-turn |  | 3-thru and 1-turn |  |
| Pavement Width: | 51 | ft . | 48 | ft . |
| Shoulder Width: | N/A | ft . | N/A | ft . |
| Median Width: | N/A | ft . | 2 | ft . |
| Sidewalk Width: | 0-10 | ft . | 10 | ft . |

Name of Roadway
Functional Classification:
Current ADT:
Design Hour Volume (DHV): Designed Speed (mph):

Quadrant Road


| Existing |  |  | roposed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Lanes: |  | N/A |  | 3 |
| Type of Lanes: |  | N/A |  | hru and 1-turn |
| Pavement Width: | N/A | ft . | 38 | ft . |
| Shoulder Width: | N/A | ft . | 0 | ft . |
| Median Width: | N/A | ft . | 4 | ft . |
| Sidewalk Width: | N/A | ft . | 5 | ft . |


| Setting: | X | Urban | X | Suburban |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Topography: | X | Level |  | Rolling |

## 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.

Structure/NBI Number(s): N/A Sufficiency Rating: N/A
(Rating, Source of Information)

| Existing |  |  | Proposed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bridge/Structure Type: |  | N/A |  | N/A |
| Number of Spans: |  | N/A |  | N/A |
| Weight Restrictions: | N/A | ton | N/A | ton |
| Height Restrictions: | N/A | ft . | N/A | ft . |
| Curb to Curb Width: | N/A | ft . | N/A | ft . |
| Outside to Outside Width: | N/A | 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.

An existing 30-inch diameter by 76 -foot long corrugated metal pipe culvert under the drive at the west project terminus along the south side of SR 930 will be replaced with 77 feet of 30 -inch type 3 round concrete pipe due to the roadside ditch alignment shift.

This is page 7 of 29 Project Name: $\quad$ SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements $\quad$ Date: $\quad$| October 30, |
| :--- | 2023

Impacts to a wetland (Wetland A) in the ditch will result from replacement of the existing pipe as well as realignment of the ditch.
An existing 15 -inch diameter by 60 -foot long corrugated steel pipe culvert under a driveway near the east project terminus along the south side of SR 930 will be replaced with 56 feet of 15 -inch type 3 circular concrete pipe due to the roadside ditch alignment shift. Installation of this pipe will not impact wetlands or waterways.

In the southwest corner of the intersection, an existing 36-inch HDPE pipe culvert will be replaced with 268 feet of type 2 circular concrete pipe to meet the new alignment of the ditch along the south side of SR 930. Installation of this pipe will not impact wetlands or waterways.

An existing 3-foot by 3 -foot concrete box culvert (CLV-67632), which conveys the Sheridan Legal Drain, crosses under SR 930 approximately 500 feet east of the existing intersection. This box culvert will be extended, in kind, approximately 31 feet to the south, to meet the new alignment of the roadside ditch. Impacts to a wetland (Wetland F) in the ditch will result from extension of the structure as well as realignment of the ditch.

A new 3-foot by 3-foot concrete box culvert that is 134 feet long will be constructed under the QR approach to SR 930 to maintain the roadside ditch drainage to the above-mentioned extended culvert that crosses under SR 930. Installation of this pipe will not impact wetlands or waterways.

## MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (MOT) DURING CONSTRUCTION:

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

| Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | x |
|  | x |
|  | x |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | x |
|  | x |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
|  | x |

Discuss closures, detours, 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. Discuss any pedestrian/bicycle closures. Any local concerns about access and traffic flow should be detailed as well.

The MOT for the project will require two-way traffic to be maintained on both SR 930 and Maplecrest Road through all phases of the project. The construction design speed will be 35 mph .

The closures/lane restrictions will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists (including school buses and emergency services); however, no significant delays are anticipated, and all inconveniences and delays will cease upon project completion.

A multi-use trail is located on the east side of Maplecrest Road, north of SR 930. The project will require approximately 100 linear feet of the trail to be shifted several feet to the east, to align with the trail proposed on the east side of Maplecrest Road, south of the intersection. MOT for the impacted section of multi-use trail was determined not to be necessary because there is no other existing pedestrian/trail facility within the project area.

## ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:

Engineering: $\$ \underline{500,000.00(2021) ~ R i g h t-o f-W a y: ~} \$ 100,000.00$ (2023) Construction: $\$ \underline{2,867,291.00 \quad(2024)}$

SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements
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County Allen
Route
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Anticipated Start Date of Construction:
August 2024

## Remarks:

Note that the right of way funds indicated above, with 2023 year of expenditure, are state funds and are not required to be listed in the 2024-2028 Transportation Improvement Program or the 2024-2028 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

## RIGHT OF WAY:

| Land Use Impacts |  | Permanent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Temporary |
| Residential | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial | 3.52 | 0.33 |
| Agricultural $^{\text {Forest }}$ : | 0 | 0 |
| Wetlands $^{*}$ | 0 | 0 |
| Other: | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 |

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

Note that the project will require tree removal ( 0.2 acre) and wetland impacts ( 0.319 acre); however, acreages for Forest and Wetlands are not reported separately in the above table as they are within the 3.52 acre of commercially zoned land to be acquired as new permanent right of way.

The existing SR 930 typical minimum right of way (ROW) width is 69 feet near the Old Maumee Road approach, and the existing SR 930 maximum ROW width is 111 feet in the southeast corner of the intersection with Maplecrest Road. The proposed SR 930 typical minimum ROW width is 84 feet near the Old Maumee Road approach, and the proposed SR 930 maximum ROW width is 190 feet in the southeast corner of the intersection with Maplecrest Road.

The existing Maplecrest Road typical minimum ROW width is 60 feet at the south end of the project, and the existing Maplecrest Road maximum ROW width is 120 feet at the north end of the project. No new ROW is required for Maplecrest Road.

The proposed quadrant roadway typical minimum ROW width is 35 feet along the east side of the roadway, and the proposed quadrant roadway maximum ROW width is 114 feet at the intersection with Maplecrest Road.

The project requires acquisition of approximately 3.52 acre of commercial land use along the south side of SR 930 for new permanent ROW. The project also requires acquisition of approximately 0.33 acre of commercial land along the south side of SR 930 for temporary ROW.

If the scope of work or permanent or temporary ROW amounts change, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately.
$\qquad$ Date: 2023

## 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.

Early coordination letters were sent on July 9, 2021 (Appendix C, pages 1-4). In addition, an early coordination request was sent to Fort Wayne Trails, Inc., on April 22, 2022.

| Agency | Date Sent | Date Response <br> Received | Appendix C <br> Page \# |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | $5-13$ |
| Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $8 / 6 / 2021$ | $25-26$ |
| Indiana Geological and Water Survey (IGWS) | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | $7 / 22 / 2021$ | $14-16$ |
| INDOT Aviation Section | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $7 / 26 / 2021$ | 22 |
| INDOT Fort Wayne District | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $7 / 13 / 2021$ | 18 |
| Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $7 / 29 / 2021$ | 28 |
| US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $8 / 18 / 2021$ | 17 |
| National Parks Service (NPS) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $7 / 26 / 2021$ | $20-21$ |
| US Department of Housing and Urban Development (USHUD) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council (NIRCC) | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $8 / 17 / 2021$ | $23-24$ |
| Allen County Highway Department | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Allen County Department of Planning Services | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Allen County Commissioners | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| New Haven MS4 Coordinator / New Haven Utility Office | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Allen County Surveyor / Allen County Drainage Board | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Allen County MS4 Coordinator | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $7 / 23 / 2021$ | 19 |
| New Haven Mayor's Office | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| New Haven Police Department | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| New Haven Fire Department / Emergency Services | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| New Haven Planning Department | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $8 / 17 / 2021$ | 27 |
| New Haven Public Works Department | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| East Allen County Schools | $7 / 9 / 2021$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Fort Wayne Trails, Inc. | $4 / 22 / 2022$ | $4 / 22 / 2022$ | 57 |

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

## SECTION B - ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES:



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

October 30, 2023
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| Stream Name | Classification | Total Size in <br> Project Area <br> (linear feet) | Impacted <br> linear feet | Comments (i.e. location, flow direction, likely Water of the <br> US, appendix reference) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

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 likely 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, and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 3), there are two streams, rivers, watercourse, 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 August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
Open Water Feature(s)
$\quad$ Reservoirs
Lakes
Farm Ponds
Retention/Detention Basin
Storm Water Management Facilities
Other:


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 likely 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, and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 3), there are three open water features within the 0.5 -mile search radius. There are no open water features within or adjacent to the project area. That number was confirmed by the site visits on August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

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

| Wetland <br> No. | Classification | Total Size <br> (Acres) | Impacted <br> Acres | Comments (i.e. location, likely Water of the US, appendix reference) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Emergent | 0.159 | 0.090 | SR 930, Sta. 54+00 to Sta. 59+00 Right, Likely Water of the US, Appendix F, <br> page 5. |
| B | Emergent | 0.065 | 0 | SR 930, Sta. 54+00 to Sta. 59+00 Left, Likely Water of the US, Appendix F, <br> page 5. |
| C | Emergent | 0.085 | 0.035 | Maplecrest Road, Sta. 26+75 to Sta. 29+60 Left, Likely Water of the US, <br> Appendix F, page 6. |
| D | Emergent | 0.063 | 0 | SR 930, Sta. 74+30 to Sta. 79+25 Left, Likely Water of the US, Appendix F, <br> page 6. |

SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No.
1900107

| Wetland <br> No. | Classification | Total Size <br> (Acres) | Impacted <br> Acres | Comments (i.e. location, likely Water of the US, appendix reference) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E | Emergent | 0.035 | 0 | SR 930, Sta. 64+20 to Sta. 67+80 Left, Likely Water of the US, Appendix F, <br> page 7. |
| F | Emergent | 0.194 | 0.194 | SR 930, Sta. 63+00 to Sta. 74+80 Right, Likely Water of the US, Appendix F, <br> page 8. |
| G | Emergent | 0.084 | 0 | Maplecrest Road, Sta. 13+15 to Sta. 14+20 Right, Likely Water of the US, <br> Appendix F, page 8. |
| H | Emergent | 0.007 | 0 | Maplecrest Road, Sta. 13+85 to Sta. 14+20 Left, Likely Water of the US, <br> Appendix F, page 9. |

Wetlands (Mark all that apply)<br>Wetland Determination<br>Wetland Delineation<br>USACE Isolated Waters Determination

Documentation

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

## ESD Approval Dates

| $5 / 19 / 2022$ |
| :--- |
| $5 / 19 / 2022$ |
|  |

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.


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 likely 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, and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 3), there are 16 NWI-mapped wetlands and one NWI line within the 0.5 -mile search radius. There are eight likely wetlands within or adjacent to the project area. That number was confirmed by the site visits on August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ.

A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was approved by INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office on May 19, 2022. Please refer to Appendix F, page 1 for the Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report. It was recommended that there are eight areas that meet the jurisdictional wetland criteria, Wetlands A through H . The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

## Wetland A:

Wetland A is located in a roadside ditch along the south side of SR 930 and to the west of Maplecrest Road. Wetland A is dominated by wetland plants consisting of narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia) and rice cutgrass (Leersia oryzoides). The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland A is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is located within a roadside ditch. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland A within the study limits is approximately 0.159 acre. The boundary of Wetland A was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland $A$ is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a traditional navigable water (TNW) to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and an unnamed tributary (UNT) to the Maumee River.

## Wetland B:

Wetland B is located in a roadside ditch along the north side of SR 930 and to the west of Maplecrest Road. Wetland B is dominated by wetland plants consisting of narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia) and barnyard grass (Echinochloa crus-galli). These plants meet the hydrophytic plant criteria. The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland B is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is located within a roadside ditch. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland B within the study limits is approximately 0.065 acre. The boundary of Wetland B was determined by observing the change in plant community and

Route SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No.
corresponding change in topography. Wetland B is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

## Wetland C:

Wetland C is located in a roadside ditch along the west side of Maplecrest Road and to the north of SR 930. Wetland C is dominated by narrow-leaf of Maplecrest Road and to the north of SR 930. Wetland C is dominated by narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia), a wetland plant. This plant meets the hydrophytic plant criteria. The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland $C$ is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is located within a roadside ditch. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland $C$ within the study limits is approximately 0.085 acre. The boundary of Wetland $C$ was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland C is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

## Wetland D:

Wetland $D$ is located in a roadside ditch along the north side of SR 930 near the east project terminus. Wetland $D$ is dominated by narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia), a wetland plant. This plant meets the hydrophytic plant criteria. The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland D is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is located within a roadside ditch. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland D within the study limits is approximately 0.063 acre. The boundary of Wetland D was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland D is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

## Wetland E:

Wetland $E$ is located in a roadside ditch along the north side of SR 930 and to the east of Maplecrest Road. Wetland $E$ is dominated by narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia), a wetland plant. The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland $E$ is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is located within a roadside ditch. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland E within the study limits is approximately 0.035 acre. The boundary of Wetland E was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland $E$ is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

## Wetland F:

Wetland $F$ is located in a roadside ditch along the south side of SR 930 and to the east of Maplecrest Road. Wetland $F$ is dominated by narrow-leaf cattail (Typha angustifolia), a wetland plant. This plant meets the hydrophytic plant criteria. The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland F is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is located within a roadside ditch. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland F within the study limits is approximately 0.194 acre. The boundary of Wetland F was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland $F$ is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

## Wetland G:

Wetland G is located along the east side Maplecrest Road near the south project terminus. Wetland G is dominated by wetland plants consisting of reed canarygrass (Phalaris arundinacea) and Indian hemp (Apocynum cannabinum). The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland $G$ is considered poor due to its low species diversity and since it is dominated by reed canarygrass, an invasive species. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland $G$ within the study limits is approximately 0.084 acre. The boundary of Wetland $G$ was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland $G$ is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

## Wetland H :

Wetland H is located along the west side Maplecrest Road near the south project terminus. Wetland H is dominated by wetland plants consisting of giant ragweed (Ambrosia trifida), field nut sedge (Cyperus esculentus) and barnyard grass (Echinochloa crusgalli). The plant community type is emergent wetland. The quality of Wetland H is considered poor due to its low species diversity

SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements

October 30, 2023

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Allen
Route
SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No.
1900107
and apparently frequent disturbance from farming activities. Wetland hydrology and hydric soils were noted to be present. This area therefore meets the three jurisdictional wetland criteria. The size of Wetland H within the study limits is approximately 0.007 acre. The boundary of Wetland H was determined by observing the change in plant community and corresponding change in topography. Wetland H is considered a likely jurisdictional Water of the U.S. because it is connected to the Maumee River, a TNW to the north, via the roadway drainage network, storm sewer and a UNT to the Maumee River.

The project will result in a total of approximately 0.319 acre of permanent wetland impacts, consisting of 0.090 acre of impact to Wetland A, 0.035 acre of impact to Wetland C and 0.194 acre of impact to Wetland F. No temporary impacts are proposed. These impacts are the result of ditch realignment (Wetland A and Wetland F) and slope widening (Wetland C). The proposed ditch realignment and slope widening are required for construction of the proposed improvements; therefore, avoidance is not practicable. Impacts have been minimized by keeping work contained to the area necessary for the proposed construction. Mitigation will likely be required and will be determined during permitting. Wetlands B, D, E, G and H will be labeled on the plans as "Do Not Disturb". This is included as a firm commitment in the Environmental Commitments section of this document.

A USACE Section 404 Permit will likely be required. In the event a Section 404 Permit is required, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification must also be obtained from the IDEM Office of Water Quality.

IDEM's electronically generated early coordination response dated July 22, 2021 contained recommendations relating to wetlands, agency coordination and permitting requirements (Appendix C, pages 7 and 8).

IDNR-DFW responded on August 6, 2021 with recommendations pertaining to agency coordination and mitigation ratios (Appendix C, page 25).

The USACE response dated July 26, 2021 contained a recommendation relating to permitting requirements (Appendix C, page 20). All applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE.


Total terrestrial habitat in project area: 5.56 Acre(s) Total tree clearing: 0.2 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 August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 3 ), there is wooded land, agricultural field and roadside slopes and ditch banks vegetated with grass. The dominant tree species present are Norway spruce (Picea abies), American elm (Ulmus americana), black walnut (Juglans nigra), and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia). At the time of field reconnaissance, the agricultural fields contained soybeans (Glycine max). The dominant grass species in the road slopes and ditch banks are English plantain (Plantago lanceolata), yellow bristle grass (Setaria pumila), tall fescue (Schedonorus arundinaceus) and chicory (Cichorium intybus).

The project will result in a total of approximately 5.56 acres of terrestrial habit impacts, consisting of approximately 0.2 acre of tree removal, approximately 3.57 acres of agricultural land and approximately 1.79 acres of roadside slopes and ditch banks. These impacts are the result of roadway widening and reconstruction, as well as new alignment roadway construction, and are necessary for construction of the proposed improvements. Therefore, avoidance is not practicable. Impacts have been minimized by keeping work contained to the area necessary for the proposed construction. Mitigation is not anticipated to be required.

IDNR-DFW responded on August 6, 2021 with recommendations pertaining to mitigation ratios, revegetation of disturbed areas, seasonal tree clearing restrictions and erosion and sedimentation control (Appendix C, pages 25 and 26).

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

## Indiana Department of Transportation

Route
SR 930 and Maplecrest Road
Des. No.
1900107

## 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 |
| :---: |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |
|  |$\quad$|  |
| :---: |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |



## 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)


## Migratory Birds

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

| Yes |
| :---: |
|  | | $\mathbf{N o}$ |
| :---: |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |

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, page 6), completed by DLZ on April 18, 2022, the IDNR Allen County Endangered, Threatened and Rare (ETR) Species List has been checked. According to the IDNR-DFW early coordination response letter dated August 6, 2021 (Appendix C, pages 25 and 26), the Natural Heritage Program's Database has been checked and to date, 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 July 8, 2021. The review did not indicate the presence of endangered bat species in or within 0.5 mile of the project area.

Project information was submitted through the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) portal, and an official species list was generated (Appendix C, pages 30-44). The project is within range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and the federally endangered northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (Myotis septentrionalis). Other species were generated in the IPaC species list along with the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat.

The official species list generated from IPaC indicated one other species present within the project area: the federal candidate species Monarch Butterfly (Danaus plexippus). Because the Monarch Butterfly is currently listed as a candidate species, no determination of effect or further coordination is required at this time.

The project qualifies for the Rangewide Programmatic Informal Consultation for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat (NLEB), dated May 2016 (revised February 2018), between FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and USFWS. Small structure inspections occurred on June 7 and June 14, 2022 and no evidence of bats/birds using the structure were found (Appendix C, pages 54 and 55). An effect determination key was completed on June 23, 2022, and based on the responses provided, the project was found to have "No Effect" upon the Indiana bat and/or the NLEB (Appendix C, page 45). INDOT reviewed and concurred with the effect finding on June 24, 2022 (Appendix C, page 56).

Small structure inspections occurred on June 7 and June 14, 2022 and no evidence of bats/birds using the structure were found (Appendix C, pages 54 and 55). USFWS Bridge/Structure Assessment are only valid for two years. If construction will begin after June 7, 2024, an inspection of the structure by a qualified individual, must be performed. Inspection of the structure should check for presence of bats/bat indicators and/or presence of birds. The results of the inspection must indicate no signs of bats or birds. If signs of bats or birds are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. This firm commitment is included in the Environmental Commitments of this document.

This precludes the need for further consultation on this project as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended. If new information on endangered species at the site becomes available, or if project plans are changed, USFWS will be contacted for consultation.
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The USFWS response dated August 18, 2021 (Appendix C, page 17) indicated that the USFWS had no concerns with the project.

## Geological and Mineral Resources

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


| $\mathbf{N o}$ |
| :---: |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |
| $\mathbf{x}$ |

Date Karst Evaluation reviewed by INDOT EWPO (if applicable):
N/A
Discuss if project is located in the Indiana Karst Region 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. Include discussion of karst study/report was completed and results. (Karst investigation must comply with the current Protection of Karst Features during Planning and Construction guidance and coordinated and reviewed by INDOT EWPO)

Based on a desktop review and the Indiana Karst Region map, the project is located outside the designated Indiana Karst Region as outlined in the most current Protection of Karst Features during Project Development and Construction. According to the topo map of the project area (Appendix B, page 2) and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 3), there are no karst features identified within or adjacent to the project area. In the early coordination response July 22, 2021, the IGWS did not indicate that karst features exist in the project area (Appendix C, page 14).

The IGWS Environmental Assessment Report indicated the following in the general project vicinity:

- Geological hazards: high liquefaction potential
- Bedrock resources: high potential
- Sand and gravel resources: high potential
- Active or abandoned mineral resources extraction sites: none documented in the area.

The features will not be affected because appropriate soils investigations will be conducted to assess the soils in the project area, and the project will be designed accordingly. The project involves roadway construction and reconstruction, and associated sidewalk and storm sewer work. No excavation which could affect bedrock or sand/gravel extraction or deposits is proposed. Response from IGWS has been communicated with the designer on July 23, 2021. 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)
```

Presence


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?


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 Allen County, which is not located within the area of the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state of Indiana. Therefore, the FHWA/EPA/INDOT Sole Source Aquifer Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not applicable to this project, a detailed groundwater assessment is not needed, and no impacts are

SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements This is page 16 of 29 Project Name:

Date:
expected.
The Indiana Department of Environmental Management's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (http://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/pages/wellhead/) was accessed on April 5, 2023 by DLZ. This project is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area or Source Water Area. No impacts are expected.

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources Water Well Record Database website (https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm) was accessed on April 5, 2023 by DLZ. A well is located near the north project terminus, approximately 150 feet east of Maplecrest Road. The features will not be affected because they are not located within the right of way and are not within the project's construction limits. Therefore, no impacts are expected. Should it be determined during the right-of-way phase that these wells will be affected, a cost to cure will likely be included in the appraisal to restore the wells.

Based on a desktop review of IDEM's MS4 Boundary Areas (https://www.in.gov/idem/stormwater/municipal-separate-storm-sewer-systems-ms $4 / \mathrm{ms} 4$-boundary-areas/) by DLZ on April 29, 2021, this project is located in an Urban Area Boundary (UAB). An early coordination letter was sent on December 16, 2021 to the New Haven MS4 Coordinator. The New Haven MS4 coordinator did not respond within the 30 -day time frame. The project's drainage design is being developed in coordination with the City of New Haven and it will comply with the storm water quality management plan. An IDEM Construction Stormwater General Permit is required for this project. In a response dated July 23, 2021 (Appendix C, page 19), the Allen County MS4 coordinator indicated there were no concerns regarding water quality.

Based on a desktop review, the site visits on August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 3), this project is located where there is a public water system. Existing City of Fort Wayne and City of New Haven water mains are in direct conflict with the proposed construction. The project involves roadway widening and new roadway construction. Avoidance of the existing water mains is not practicable; therefore, the existing water mains will need to be relocated. No unusual conflicts have been identified to date, and no disruptions to water service are anticipated. Utility coordination has been initiated and will continue as the project is developed.

## Floodplains

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


If applicable, indicate the Floodplain Level?
Level 1 $\square$ Level 2 $\square$ Level 3 $\square$ Level 4 $\square$ Level $5 \quad \square$

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://dnrmaps.dnr.in.gov/appsphp/fdms/) was accessed on April 5, 2023 by DLZ. This project is not located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from approved IDNR floodplain maps (Appendix B, page 7). 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.

*If 160 or greater, see CE Manual for guidance.
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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 site visits on August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page 3), the project will convert 3.52 acres of farmland as defined by the Farmland Protection Policy Act. An early coordination letter was sent on July 9, 2021, to Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Coordination with NRCS resulted in a score of 119 on the NRCS-AD 1006 Form (Appendix C, page 29). NRCS's threshold score for significant impacts to farmland that result in the consideration of alternatives is 160. Since this project score is less than the threshold, no significant loss of prime, unique, statewide, or local important farmland will result from this project. No alternatives other than those previously discussed in this document will be investigated without reevaluating impacts to prime farmland.

## SECTION D - CULTURAL RESOURCES



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.

## Area of Potential Effect (APE):

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for this project primarily extends at least 500 feet beyond the project end points to allow for construction staging and traffic, and at least one property deep on both sides of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road. In addition to sightlines to the project which are obscured by wooded areas and surrounding building, the APE was also delineated based upon indirect impacts due to construction traffic and noise which considers distance from the project, natural barriers, and other buildings. The APE for archaeology was the project footprint. Graphics depicting the APE is presented as Appendix D, pages 20 and 21.

## Coordination with Consulting Parties:

On August 12, 2021, an early coordination letter was sent to the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the other invited consulting parties listed below. Parties that accepted the invitation are listed in bold text.

County Allen
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Allen County Historian<br>African/African-American Historical Museum<br>Allen County Genealogical Society of Indiana<br>Besancon Historical Society<br>Fort Wayne Jewish Historical Society<br>The Genealogy Center<br>The History Center (Fort Wayne) / Allen County Historical Society<br>New Haven Area Heritage Association<br>Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council (NIRCC)<br>Allen County Commissioners<br>Indiana Landmarks Northeast Field Office<br>Allen County Highway Department<br>Allen County Engineer<br>Allen County Department of Planning Services<br>New Haven Mayor's Office<br>New Haven Public Works Department<br>Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma<br>Miami Tribe of Oklahoma<br>Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma<br>Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians<br>Shawnee Tribe<br>Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma<br>Delaware Tribe of Indians<br>Forest County Potawatomi Community<br>Wyandotte Nation

The invited agencies/parties were requested to indicate whether the agency/party agreed or did not agree to participate as a consulting party, within 30 days of receipt of the invitation. It was noted that if the desire to participate as a consulting party was not indicated, the agency/party would not be considered a consulting party and would not receive further information about the undertaking unless the scope changed.

In a letter dated August 17, 2021, NIRCC accepted the invitation to participate as a consulting party and noted the presence of PostWar Era (1940-1973) residential housing sites adjacent to or near the project area. NIRCC recommended coordination with INDOT regarding these properties.

In a letter dated August 23, 2021, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ECL and indicated that ARCH, Inc. should be invited to participate as a consulting party. They also recommended that the owner of any historic properties be added to the list of CPs.

On August 23, 2021, an ECL was sent via email to ARCH, Inc.
In a letter dated August 25, 2021, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma accepted the invitation to participate as a consulting party and stated that if any archaeological sites or objects are inadvertently discovered during the project their office should be notified immediately.

In a letter dated September 10, 2021, the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi accepted the invitation to participate as a consulting party and stated that if any archaeological sites or objects are inadvertently discovered during the project their office should be notified immediately.

## Archaeological Short Report:

A Phase la Archaeological Short Report (ASR) was prepared by Samuel Snell of Metric Environmental, LLC (Snell 9/7/2021). Snell is an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.4(b).

On August 11 and 12, 2021, Metric staff conducted field work that included visual inspection and the excavation of shovel test probes. Three previously recorded archaeological sites were noted within the project area. Site 12-Al-0057 was noted to have been destroyed by commercial development. Sites 12-Al- 0553 and 12-Al-0554 were considered not eligible for listing in the NRHP. The archaeological survey conducted for this project did not encounter any evidence of the three previously recorded sites and did not identify any previously unrecorded sites; as such, no additional archaeological work was recommended. The recommendations from the ASR are presented as Appendix D, page 92.
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In a letter dated October 5, 2021, a request to review and comment on the ASR (SHPO and Tribes only) via IN SCOPE (https://erms12c.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents) was sent to the SHPO and Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days; however, Tribal consulting parties could enter the process at any time and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

On October 18, 2021, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe acknowledged receipt of the ASR and indicated that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if archaeological sites or objects are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

In a letter dated November 12, 2021, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The SHPO indicated that intact portions of archaeological sites 12-Al-0057, 12-Al-0553, and 12-Al-0554 may remain extant within, and immediately adjacent to, portions of the proposed project area. The SHPO expressed its opinion that any portions of these sites which may remain within the proposed project areas likely have been demolished by modern construction activities, and that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at the proposed project area. The SHPO noted that if the boundaries of the proposed project area are altered to include additional portions of archaeological sites 12-Al-0057, 12-Al-0553, and 12-Al- 0554, then additional archaeological investigations may be required.

On March 7, 2022, the Forest County Potawatomi Community acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The Tribe offered a finding of No Historic Properties Affected that are of significance to the Forest County Potawatomi Community. The Forest County Potawatomi Community noted that, as a standard caveat, in the event that human remains or archaeological materials are exposed as a result of the project, work should cease immediately, and the Tribe(s) must be included with the SHPO in any consultation regarding treatment and disposition of the find.

On March 8, 2022, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if any items which fall under the protection of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

## Historic Properties:

To determine the presence of historic properties within the project's APE, a historic property report (HPR) was prepared by Timothy Miller of Metric Environmental, LLC (Miller 11/30/2021). Miller is a Qualified Professional (QP) architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.4(b). Miller conducted a literature review by examining the Indiana State Historic Architectural and Archaeological Research Database (SHAARD), Indiana Historic Buildings, Bridges, and Cemeteries Map (IHBBCM), National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) database, INDOT-Cultural Resources Office (CRO) Public Web Map App, and Indiana Historical Bureau's Historic Markers database. The results of the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) for Allen County (1996) were also reviewed. Additionally, a field survey was conducted on August 9,2021 , for the project. No properties within the APE are currently listed in the NRHP. The following four properties were recommended to be eligible for listing in the NRHP:

1. Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27104) under Criteria B and C;
2. House at 1759 Estella Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27119) under Criterion C;
3. Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27165) under Criterion C;
4. Sunnymede Residential Historic District along Medford Drive, Sunnymede Drive, Dellwood Drive, Ridgeview, Sunwood Drive, and New Haven Avenue from Medford Drive to Dellwood Drive (IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-214-27124, \#003-21427126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196) under Criteria A and C.

The summary and conclusion sections of the HPR are presented as Appendix D, pages 88 and 89 .
In a letter dated March 7, 2022, a request to review and comment on the HPR via IN SCOPE was sent to the SHPO and both Tribal and non-Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. The Lincoln Highway Association and the owners of the identified historic properties were invited to participate as consulting parties. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days; however, Tribal consulting parties could enter the process at any time and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

In a letter dated April 4, 2022, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the HPR. The SHPO concurred with the size of the proposed APE, with the eligibility determinations of Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory
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["IHSSI"] \#003-214-27104), house at 1759 Estella Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27119), Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27165, and Sunnymede Residential Historic District (IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-214-27124, \#003-214-27126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196).

## Archaeological Short Report Addendum:

An ASR Addendum was prepared by Samuel Snell of Metric Environmental, LLC (Snell 3/28/2022) to account for the addition of a detention basin in the southeast project quadrant. The involved area was pedestrian surveyed during the original survey on August 11, 2021, but was not reported because it was outside the boundaries of the project. At that time, the area was a planted soybean field with 40-50 percent visibility along the field edge. The area was revisited by Metric staff on January 21, 2022, to document the current conditions. No archaeological resources were identified as a result of the survey; as such, no additional archaeological work was recommended. The recommendations from the ASR Addendum are presented as Appendix D, page 94.

In a letter dated May 20, 2022, a request to review and comment on the ASR Addendum (SHPO and Tribes only) via IN SCOPE (http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/) was sent to the SHPO and Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days; however, Tribal consulting parties could enter the process at any time and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

On May 23, 2022, the Forest County Potawatomi Community acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum. The Tribe offered a finding of No Historic Properties Affected that are of significance to the Forest County Potawatomi Community. Additionally, the Forest County Potawatomi Community expressed its desire to remain as a consulting party for this project.

On May 23, 2022, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum and offered no objection to the project proceeding. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma requested to be immediately notified and consulted if any items which fall under the protection of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

On May 26, 2022, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if any items which fall under the protection of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

On June 8, 2022, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum and indicated that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if archaeological sites or objects are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

On June 13, 2022, the Shawnee Tribe acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum and indicated it concurs that no known historic properties will be negatively impacted by this project. The Tribe noted there is still potential for discovery of unknown resources and requested that in the event that archaeological materials are encountered during construction, use, or maintenance of this location, the Tribe should be notified to resume immediate consultation under such a circumstance.

In a letter dated June 13, 2022, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum. The SHPO indicated they have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the proposed project area; and concurred that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at the proposed project area.

## Effects Report:

An Effects Report (Appendix D, pages 148 - 159) was prepared by Candace Hudziak, a Qualified Professional historian with Metric Environmental, LLC, and it was distributed to consulting parties and Tribes on December 2, 2022, with a request to review and comment on the document. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. The Effects Report provided additional information on project activities, updated design plans, and discussed potential effects on the NRHP-eligible resources located in the project's APE. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

In a letter dated December 9, 2022, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the Effects Report. The SHPO agreed that the project as proposed will not adversely affect the identified historic properties and provided clarification regarding the spelling of Estella Avenue. The SHPO indicated that unless another consulting party expresses a different opinion about this project's effects, it might now be appropriate to ask INDOT for a finding.
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In a letter dated January 5, 2023, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe expressed the opinion that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe, and recommended the project may continue as planned. The Tribe noted that, should this project inadvertently discover an archeological site or object(s) the Eastern Shawnee Tribe should be contacted immediately, as well as the appropriate state agencies, and all ground disturbing activity should stop until the Tribe and State agencies are consulted.

## Documentation Finding:

INDOT-CRO, acting on the FHWA's behalf, issued a finding of "No Adverse Effect" on April 4, 2023 for this undertaking (Appendix D, page 2). The SHPO concurred with the finding in a letter dated May 4, 2023 (Appendix D, pages 166 and 167).

## Public Involvement:

Views of the public pertaining to the INDOT CRO/FHWA finding of "No Adverse Effect" were sought through publication of a legal notice in the Journal Gazette newspaper on April 13, 2023. Comments were requested on or before May 15, 2023. No comments were received. The legal notice text and affidavit for publication of the legal notice are presented as Appendix D, pages 164 and 165.

This completes the Section 106 process and the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 have been fulfilled.

## SECTION E - SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES/ SECTION 6(f) RESOURCES

## Parks and Other Recreational Land

Publicly owned park
Publicly owned recreation area
Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)
Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges
National Wildlife Refuge
National Natural Landmark
State Wildlife Area
State Nature Preserve
Historic Properties
Site eligible and/or listed on the NRHP


## Evaluations Prepared

Programmatic Section 4(f)
"De minimis" Impact
Individual Section 4(f)
Any exception included in 23 CFR 774.13

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 $4(\mathrm{f})$ 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, page 3), and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 2), there are four potential $4(\mathrm{f})$ resources located within the 0.5 -mile search radius. According to additional research, and the site visits on August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ, one of these potential 4(f) resources, the SR 930 East north to Lake Avenue Segment of the
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Maplecrest Road/NE Utility Corridor trail, is within the project area. The Section 106 review identified four 4(f) resources located within the APE, but only two are within/adjacent to the project area and there will be no use of the other two resources.

The Section 106 review conducted for this project determined the following two properties located within and adjacent to the project area to be eligible for listing in the NRHP. Therefore, these properties are Section 4(f) resources:

1. Holter's Roost (c.1902) at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27104) is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion B for its association with the Holterman family, and under Criterion C as a rare architectural style in the township and county.
2. Sunnymede Residential Historic District (c.1940-1973) along Medford Drive, Sunnymede Drive, Dellwood Drive, Ridgeview, Sunwood Drive, and New Haven Avenue from Medford Drive to Dellwood Drive (IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-21427124, \#003-214-27126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196) is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A as a representation of postwar tract planning and development, and under Criterion C for its houses with architectural styles popular in the postwar period, such as American Small House, Cape Cod, and Ranch.

In proximity to these properties, the project involves roadway reconstruction and widening, and sidewalk construction. The project will not use these resources by taking permanent right of way and will not indirectly use the resources in such a way that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify these resources for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Therefore, no 4(f) use of either resource is expected.

Note that the project will require reconstruction of approximately 100 feet of the 10 -foot shared-use path located along the east side of Maplecrest Road, north of SR 930. This shared use path is located within existing right of way, and the project will not require any acquisition of property. This path is part of the local transportation system and functions primarily for transportation; therefore, it is not considered a Section 4(f) resource. MOT for the impacted section of multi-use trail was determined not to be necessary because there is no other existing pedestrian/trail facility within the project area. The RFI contains a recommendation for coordination with Fort Wayne Trails, Inc. An early coordination request was sent to Fort Wayne Trails, Inc., on April 22, 2022. Fort Wayne Trails, Inc. acknowledged receipt of the request; however, no other response was provided (Appendix C, page 57).


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 U.S. Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 established the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which was created to preserve, develop, and assure accessibility to outdoor recreation resources. Section 6(f) of this Act prohibits conversion of lands purchased with LWCF monies to a non-recreation use.

A review of $6(f)$ properties on the INDOT ESD website revealed a total of 30 properties in Allen County (Appendix I, page 1). None of these properties are located within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, there will be no impacts to $6(\mathrm{f})$ resources.

## SECTION F - Air Quality



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

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) 2024-2028 Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council Transportation Improvement Program (NIRCC TIP) which is directly incorporated into the FY 2024-2028 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (Appendix H, pages 1-5).

This project is located in Allen County, which is currently a maintenance 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. The project's design concept and scope are accurately reflected in both the NIRCC Transportation Plan (TP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and both conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Therefore, the conformity requirements of 40 CFR 93 have been met.

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.

## SECTION G - NOISE

| Noise | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Is a noise analysis required in accordance with FHWA regulations and INDOT's traffic noise policy? | $\square$ | $\square$ |

Date Noise Analysis was approved/technically sufficient by INDOT ESD: N/A
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 Indiana Department of Transportation Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure, this action does not require a formal noise analysis.
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## 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 |
| :---: | :---: |
| X |  |
|  | X |
|  | X |
|  | X |
| X |  |
|  |  |
| X |  |

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 project is located in a commercially developed setting. No community features are present in the project area. The project is not anticipated to impact community or neighborhood cohesion, the local tax base, property values, public facilities, community centers, community plans or other important resources. No negative community impacts are anticipated.

No events, fairs or festivals take place within the project area. The proposed MOT will ensure that any events held nearby will remain accessible during construction.

Coordination has occurred with the City of New Haven during the planning process. The project involves the construction of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant pedestrian facilities and is therefore in compliance with the City's ADA Transition Plan.

## 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, page 3) and the RFI report (Appendix E, page 2), there are two recreational facilities, two trails, one managed land and five pipelines located within the 0.5 mile of the project. One multiuse trail and two pipelines are located within the project area. That number was confirmed by the site visits on August 18 and 19, 2021 by DLZ.

The multi-use trail is located along the east side of Maplecrest Road within the project area, north of SR 930. The project will require approximately 100 linear feet of the trail north of SR 930 to be shifted several feet to the east, to align with the trail proposed on the east side of Maplecrest Road, south of the intersection. The trial will be 10 feet wide and will extend to the new intersection with the QR. MOT for the impacted section of multi-use trail was determined not to be necessary because there is no other existing pedestrian/trail facility within the project area. The RFI contains a recommendation for coordination with Fort Wayne Trails, Inc. An early coordination request was sent to Fort Wayne Trails, Inc., on April 22, 2022. Fort Wayne Trails, Inc. acknowledged receipt of the request; however, no other response was provided (Appendix C, page 57).

A Tri-State Pipeline Properties pipeline crosses the western terminus of the project area. A Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO) pipeline crosses the project area south of the SR 930 and Maplecrest Road intersection and the proposed QR south of its intersection with SR 930. The RFI contains a recommendation for coordination with INDOT Utilities and Railroads. Utility coordination has been initiated and will continue as the project is developed.

The NIRCC response dated August 17, 2021 (Appendix C, page 24) noted the existing multi-use trail along the east side of Maplecrest Road and indicated that the Northeast Indiana United Trails Plan calls for this trail to be extended to the south. The
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project will extend this trail south to the new intersection with the QR. NIRCC indicated that sidewalks are proposed along the north and south sides of SR 930. The project includes the addition of a sidewalk on the south side of SR 930, between the Maplecrest Road intersection and the east project terminus.

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.

In a response dated August 17, 2021 (Appendix C, page 27), the New Haven Planning Department provided information regarding the locations of water and sewer utilities in the project area. Utility coordination has been initiated and will continue as the project is developed.

## 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?


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 or 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 Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis is required for any project that has two or more relocations or 0.5 acre of additional permanent right-of-way. The project will require acquisition of approximately 3.52 acres of new permanent ROW, acquisition of approximately 0.33 acre of temporary ROW and will require no relocations. Therefore, an EJ Analysis is required.

Potential EJ impacts are detected by locating minority and low-income populations relative to a reference population to determine if populations of EJ concern exists 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 Allen County. The community that overlaps the project area is called the affected community (AC). In this project, the AC is comprised of Census Tracts 112.01 and 112.02. 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 2021 American Community Survey Five Year Estimates was obtained from the US Census Bureau (https://data.census.gov/) on April 11, 2023 by DLZ. The data collected for minority and low-income populations within the AC are presented as Appendix I, pages 2-4, and are summarized in the below table.

| Minority and Low-Income Data (2021 American Community Survey Five Year Estimates) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | COC - Allen County, Indiana | AC-1-Census Tract | AC-2 - Census Tract |
| Percent Minority | 27.57 | 15.74 | 5.95 |
| 125\% of COC | 34.46 | AC < 125\% COC | AC < 125\% COC |
| EJ Population of Concern |  | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |
| Percent Low-Income | 12.34 | 20.87 | 5.72 |
| 125\% of COC | 15.43 | AC > 125\% COC | AC < 125\% COC |
| EJ Population of Concern |  | Yes | No |

AC-1, Census Tract 112.01 has a percent minority of 15.74 which is below $50 \%$ and is below the $125 \%$ COC threshold. Therefore, AC-1 is not a minority population of EJ concern. AC-2, Census Tract 112.02 has a percent minority of 5.95 which is below $50 \%$ and is below the $125 \%$ COC. Therefore, AC-2 is not a minority population of EJ concern.

AC-1, Census Tract 112.01 has a percent low-income of 20.87 which is below $50 \%$ and is above the $125 \%$ COC threshold. Therefore, AC-1 is a low-income population of EJ concern. AC-2, Census Tract 112.02 has a percent low-income of 5.72 which is below $50 \%$ and is below the $125 \%$ COC. Therefore, AC-2 is not a low-income population of EJ concern.

## Conclusion:

The project will require acquisition of approximately 3.52 acres of new permanent ROW, acquisition of approximately 0.33 acre of temporary ROW and will require no relocations. Access to abutting properties will be maintained during construction. Two-way traffic will be maintained on both SR 930 and Maplecrest Road through the duration of the project. Aside from short-term inconveniences during construction, the project will not disrupt community cohesion or negatively affect existing linkages between neighborhoods within or beyond the project area. Safety conditions for motorists will be improved. This project will not result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts to the identified low-income EJ population.

On April 24, 2023, INDOT-ESD reviewed the project information along with the EJ Analysis for the above referenced project (Appendix I page 5). With the information provided, the project may require minimal right-of-way, require no relocations, and would not disrupt community cohesion or create a physical barrier. 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.

## 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 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | x |
|  | X |

Number of relocations: Residences: $\quad 0 \quad$ Businesses: $\quad 0 \quad$ Farms: 0 O 0 Other: $\quad$ N/A

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.

## SECTION I - HAZARDOUS MATERIALS \& REGULATED SUBSTANCES



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, the RFI was completed on April 18, 2022 by DLZ and INDOT SAM provided their concurrence on April 22, 2022 (Appendix E).

One Superfund site is located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Five Resource Conservation and Recovery Act generators are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Four underground storage tank sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Two Voluntary Remediation Program sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. One solid waste landfill is located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Ten leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. One Brownfield site is located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Three institutional controls sites are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. Five National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) facilities are located within 0.5 mile of the project area. One
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NPDES pipe is located within 0.5 mile of the project area.
One LUST site is located in the project area.
Speedway \#8526, 6244 Lincoln Highway, Fort Wayne, IN 46803, AI \#1295, is located at the southwest corner of the SR 930 and Maplecrest Road intersection. IDEM issued a No Further Action (NFA) Status Approval Determination Pursuant to IDEM Risk Integrated System of Closure (RISC) Guidance for the site on June 21, 2016; however, the site was closed under non-default, industrial for subsurface soil and default, industrial for groundwater. Soil and groundwater contamination were left in place. Soil contamination was noted at approximately seven feet below ground surface. If excavation occurs in this area, proper handling, removal, and disposal of soil and/or groundwater may be necessary. Coordination with Tim Veatch (tveatch@idem.in.gov) IDEM LUST Section, should occur before the ready for contracts date. Refer to Appendix G of the SAM Manual for the recommended procedure to manage and report contamination.

## Part IV - Permits and Commitments

## PERMITS CHECKLIST

Permits (mark all that apply)
Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section10 Permit)
Nationwide Permit (NWP)
Regional General Permit (RGP)
Individual Permit (IP)
Other
IN Department of Environmental Management (401/Construction Stormwater General Permit)
Nationwide Permit (NWP)
Regional General Permit (RGP)
Individual Permit (IP)
Isolated Wetlands
Construction Stormwater General Permit Other
IN Department of Natural Resources
Construction in a Floodway Navigable Waterway Permit Other
Mitigation Required
US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit Others (Please discuss in the discussion below)

Likely Required


Allen County Legal Drain

List the permits likely required for the project and summarize why the permits are needed, including permits designated as "Other."
This project will require disturbance to more than one acre of ground surface; therefore, an IDEM Construction Stormwater General Permit is likely to be required. This project will impact likely jurisdictional wetlands; therefore, an IDEM Section 401/USACE Section 404 Permit is likely required. Sheridan Drain is a legal drain; therefore, the project requires the Allen County Drainage Board's consent to allow a permanent crossing structure in the legal drain.

## 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 Fort Wayne 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. Any work in a wetland area within INDOT's right-of-way or in borrow/waste areas is prohibited unless specifically allowed in the US Army Corps of Engineers or IDEM permit. (INDOT ESD)
4. Wetlands B, D, E, G and H will be labeled on the plans as "Do Not Disturb". (INDOT ESD)
5. Small structure inspections occurred on June 7 and June 14, 2022 and no evidence of bats/birds using the structure were found (Appendix C, pages 54 and 55). USFWS Bridge/Structure Assessment are only valid for two years. If construction will begin after June 7, 2024, an inspection of the structure by a qualified individual, must be performed. Inspection of the structure should check for presence of bats/bat indicators and/or presence of birds. The results of the inspection must indicate no signs of bats or birds. If signs of bats or birds are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. (INDOT ESD)
6. Speedway \#8526, 6244 Lincoln Highway, Fort Wayne, IN 46803, AI \#1295, is located at the southwest corner of the SR 930 and Maplecrest Road intersection. IDEM issued a NFA Status Approval Determination Pursuant to IDEM Risk Integrated System of Closure (RISC) Guidance for the site on June 21, 2016; however, the site was closed under non-default, industrial for subsurface soil and default, industrial for groundwater. Soil and groundwater contamination were left in place. Soil contamination was noted at approximately seven feet below ground surface. If excavation occurs in this area, proper handling, removal, and disposal of soil and/or groundwater may be necessary. Coordination with Tim Veatch (tveatch@idem.in.gov) IDEM LUST Section, should occur before the ready for contracts date. Refer to Appendix G of the SAM Manual for the recommended procedure to manage and report contamination. (INDOT SAM)

## For Further Consideration:

1. Impacts to non-wetland forest of one acre or more should be mitigated at a minimum $2: 1$ ratio. If less than one acre of nonwetland forest is removed in a rural setting, replacement should be at a $1: 1$ ratio based on area. Impacts to non-wetland forest under one acre in an urban setting should be mitigated by planting five trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height (dbh), for each tree which is removed that is 10 inches dbh or greater ( $5: 1$ mitigation based on the number of large trees) or by using the $1: 1$ replacement ratio based on area depending on the type of habitat impacted (individual canopy tree removal in an urban streetscape or park-like environment versus removal of habitat supporting a tree canopy, woody understory, and herbaceous layer). Impacts under 0.10 acre in an urban area may still involve the replacement of large diameter trees but typically do not require any additional mitigation or additional plantings beyond seeding and stabilizing disturbed areas. (IDNR-DFW)
2. Impacts to wetland habitat should be mitigated at the appropriate ratio according to the 1991 INDOT/IDNR/USFWS Memorandum of Understanding. (IDNR-DFW)
3. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat or Northern Long-eared bat roosting (greater than 5 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or with cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 through September 30. (IDNR-DFW)

# Level 4 Categorical Exclusion <br> SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements <br> Des. No. 1900107 <br> Indiana Department of Transportation 
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## APPENDIX A

## INDOT Supporting Documentation

## Categorical Exclusion Level Thresholds

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

[^0]
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## Graphics




SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements Indiana Department of Transportation

Des. No.: 1900107

Scale - 1" $=10,417$ '
Figure 1
Project Location



SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements Indiana Department of Transportation

Des. No.: 1900107
Figure 3
Figure 3 - Aerial Photo and Photo Key


Photo 1 - View westerly along SR 930 from west of Maplecrest Road


Photo 2 - View easterly along SR 930 from west of Maplecrest Road
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Photo 3 - View northeasterly along SR 930 toward Maplecrest Road intersection


Photo 4 - View northerly toward SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection from west of Maplecrest Road
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Photo 5 - View northerly along Maplecrest Road toward SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection


Photo 6 - View westerly along SR 930 toward Maplecrest Road intersection from east of Maplecrest Road
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Point of Interest

- Base Flood Elevation Point

Flood Elevation Points

- STUDIED STREAM


## Rivers and Streams at

 least 1 square mileDrainage Area (sq. miles)
$>500$
FEMA Zone AE Floodway, FEMA
Administrative Floodway
FEMA Zone AE
Additional Floodplain Area; DNR . 2
Percent Flood Hazard

Point of Interest Coordinates (WGS84) Long: -85.058762358 Lat: $\mathbf{4 1 . 0 6 9 4 6 6 9 5 0 1}$

The information provided below is based on the point of interest shown in the map above.

County: Allen
Stream Name:
Maumee River
Best Available Flood Hazard Zone: Not Mapped National Flood Hazard Zone: Not Mapped
Is a Flood Control Act permit from the DNR needed for this location? See following pages Is a local floodplain permit needed for this location? Contact your local Floodplain AdministratorFloodplain Administrator: Rob Gutierrez, Director of Planning and Economic Development Community Jurisdiction: City Of New Haven, City proper
Phone: (260) 748-7040
Email: rgutierrez@newhavenin.org
US Army Corps of Engineers District: Detroit
Approximate Ground Elevation: 761.7 feet (NAVD88) Base Flood Elevation: 750.9 feet (NAVD88)

Drainage Area: Not available

SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements Indiana Department of Transportation

Des. No.: 1900107

Date Generated: 4/5/2023
Figure 7

IDNR Floodplain Map
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## APPENDIX C

## Early Coordination

|  | SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements <br> Indiana Department of Transportation <br> Des. No.: 1900107 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |

INNOVATIVE IDEAS
EXCEPTIONAL DESIGN
UNMATCHED CLIENT SERVICE

July 9, 2021

## See Appended List

Re: Early Coordination Request
SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County
Indiana Department of Transportation
INDOT Des. No.: 1900107 DLZ No.: 2066-2180-90

Dear Interested Party:

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) intend to proceed with an intersection improvement project in Allen County. This letter is part of the early coordination phase of the environmental review process. DLZ Indiana, LLC (DLZ) is under contract to advance environmental documentation for the referenced project. We are requesting comments from your area of expertise regarding any possible environmental effects associated with these projects. Please use the above designation number and description in your reply. We will incorporate your comments into a study of the project's environmental impacts.

This project is located at the intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road, approximately 3.67 miles west of I-469. Note that Maplecrest Road south of 930 within the project area was formerly known as Adams Center Road. The intersection operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. Between 2014 and 2016, 62 crashes occurred at the intersection, $69 \%$ of which were rear-end and $11 \%$ of which were left turn crashes. Based on this data, congestion is the cause for the higher than expected rate of crashes. A traffic count from 2018 shows the AADT for SR 930 to be 23,936 vehicles per day and Maplecrest Road (formerly Adams Center Road) to be 11,307 VPD. The southbound right turn movement operates at a LOS F at peak hours. There is also a high number of left turn movements from SR 930 to Maplecrest Road as evidenced by the two left turn lanes in this direction. A potential factor contributing to congestion in the eastbound through movement is the merging of SR 930 to one lane approximately one mile east of the intersection. There is also a road diet project on Lincoln Highway that may affect the congestion as it will be reduced from two lanes to one lane in each direction. This project will provide congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes.

Within the project area, SR 930 is a two-lane Principal Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within SURVEYING - CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

INNOVATIVE IDEAS EXCEPTIONAL DESIGN UNMATCHED CLIENT SERVICE
the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area. Within the project area, Maplecrest Road is a two-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area.

The project proposes construction of a quadrant roadway which will eliminate left turn movements through the primary intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest by relocating those maneuvers to secondary intersections created by the quadrant roadway south and west of the primary intersection. The primary intersection will then operate as a two-phase intersection with both secondary signals at the end of this connector roadway operating as three-phase signals to protect the left turn maneuvers. By using two phases instead of the previous four, the primary signal will decrease delay. The traffic will have less time to queue, helping lower the congestion as well. The new quadrant roadway will also provide storage length for the turning vehicles. The project will include the addition of a southbound right turn lane on Maplecrest Road, an additional eastbound right-turn lane on SR 930, an additional southbound through lane on Maplecrest Road, and a northbound left-turn lane on Maplecrest Road south of the quadrant roadway paired with the four lane quadrant roadway.

The project's right of way needs have not yet been determined; however, it is anticipated that up to 8 acres may be acquired. The method of traffic maintenance is not anticipated to require a detour as most improvements will occur outside the existing roadway. Adding the additional turn lanes will require restricting access to lanes during construction. Once the new infrastructure is constructed, resurfacing and reconfiguring the lanes is expected to be completed under traffic.

Land in commercial, residential and agricultural use abuts the project area. Waters and wetlands determinations will be performed. This project does not qualify for USFWS range-wide programmatic informal consultation for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat, and standard informal consultation will occur. A Section 106 compliance review will be conducted to assess effects upon historic properties. The results of this investigation will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Officer for review and concurrence, as appropriate.

Should we not receive your response within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of this letter, it will be assumed that your agency feels that there will be no adverse effects incurred as a result of the proposed project. However, should you find that an extension to the response time is necessary, a reasonable amount may be granted upon request. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact Jason A. Stone, DLZ Indiana, LLC, 2211 E. Jefferson Blvd.,

South Bend, Indiana 46615, Telephone - 574 245-1674, E-mail - jstone@dlz.com, or Matthew Witt, INDOT Project Manager, 5333 Hatfield Rd., Fort Wayne, Indiana 46808, Telephone - 260 399-7320, E-mail - mwitt@indot.in.gov

Thank you in advance for your input.


The following agencies received this early coordination request<br>Indiana Department of Environmental<br>Management<br>(on-line)<br>\section*{Environmental Geology Section<br><br>Indiana Geological Survey<br><br>(on-line)}<br>Indiana Department of Natural Resources<br>environmentalreview@dnr.in.gov<br>Manager, Aviation Section<br>Indiana Department of Transportation<br>jcourtade@indot.in.gov<br>State Conservationist<br>Natural Resource Conservation Service<br>rick.neilson@in.usda.gov<br>US Fish and Wildlife Service<br>elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov<br>Regional Environmental Coordinator<br>Midwest Regional Office<br>National Park Service<br>601 Riverfront Drive<br>Omaha, NE 68102<br>Environmental Analysis Branch, CENCE-PL-E<br>Department of the Army<br>Detroit District, Corps of Engineers<br>Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil<br>Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil<br>Environmental Officer<br>Chicago Regional Office, USHUD<br>Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov<br>Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council<br>Dan.Avery@co.allen.in.us<br>Allen County Commissioners richard.beck@allencounty.us therese.brown@co.allen.in.us nelson.peters@allencounty.us<br>Allen County Surveyor's Office / Allen County Drainage Board<br>Surveyor@co.allen.in.us<br>Allen County Highway Department<br>Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us<br>Allen County Department of Planning Services<br>dps@allencounty.us<br>New Haven Public Works Department<br>jjacquay@newhaven.in.gov<br>New Haven Fire Department / Emergency Services jhale@newhaven.in.gov<br>New Haven Planning Department<br>rgutierrez@newhaven.in.gov<br>New Haven Chief of Police<br>jmccracken@newhaven.in.gov<br>New Haven MS4 Coordinator<br>utilityoffice@newhaven.in.gov<br>East Allen County Schools<br>mhissong@eacs.k12.in.us<br>New Haven Mayor's Office smccmichael@newhaven.in.gov

## 2. Indiana Department of Environmental Management

We Protect Hoosiers and Our Environment.

100 North Senate Avenue - Indianapolis, IN 46204
(800) 451-6027-(317) 232-8603 - www.idem.IN.gov

INDOT Ft. Wayne District
Matthew Witt, Project Manager
5333 Hatfield Road
Fort Wayne , IN 46808

DLZ Indiana, LLC<br>Jason A. Stone<br>Environmental Services Dept. Manager<br>2211 E Jefferson Blvd<br>South Bend , IN 46615

Dear Grant Administrator or Other Finance Approval Authority:

RE: This INDOT project is located at the intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road, approximately 3.67 miles west of I-469. Note that Maplecrest Road south of 930 within the project area was formerly known as Adams Center Road. The intersection operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. Between 2014 and 2016, 62 crashes occurred at the intersection, $69 \%$ of which were rear-end and $11 \%$ of which were left turn crashes. Based on this data, congestion is the cause for the higher than expected rate of crashes. A traffic count from 2018 shows the AADT for SR 930 to be 23,936 vehicles per day and Maplecrest Road (formerly Adams Center Road) to be 11,307 VPD. The southbound right turn movement operates at a LOS F at peak hours. There is also a high number of left turn movements from SR 930 to Maplecrest Road as evidenced by the two left turn lanes in this direction. A potential factor contributing to congestion in the eastbound through movement is the merging of SR 930 to one lane approximately one mile east of the intersection. There is also a road diet project on Lincoln Highway that may affect the congestion as it will be reduced from two lanes to one lane in each direction. This project will provide congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes. Within the project area, SR 930 is a two-lane Principal Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12-foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area. Within the project area, Maplecrest Road is a two-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area. The project proposes construction of a quadrant roadway which will eliminate left turn movements through the primary intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest by relocating those maneuvers to secondary intersections created by the quadrant roadway south and east of the primary intersection. The primary intersection will then operate as a two-phase intersection with both secondary signals at the end of this connector roadway operating as three-phase signals to protect the left turn maneuvers. By using two phases instead of the previous four, the primary signal will decrease delay. The traffic will have less time to queue, helping lower the congestion as well. The new quadrant roadway will also provide storage length for the turning vehicles. Besides construction of the new quadrant road, lanes will be added to Maplecrest Road and SR 930 to accommodate the new traffic patterns. The project's right of way needs have not yet been determined; however, it is anticipated that less than 10 acres may be acquired. The method of traffic maintenance is not anticipated to require a detour as most improvements will occur outside the existing roadway. Adding the additional turn lanes will require restricting access to lanes during construction. Once the new infrastructure is constructed, resurfacing and reconfiguring the lanes is expected to be completed under traffic. Land in commercial, residential and agricultural use abuts the project area.
The Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) is aware that many local government or not-forprofit entities are seeking grant monies, a bond issuance, or another public funding mechanism to cover some portion of the cost of a public works, infrastructure, or community development project. IDEM also is aware that in order to be eligible for such funding assistance, applicants are required to first evaluate the potential impacts that their particular project may have on the environment. In order to assist applicants seeking such financial assistance and to ensure that such projects do not have an adverse impact on the environment, IDEM has prepared the following list of environmental issues that each applicant must consider in order to minimize environmental impacts in compliance with all relevant state laws.

IDEM recommends that each applicant consider the following issues when moving forward with their project. IDEM also requests that, in addition to submitting the information requested above, each applicant also sign the attached certification, attesting to the fact that they have read the letter in its entirety, agree to abide by the recommendations of the letter, and to apply for any permits required from IDEM for the completion of their project.

IDEM recommends that any person(s) intending to complete a public works, infrastructure, or community development project using any public funding consider each of the following applicable recommendations and requirements:

## WATER AND BIOTIC QUALITY

1. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires that you obtain a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) before discharging dredged or fill materials into any wetlands or other waters, such as rivers, lakes, streams, and ditches. Other activities regulated include the relocation, channelization, widening, or other such alteration of a stream, and the mechanical clearing (use of heavy construction equipment) of wetlands. Thus, as a project owner or sponsor, it is your responsibility to ensure that no wetlands are disturbed without the proper permit. Although you may initially refer to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory maps as a means of identifying potential areas of concern, please be mindful that those maps do not depict jurisdictional wetlands regulated by the USACE or the Department of Environmental Management. A valid jurisdictional wetlands determination can only be made by the USACE, using the 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual.

USACE recommends that you have a consultant check to determine whether your project will abut, or lie within, a wetland area. To view a list of consultants that have requested to be included on a list posted by the USACE on their Web site, see USACE Permits and Public Notices
(http://www.Irl.usace.army.mil/orf/default.asp) (http://www.Irl.usace.army.mi//orf /default.asp
(http://www.Irl.usace.army.mi//orf/default.asp)) and then click on "Information" from the menu on the righthand side of that page. Their "Consultant List" is the fourth entry down on the "Information" page. Please note that the USACE posts all consultants that request to appear on the list, and that inclusion of any particular consultant on the list does not represent an endorsement of that consultant by the USACE, or by IDEM.

Much of northern Indiana (Newton, Lake, Porter, LaPorte, St. Joseph, Elkhart, LaGrange, Steuben, and Dekalb counties; large portions of Jasper, Starke, Marshall, Noble, Allen, and Adams counties; and lesser portions of Benton, White, Pulaski, Kosciusko, and Wells counties) is served by the USACE District Office in Detroit (313-226-6812). The central and southern portions of the state (large portions of Benton, White, Pulaski, Kosciosko, and Wells counties; smaller portions of Jasper, Starke, Marshall , Noble, Allen, and Adams counties; and all other Indiana counties located in north-central, central, and southern Indiana ) are served by the USACE Louisville District Office (502-315-6733).

Additional information on contacting these U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) District Offices, government agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands, and other water quality issues, can be found at http://www.in.gov/idem/4396.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4396.htm). IDEM recommends that impacts to wetlands and other water resources be avoided to the fullest extent.
2. In the event a Section 404 wetlands permit is required from the USACE, you also must obtain a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the IDEM Office of Water Quality. To learn more about the water quality certification program, visit: http://www.in.gov/idem/4384.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4384.htm).
3. If the USACE determines that a wetland or other body of water is isolated and not subject to Clean Water Act regulation, it is still regulated by the state of Indiana. A state isolated wetland permit from IDEM's Office of Water Quality is required for any activity that results in the discharge of dredged or fill materials into isolated wetlands. To learn more about isolated wetlands, contact the Office of Water Quality at 317-2338488.
4. If your project will impact more than 0.5 acres of wetland, stream relocation, or other large-scale alterations to bodies of water such as the creation of a dam or a water diversion, you should seek additional input from the Office of Water Quality, Wetlands staff at 317-233-8488.
5. Work within the one-hundred year floodway of a given body of water is regulated by the Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water. Contact this agency at 317-232-4160 for further information.
6. The physical disturbance of the stream and riparian vegetation, especially large trees overhanging any affected water bodies should be limited to only that which is absolutely necessary to complete the project. The shade provided by the large overhanging trees helps maintain proper stream temperatures and dissolved oxygen for aquatic life.
7. For projects involving construction activity (which includes clearing, grading, excavation and other land disturbing activities) that result in the disturbance of one (1), or more, acres of total land area, contact the Office of Water Quality - Watershed Planning Branch (317/233-1864) regarding the need for of a Rule 5 Storm Water Runoff Permit. Visit the following Web page

- http://www.in.gov/idem/4902.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4902.htm)

To obtain, and operate under, a Rule 5 permit you will first need to develop a Construction Plan (http://www.in.gov/idem/4917.htm\#constreq (http://www.in.gov/idem/4917.htm\#constreq)), and as described in 327 IAC 15-5-6.5 (http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/T03270/A00150 [PDF] (http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/T03270/A00150.PDF), pages 16 through 19). Before you may apply for a Rule 5 Permit, or begin construction, you must submit your Construction Plan to your county Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) (http://www.in.gov/isda/soil/contacts/map.html (http://www.in.gov/isda/soil/contacts/map.html)).

Upon receipt of the construction plan, personnel of the SWCD or the Indiana Department of Environmental Management will review the plan to determine if it meets the requirements of 327 IAC 15-5. Plans that are deemed deficient will require re-submittal. If the plan is sufficient you will be notified and instructed to submit the verification to IDEM as part of the Rule 5 Notice of Intent (NOI) submittal. Once construction begins, staff of the SWCD or Indiana Department of Environmental Management will perform inspections of activities at the site for compliance with the regulation.

Please be mindful that approximately 149 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) areas are now being established by various local governmental entities throughout the state as part of the implementation of Phase II federal storm water requirements. All of these MS4 areas will eventually take responsibility for Construction Plan review, inspection, and enforcement. As these MS4 areas obtain program approval from IDEM, they will be added to a list of MS4 areas posted on the IDEM Website at:
http://www.in.gov/idem/4900.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4900.htm).
If your project is located in an IDEM-approved MS4 area, please contact the local MS4 program about meeting their storm water requirements. Once the MS4 approves the plan, the NOI can be submitted to IDEM.

Regardless of the size of your project, or which agency you work with to meet storm water requirements, IDEM recommends that appropriate structures and techniques be utilized both during the construction phase, and after completion of the project, to minimize the impacts associated with storm water runoff. The use of appropriate planning and site development and appropriate storm water quality measures are recommended to prevent soil from leaving the construction site during active land disturbance and for post construction water quality concerns. Information and assistance regarding storm water related to
construction activities are available from the Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) offices in each county or from IDEM.
8. For projects involving impacts to fish and botanical resources, contact the Department of Natural Resources - Division of Fish and Wildlife (317-232-4080) for additional project input.
9. For projects involving water main construction, water main extensions, and new public water supplies, contact the Office of Water Quality - Drinking Water Branch (317-308-3299) regarding the need for permits.
10. For projects involving effluent discharges to waters of the State of Indiana, contact the Office of Water Quality - Permits Branch (317-233-0468) regarding the need for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.
11. For projects involving the construction of wastewater facilities and sewer lines, contact the Office of Water Quality - Permits Branch (317-232-8675) regarding the need for permits.

## AIR QUALITY

The above-noted project (see page 1) should be designed to minimize any impact on ambient air quality in, or near, the project area. The project must comply with all federal and state air pollution regulations. Consideration should be given to the following:

1. Regarding open burning, and disposing of organic debris generated by land clearing activities; some types of open burning are allowed under specific conditions (http://www.in.gov/idem/4148.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4148.htm)). You also can seek an open burning variance from IDEM.

IDEM generally recommends that you take vegetative wastes to a registered yard waste composting facility or that the waste be chipped or shredded with composting on-site. You must register with IDEM if more than 2,000 pounds is to be composted; contact 317-232-0066). The finished compost can then be used as a mulch or soil amendment. You also may bury any vegetative wastes (such as leaves, twigs, branches, limbs, tree trunks and stumps) on-site, although burying large quantities of such material can lead to subsidence problems.
2. Reasonable precautions must be taken to minimize fugitive dust emissions from construction and demolition activities. For example, wetting the area with water, constructing wind barriers, or treating dusty areas with chemical stabilizers (such as calcium chloride or several other commercial products). Dirt tracked onto paved roads from unpaved areas should be minimized.

If construction or demolition is conducted in a wooded area where blackbirds have roosted or abandoned buildings or building sections in which pigeons or bats have roosted for three to five years, precautionary measures should be taken to avoid an outbreak of histoplasmosis. This disease is caused by the fungus Histoplasma capsulatum, which stems from bird or bat droppings that have accumulated in one area for three to five years. The spores from this fungus become airborne when the area is disturbed and can cause infections over an entire community downwind of the site. The area should be wetted down prior to cleanup or demolition of the project site. For more detailed information on histoplasmosis prevention and control, please contact the Acute Disease Control Division of the Indiana State Department of Health at 317-2337272.
3. The U.S. EPA and the U.S. Surgeon General recommend that people not have long-term exposure to radon at levels above $4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$. For a county-by-county map of predicted radon levels in Indiana, visit http://www.in.gov/idem/4267.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4267.htm).

The U.S. EPA further recommends that all homes and apartments (within three stories of ground level) be tested for radon. If in-home radon levels are determined to be $4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ or higher, then U.S. EPA recommends a follow-up test. If the second test confirms that radon levels are $4 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ or higher, then U.S. EPA recommends the installation of radon-reduction measures. For a list of qualified radon testers and radon mitigation (or reduction) specialists, visit http://www.
in.gov/isdh/regsvcs/radhealth/pdfs/radon_testers_mitigators_list.pdf
(http://www.in.gov/isdh/regsvcs/radhealth/pdfs/radon_testers_mitigators_list.pdf). Also, is recommended that radon reduction measures be built into all new homes, particularly in areas like Indiana that have moderate to high predicted radon levels.

To learn more about radon, radon risks, and ways to reduce exposure, visit http://www.in.gov/isdh/regsvcs/radhealth/radon.htm (http://www.in.gov/isdh/regsvcs/radhealth/radon.htm), http://www.in.gov/idem/4145.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4145.htm), or http://www.epa.gov/radon/index.html (http://www.epa.gov/radon/index.html).
4. With respect to asbestos removal, all facilities slated for renovation or demolition (except residential buildings that have four (4) or fewer dwelling units and which will not be used for commercial purposes) must be inspected by an Indiana-licensed asbestos inspector prior to the commencement of any renovation or demolition activities. If regulated asbestos-containing material (RACM) that may become airborne is found, any subsequent demolition, renovation, or asbestos removal activities must be performed in accordance with the proper notification and emission control requirements.

If no asbestos is found where a renovation activity will occur, or if the renovation involves removal of less than 260 linear feet of RACM off of pipes, less than 160 square feet of RACM off of other facility components, or less than 35 cubic feet of RACM off of all facility components, the owner or operator of the project does not need to notify IDEM before beginning the renovation activity.

For questions on asbestos demolition and renovation activities, you can also call IDEM's Lead/Asbestos section at 1-888-574-8150.

In all cases where a demolition activity will occur (even if no asbestos is found), the owner or operator must still notify IDEM 10 working days prior to the demolition, using the form found at www.in.gov/icpr/webfile/formsdiv/44593.pdf.

Anyone submitting a renovation/demolition notification form will be billed a notification fee based upon the amount of friable asbestos containing material to be removed or demolished. Projects that involve the removal of more than 2,600 linear feet of friable asbestos containing materials on pipes, or 1,600 square feet or 400 cubic feet of friable asbestos containing material on other facility components, will be billed a fee of $\$ 150$ per project; projects below these amounts will be billed a fee of $\$ 50$ per project. Billings will occur on a quarterly basis.

For more information about IDEM policy regarding asbestos removal and disposal, visit: http://www.in.gov/idem/4983.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4983.htm).
5. With respect to lead-based paint removal, IDEM encourages all efforts to minimize human exposure to leadbased paint chips and dust. IDEM is particularly concerned that young children exposed to lead can suffer from learning disabilities. Although lead-based paint abatement efforts are not mandatory, any abatement that is conducted within housing built before January 1,1978 , or a child-occupied facility is required to comply with all lead-based paint work practice standards, licensing and notification requirements. For more information about lead-based paint removal, visit
http://www.in.gov/idem/permits/guide/waste/leadabatement.html (http://www.in.gov/idem/permits/guide/waste/leadabatement.html).
6. Ensure that asphalt paving plants are permitted and operate properly. The use of cutback asphalt, or asphalt emulsion containing more than seven percent ( $7 \%$ ) oil distillate, is prohibited during the months of April through October. See 326 IAC 8-5-2, Asphalt Paving Rule (http://www.ai.org/legislative/iac/T03260/A00080.PDF (http://www.ai.org/legislative/iac/T03260/A00080.PDF)).
7. If your project involves the construction of a new source of air emissions or the modification of an existing source of air emissions or air pollution control equipment, it will need to be reviewed by the IDEM Office of Air Quality (OAQ). A registration or permit may be required under 326 IAC 2 ( www.ai.org/legislative/iac/t03260/a00020.pdf (http://www.ai.org/legislative/iac/t03260/a00020.pdf).). New sources that use or emit hazardous air pollutants may be subject to Section 112 of the Clean Air Act and corresponding state air regulations governing hazardous air pollutants.
8. For more information on air permits, visit http://www.in.gov/idem/4223.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4223.htm), or to initiate the IDEM air permitting process, please contact the Office of Air Quality Permit Reviewer of the Day at (317) 233-0178 or oamprod at idem.in.gov.

## LAND QUALITY

In order to maintain compliance with all applicable laws regarding contamination and/or proper waste disposal, IDEM recommends that:

1. If the site is found to contain any areas used to dispose of solid or hazardous waste, you need to contact the Office of Land Quality (OLQ) at 317-308-3103.
2. All solid wastes generated by the project, or removed from the project site, need to be taken to a properly permitted solid waste processing or disposal facility. For more information, visit http://www.in.gov/idem/4998.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4998.htm).
3. If any contaminated soils are discovered during this project, they may be subject to disposal as hazardous waste. Please contact the OLQ at 317-308-3103 to obtain information on proper disposal procedures.
4. If Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) are found at this site, please contact the Industrial Waste Section of OLQ at 317-308-3103 for information regarding management of any PCB wastes from this site.
5. If there are any asbestos disposal issues related to this site, please contact the Industrial Waste Section of OLQ at 317-308-3103 for information regarding the management of asbestos wastes. (Asbestos removal is addressed above, under Air Quality.)
6. If the project involves the installation or removal of an underground storage tank, or involves contamination from an underground storage tank, you must contact the IDEM Underground Storage Tank program at 317-308-3039( http://www.in.gov/idem/4999.htm (http://www.in.gov/idem/4999.htm)).

## FINAL REMARKS

Should the applicant need to obtain any environmental permits in association with this proposed project, please be mindful that IC 13-15-8 requires that they notify all adjoining property owners and/or occupants within ten days of your submittal of each permit application. Applicants seeking multiple permits, may still meet the notification requirement with a single notice if all required permit applications are submitted with the same ten day period.

Please note that this letter does not constitutes a permit, license, endorsement, or any other form of approval on the part of either the Indiana Department of Environmental Management or any other Indiana state agency.

Should you have any questions relating to the content or recommendations of this letter, or if you have additional questions about whether a more complete environmental review of your project should be conducted, please feel free to contact Steve Howell at (317) 232-8587, snhowell@idem.in.gov.

## Signature(s) of the Applicant

I acknowledge that I am seeking grant monies, a bond issuance, or other public funding mechanism to cover some portion of the cost of the public works, infrastructure, or community development project as described herein, which I am working (possibly with others) to complete.

## Project Description

This INDOT project is located at the intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road, approximately 3.67 miles west of I-469. Note that Maplecrest Road south of 930 within the project area was formerly known as Adams Center Road. The intersection operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. Between 2014 and 2016, 62 crashes occurred at the intersection, $69 \%$ of which were rear-end and $11 \%$ of which were left turn crashes. Based on this data, congestion is the cause for the higher than expected rate of crashes. A traffic count from 2018 shows the AADT for SR 930 to be 23,936 vehicles per day and Maplecrest Road (formerly Adams Center Road) to be 11,307 VPD. The southbound right turn movement operates at a LOS F at peak hours. There is also a high number of left turn movements from SR 930 to Maplecrest Road as evidenced by the two left turn lanes in this direction. A potential factor contributing to congestion in the eastbound through movement is the merging of SR 930 to one lane approximately one mile east of the intersection. There is also a road diet project on Lincoln Highway that may affect the congestion as it will be reduced from two lanes to one lane in each direction. This project will provide congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes. Within the project area, SR 930 is a two-lane Principal Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area. Within the project area, Maplecrest Road is a two-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12-foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area. The project proposes construction of a quadrant roadway which will eliminate left turn movements through the primary intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest by relocating those maneuvers to secondary intersections created by the quadrant roadway south and east of the primary intersection. The primary intersection will then operate as a two-phase intersection with both secondary signals at the end of this connector roadway operating as three-phase signals to protect the left turn maneuvers. By using two phases instead of the previous four, the primary signal will decrease delay. The traffic will have less time to queue, helping lower the congestion as well. The new quadrant roadway will also provide storage length for the turning vehicles. Besides construction of the new quadrant road, lanes will be added to Maplecrest Road and SR 930 to accommodate the new traffic patterns. The project's right of way needs have not yet been determined; however, it is anticipated that less than 10 acres may be acquired. The method of traffic maintenance is not anticipated to require a detour as most improvements will occur outside the existing roadway.
restricting access to lanes during construction. Once the new infrastructure is constructed, resurfacing and reconfiguring the lanes is expected to be completed under traffic. Land in commercial, residential and agricultural use abuts the project area.

With my signature, I do hereby affirm that I have read the letter from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management that appears directly above. In addition, I understand that in order to complete the project in which I am interested, with a minimum impact to the environment, I must consider all the issues addressed in the aforementioned letter, and further, that I must obtain any required permits.

## Dated Signature of the Public Owner Contact/Responsible Elected Official <br> MATthew P Witt

Dated Signature of the Project
Planner/Consultant Contact Person

# Organization and Project Information 

Project ID: 2066-2180-90<br>Des. ID:<br>Project Title:<br>1900107<br>Name of Organization: DLZ Indiana, LLC<br>Requested by: Jason Stone

## Environmental Assessment Report

\author{

1. Geological Hazards: <br> - High liquefaction potential <br> - Floodway
}

2. Mineral Resources:<br>- Bedrock Resource: High Potential<br>- Sand and Gravel Resource: High Potential

3. Active or abandoned mineral resources extraction sites:

- None documented in the area
*All map layers from Indiana Map (maps.indiana.edu)


#### Abstract

DISCLAIMER: This document was compiled by Indiana University, Indiana Geological Survey, using data believed to be accurate; however, a degree of error is inherent in all data. This product is distributed "AS-IS" without warranties of any kind, either expressed or implied, including but not limited to warranties of suitability to a particular purpose or use. No attempt has been made in either the design or production of these data and document to define the limits or jurisdiction of any federal, state, or local government. The data used to assemble this document are intended for use only at the published scale of the source data or smaller (see the metadata links below) and are for reference purposes only. They are not to be construed as a legal document or survey instrument. A detailed on-the-ground survey and historical analysis of a single site may differ from these data and this document.


This information was furnished by Indiana Geological Survey
Address: 1001 E. 10th St., Bloomington, IN 47405
Email: IGSEnvir@indiana.edu
Phone: 812 855-7428
Date: July 22, 2021


Metadata:

- https://maps.indiana.edu/metadata/Geology/Seismic_Earthquake_Liquefaction_Potential.html - https://maps.indiana.edu/metadata/Geology/Industrial_Minerals_Sand_Gravel_Resources.html
- https://maps.indiana.edu/metadata/Hydrology/Floodplains_FIRM.html
- https://maps.indiana.edu/metadata/Geology/Bedrock_Geology.html

| From: | McCloskey, Elizabeth [elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov](mailto:elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, August 18, 2021 4:01 PM |
| To: | Jason Stone |
| Subject: | Re: [EXTERNAL] RE: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of |
|  | I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination |

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Good afternoon Jason, this change should eliminate the issue of trees being cut more than 300 feet from existing pavement; USFWS has no concerns about the project so won't be providing a letter.

## Liz McCloskey

From: Jason Stone [jstone@dlz.com](mailto:jstone@dlz.com)
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 7:15 AM
To: 'DNR Environmental Review' [environmentalreview@dnr.IN.gov](mailto:environmentalreview@dnr.IN.gov); 'Courtade, Julian' [JCourtade@indot.IN.gov](mailto:JCourtade@indot.IN.gov); 'rick.neilson@in.usda.gov' [rick.neilson@in.usda.gov](mailto:rick.neilson@in.usda.gov); McCloskey, Elizabeth [elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov](mailto:elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov); MWRO Compliance, NPS [MWRO_Compliance@nps.gov](mailto:MWRO_Compliance@nps.gov); 'Allerding, Paul H CIV USARMY CELRE (US)'
[Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil](mailto:Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil); 'Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil' [Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil](mailto:Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil);
'Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov' [Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov](mailto:Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov); 'Dan.Avery@co.allen.in.us' [Dan.Avery@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Dan.Avery@co.allen.in.us); 'richard.beck@allencounty.us' [richard.beck@allencounty.us](mailto:richard.beck@allencounty.us); 'therese.brown@co.allen.in.us' [therese.brown@co.allen.in.us](mailto:therese.brown@co.allen.in.us); 'nelson.peters@allencounty.us' [nelson.peters@allencounty.us](mailto:nelson.peters@allencounty.us); 'Surveyor@co.allen.in.us' [Surveyor@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Surveyor@co.allen.in.us); 'Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us' [Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us); 'dps@allencounty.us' [dps@allencounty.us](mailto:dps@allencounty.us); 'jjacquay@newhaven.in.gov' [jjacquay@newhaven.in.gov](mailto:jjacquay@newhaven.in.gov); 'jhale@newhaven.in.gov' [jhale@newhaven.in.gov](mailto:jhale@newhaven.in.gov); Rob Gutierrez [rgutierrez@newhaven.in.gov](mailto:rgutierrez@newhaven.in.gov); 'jmccracken@newhaven.in.gov' [jmccracken@newhaven.in.gov](mailto:jmccracken@newhaven.in.gov); 'utilityoffice@newhaven.in.gov' [utilityoffice@newhaven.in.gov](mailto:utilityoffice@newhaven.in.gov); 'mhissong@eacs.k12.in.us' [mhissong@eacs.k12.in.us](mailto:mhissong@eacs.k12.in.us); 'smccmichael@newhaven.in.gov' [smccmichael@newhaven.in.gov](mailto:smccmichael@newhaven.in.gov)
Cc: 'k.carmanygeorge@dot.gov' [k.carmanygeorge@dot.gov](mailto:k.carmanygeorge@dot.gov); 'knovak@indot.in.gov' [knovak@indot.in.gov](mailto:knovak@indot.in.gov); 'mwitt@indot.in.gov' [mwitt@indot.in.gov](mailto:mwitt@indot.in.gov); Philip LaBrash [plabrash@dlz.com](mailto:plabrash@dlz.com)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination

This email has been received from outside of DOI - Use caution before clicking on links, opening attachments, or responding.

All

An Early Coordination request was sent to the recipients of this e-mail on July 9, 2021, indicating that the project involved construction of a quadrant roadway in the southwest quadrant of the SR 930/Maplecrest Road intersection. It has been determined that the quadrant roadway will be located in the southeast intersection quadrant. An updated Early Coordination request is attached. Please provide any comments you may have within 30 days of your receipt of this request.

| From: | Papadakis, Arianna [APapadakis@indot.IN.gov](mailto:APapadakis@indot.IN.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, July 13, 2021 12:45 PM |
| To: | Jason Stone |
| Cc: | Novak, Karen |
| Subject: | RE: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen |
|  | County, Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination |

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Good afternoon,

I have reviewed the enclosed early coordination packet and I do not have any environmental concerns regarding the project (Des. No. 1900107 SR 930 at Maplecrest, Intersection Project) at this time. Therefore, I will not be providing a comment letter.

Thank you,

## Ariamna Papadakis

Environmental Manager II
Fort Wayne District
5333 Hatfield Road
Fort Wayne, IN 46808
Phone: (260) 969-8262
Email: APapadakis@indot.in.gov


| From: | Matt Jarrett [Matt.Jarrett@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Matt.Jarrett@co.allen.in.us) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, July 23, 2021 2:12 PM |
| To: | Danielle Hilworth |
| Cc: | Jason Stone |
| Subject: | RE: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen |
|  | County, Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination |

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Jason,
I don't have any issues from a water quality standpoint on this project.
Thanks,
Matt Jarrett, CPMSM
MS4 Program Manager/Water Quality Hydrologist
Allen County Surveyor's Office - Citizens Square
200 E. Berry Street, Suite 350
Fort Wayne, IN 46802
260-449-3612
Matt.jarrett@co.allen.in.us

From: Danielle Hilworth
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:08 AM
To: Mike Fruchey [Mike.Fruchey@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Mike.Fruchey@co.allen.in.us); Matt Jarrett [Matt.Jarrett@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Matt.Jarrett@co.allen.in.us)
Cc: Cheryl Zurbrugg [Cheryl.Zurbrugg@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Cheryl.Zurbrugg@co.allen.in.us)
Subject: FW: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination

## Danielle Hilworth

Allen County Surveyor's Office - Administrative Assistant
200 East Berry, Suite 350, Fort Wayne, IN 46802-2737
phone: 260-449-7625 fax: 260-449-7627
www.allencounty.us/surveyor-s-office
"A truly American sentiment recognizes the dignity of labor and the fact that honor lies in honest toil"
~Grover Cleveland

From: Jason Stone < jistone@dlz.com>
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:16 AM
To: 'DNR Environmental Review' [environmentalreview@dnr.IN.gov](mailto:environmentalreview@dnr.IN.gov); 'Courtade, Julian' [JCourtade@indot.IN.gov](mailto:JCourtade@indot.IN.gov); 'rick.neilson@in.usda.gov' [rick.neilson@in.usda.gov](mailto:rick.neilson@in.usda.gov); 'McCloskey, Elizabeth' <elizabeth mccloskey@fws.gov>; 'Mwro_Compliance@nps.gov' <Mwro Compliance@nps.gov>; 'Allerding, Paul H CIV USARMY CELRE (US)' [Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil](mailto:Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil); 'Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil' [Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil](mailto:Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil); 'Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov' [Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov](mailto:Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov); Dan Avery [Dan.Avery@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Dan.Avery@co.allen.in.us); Richard Beck

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, DETROIT DISTRICT

477 MICHIGAN AVE.
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-2550
July 26, 2021

Jason Stone
DLZ Indiana, LLC
2211 East Jefferson Blvd.
South Bend, IN 46615
Dear Mr. Stone:
This is in response to your letter of July 23, 2021, requesting comments on a proposed intersection improvement project for State Road (SR) 930 at Maplecrest Road, approximately 3.67 miles west of Interstate 469 in Allen County, Indiana (Des. No. 1900107). The project purpose is to reduce congestion and provide safety improvements. In summary, a quadrant roadway will be constructed to the south and east of the intersection to eliminate left-turn movements through the main intersection, and lanes will be added to Maplecrest Road and SR 930 to accommodate the new traffic patterns. We are providing the following information in accordance with our responsibilities under our Regulatory and Civil Works Programs.

Your project may require a Department of the Army Permit, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. Any of the proposed work that occurs within a water of the United States or adjacent wetlands, will likely require prior authorization through our regulatory permit process. For further information on permit requirements and the application process, please contact the Michiana Branch, Regulatory Office, South Bend, Indiana, at 574-232-1952.

There are no current plans under our Civil Works Program to develop waterways in the vicinity of your project; nor do we have any current or proposed flood risk management studies for the area described in your letter.

The project site is designated as an area of minimal flood hazard under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). We recommend that you coordinate with local officials and with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) regarding the applicability of a floodplain permit prior to construction. This coordination would help ensure compliance with local and state floodplain management regulations and acts, such as the Indiana Flood Control Act (IC 13-2-22). If you obtain information that any part of your project would impact the floodplain, you should consider other alternatives that, to the extent possible, avoid or minimize adverse impacts associated with use of the floodplain.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed intersection improvement project for SR 930 at Maplecrest Road in Allen County, Indiana. Questions regarding our regulatory program should be directed to Mr. Don Reinke, Regulatory Office, at 313-226-6812. Any other questions may be directed to Mr. Paul Allerding of my staff at 313-226-7590 or me at 313-226-2476.

Sincerely,


Charles A. Uhlarik
Chief, Environmental Analysis Branch
Copies furnished:
Don Reinke, Corps, Regulatory Office, Detroit MI
Aaron Damrill, Corps, Regulatory Office, South Bend IN
Garrett Ray, Corps, Floodplain Management Services, Detroit MI

From: Courtade, Julian [JCourtade@indot.IN.gov](mailto:JCourtade@indot.IN.gov)
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 7:56 AM
To: Jason Stone
Subject: RE: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Jason -

I reviewed the Early Coordination Letter and found no issues with any surrounding airspace or public-use airports. This is due to the project meeting the required glideslope criteria from the nearest public-use facility according to 14 CFR Part 77 - Safe, efficient use, and preservation of the navigable airspace.

If any object will exceed 200 ft in height regardless of location, the object will need to be airspaced with the FAA 45 days prior to construction through the OEAAA portal below.

## https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/searchAction.jsp

Please let me know if you have any questions!
Thanks,
Julian L. Courtade
Chief Airport Inspector
100 North Senate Ave, N758-MM
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Cell: (317) 954-7385
Email: jcourtade@indot.in.gov


From: Jason Stone [jstone@dlz.com](mailto:jstone@dlz.com)
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2021 8:16 AM
To: DNR Environmental Review [environmentalreview@dnr.IN.gov](mailto:environmentalreview@dnr.IN.gov); Courtade, Julian [JCourtade@indot.IN.gov](mailto:JCourtade@indot.IN.gov);
Neilson, Rick - NRCS, Indianapolis, IN [rick.neilson@in.usda.gov](mailto:rick.neilson@in.usda.gov); McCloskey, Elizabeth
[elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov](mailto:elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov); 'Mwro_Compliance@nps.gov' [Mwro_Compliance@nps.gov](mailto:Mwro_Compliance@nps.gov); 'Allerding, Paul H CIV
USARMY CELRE (US)' [Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil](mailto:Paul.H.Allerding@usace.army.mil); 'Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil'
[Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil](mailto:Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil); Castillo, Melanie H [Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov](mailto:Melanie.H.Castillo@hud.gov); Dan Avery
[dan.avery@co.allen.in.us](mailto:dan.avery@co.allen.in.us); 'richard.beck@allencounty.us' [richard.beck@allencounty.us](mailto:richard.beck@allencounty.us);
'therese.brown@co.allen.in.us' [therese.brown@co.allen.in.us](mailto:therese.brown@co.allen.in.us); 'nelson.peters@allencounty.us' [nelson.peters@allencounty.us](mailto:nelson.peters@allencounty.us); 'Surveyor@co.allen.in.us' [Surveyor@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Surveyor@co.allen.in.us);
'Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us' [Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us](mailto:Jessica.Chrisman@co.allen.in.us); 'dps@allencounty.us' [dps@allencounty.us](mailto:dps@allencounty.us);

# Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council 

August 17, 2021
Jason A. Stone
Environmental Services Department Manager
DLZ Indiana, LLC
2211 East Jefferson Boulevard
South Bend, IN 46615


Re: Early Coordination
DES 1900107 SR 930 Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement
Location: Allen County
Dear Mr. Stone:

Members of our staff reviewed your letter and report, dated August 12, 2021, concerning the Early Coordination of the SR930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements. The NIRCC staff has the following comments relating to the early coordination phase of the environmental review process with this project, see below.

- Post-War Era (1940-1973) Residential Housing Sites are located adjacent to or near the project area. The largest concentration of these Post-War Era residential parcels are located near the western portion of the project area near the intersection of New Haven Ave and SR 930 on the south side of that intersection. The neighborhood called Sunnymede is made up entirely of housing from the Post-War Era (1940-1973). There are also some individual parcels located near the project area that are not part of the Sunnymede neighborhood. Coordination with INDOT Cultural Resources Office will need to occur.
- This project is located within an area defined as an "Environmental Justice Area". As identified in NIRCC's 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Chapter 5), these areas (Census Tracts) meet the thresholds for an increased presence of minority populations and populations in poverty. The planning process should assure public involvement of low-income and minority groups in planning activities and decision-making, prevent disproportionately high and adverse impacts of decisions on minority and lowincome populations, and assure low-income and minority populations receive a proportionate share of transportation benefits. There are three fundamental principals at the core of environmental justice:
- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects including social and economic effects, on minority populations and lowincome populations.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.
- At one time there was a Cemetery identified near the western portion of the project area (Description says: west of Estella Ave and south of Old Maumee Rd). According to SHAARD it was "Reportedly moved in the early 20th Century". The mapped location in SHAARD GIS may also be incorrect since Old Maumee Rd is located north of this location. There may need to be further investigation on this.
- A pipe drain called "Sowards Drain" crosses the north approach of the intersection approximately 350' north of SR 930.
- An open drain called "Sheridan Drain" crosses the east approach of the intersection approximately 450' east of Maplecrest Rd and is adjacent to the roadway on the south side of SR 930 from 450' east of Maplecrest Rd to the southeast corner of the intersection.
- There are potential wetlands identified near the southern portion of the project area on both sides of Maplecrest Rd.
- There is an existing trail along the east side of Maplecrest Rd that connects to the SR 930 and Maplecrest Rd intersection. This trail is also proposed to extend south along Maplecrest Rd in the Northeast Indiana United Trails Plan. The trail will need to be added in with the project to the extent of the construction occurring. Coordination with City of New Haven, Allen County Highway Department, and the Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council will be needed.
- Sidewalks are proposed along the north and south side of SR 930. Sidewalks will need to be installed with the project to the extent of the construction occurring. Sidewalk connections should be made at logical destination end points both east and west of the intersection on both sides of SR 930.
Coordination with City of New Haven and the Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council will be needed.
- There is an Intrastate Natural Gas pipeline owned by Northern Indiana Public Service Co. that crosses Maplecrest Rd just south of SR 930 near the intersection.
- There is an intrastate Crude Oil pipeline owned by Tri-State Pipeline Properties that crosses SR 930 approximately 1000 ' west of the intersection.
- A Superfund Site is mapped near the northern project limits with an Agency Interest ID 7267 called "Fort Wayne Reduction Dump. This site is mapped in the wrong location and is not near the project area.
- Two LUST Sites are mapped near 6507 US Highway 30 East. The Agency Interest ID is 5520. A "No Further Action Approval Pursuant to Remediation Closure Guide" has been issued on May 6, 2021. No further action status has been approved and no remedy is needed based on soil, groundwater, and Vapor Intrusion samples taken and levels being nonexistent or below direct contact screening levels.
- A LUST site is located at the southwest corner of Maplecrest Rd and SR 930 at 6244 Lincoln Hwy E (Now SR 930). It has an Agency Interest ID of 1295 and called "Speedway \#8526". According to Virtual File Cabinet there is a "No Further Action Status Approval" unless excavation of this area or construction on this site occurs due to residual contamination that may remain. This may affect the project.
- A LUST site is located within the western portion of the project area. The site has an address of 5905 US 30 E. It has a Regulatory Program ID of 13492. There is no Agency Interest ID listed and was not found in the Virtual File Cabinet. The name associated with the site is called "Summit GMC-Kenworth. Additional investigation may be needed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,


Stacey Gorsuch
Principal Transportation Planner

# State of Indiana <br> DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES <br> <br> Division of Fish and Wildlife <br> <br> Division of Fish and Wildlife <br> Early Coordination/Environmental Assessment 

## DNR \#:

ER-23887
Request Received: July 9, 2021

Requestor: DLZ Indiana, LLC
Jason A Stone
2211 East Jefferson Boulevard
South Bend, IN 46615-2607

Project: SR 930 and Maplecrest Road (formerly Adams Center Road) intersection improvement, about 3.67 miles west of I-469, Fort Wayne; Des \#1900107, DLZ \#2066-2180-90
County/Site info:
Allen
The Indiana Department of Natural Resources has reviewed the above referenced project per your request. Our agency offers the following comments for your information and in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

If our agency has regulatory jurisdiction over the project, the recommendations contained in this letter may become requirements of any permit issued. If we do not have permitting authority, all recommendations are voluntary.

## Regulatory Assessment: Formal approval by the Department of Natural Resources under the regulatory

 programs administered by the Division of Water is not required for this project.Natural Heritage Database: The Natural Heritage Program's data have been checked.
To date, no plant or animal species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been reported to occur in the project vicinity.
Fish \& Wildlife Comments: Avoid and minimize impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources to the greatest extent possible, and compensate for impacts. The following are recommendations that address potential impacts identified in the proposed project area:

1) Forested Habitat:

We recommend a mitigation plan be developed for any unavoidable habitat impacts that will occur. The DNR's Habitat Mitigation Guidelines (and plant lists) can be found online at: http://iac.iga.in.gov/iac/20200527-IR-312200284NRA.xml.pdf.

Impacts to non-wetland forest of one (1) acre or more should be mitigated at a minimum 2:1 ratio. If less than one acre of non-wetland forest is removed in a rural setting, replacement should be at a $1: 1$ ratio based on area. Impacts to non-wetland forest under one (1) acre in an urban setting should be mitigated by planting five trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height (dbh), for each tree which is removed that is 10" dbh or greater ( $5: 1$ mitigation based on the number of large trees) or by using the 1:1 replacement ratio based on area depending on the type of habitat impacted (individual canopy tree removal in an urban streetscape or park-like environment versus removal of habitat supporting a tree canopy, woody understory, and herbaceous layer). Impacts under 0.10 acre in an urban area may still involve the replacement of large diameter trees but typically do not require any additional mitigation or additional plantings beyond seeding and stabilizing disturbed areas. There are exceptions for high quality habitat sites however.
2) Wetland Habitat:

Due to the presence or potential presence of wetland habitat on site, we recommend contacting and coordinating with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) 401 program and also the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) 404 program. Impacts to wetland habitat should be mitigated at the appropriate ratio according to the

## State of Indiana <br> DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES <br> Division of Fish and Wildlife <br> Early Coordination/Environmental Assessment <br> 1991 INDOT/IDNR/USFWS Memorandum of Understanding.

The additional measures listed below should be implemented to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources:

1. Revegetate all bare and disturbed areas with a mixture of grasses (excluding all varieties of tall fescue) and legumes as soon as possible upon completion.
2. Minimize and contain within the project limits all tree and brush clearing.
3. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat or Northern Long-eared bat roosting (greater than 5 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or with cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 through September 30.
4. Appropriately designed measures for controlling erosion and sediment must be implemented to prevent sediment from leaving the construction site; maintain these measures until construction is complete and all disturbed areas are stabilized.
5. Do not excavate or place fill in any riparian wetland.

Contact Staff:
Christie L. Stanifer, Environ. Coordinator, Fish \& Wildlife
Our agency appreciates this opportunity to be of service. Please contact the above staff member at (317) 232-4080 if we can be of further assistance.

Date: August 6, 2021

City of New Haven<br>Planning Department

August 17th, 2021

DLZ
2211 E Jefferson Blvd
South Bend, IN 46615-2692

RE: SR 930 at Maplecrest, INDOT Des. No. 1900107, DLZ No. 2066-2180-90

## DLZ and INDOT:

The City of New Haven has two Utilities within the proposed project area. On the southwest side of the intersection and continues along the south side of 930 , there is a 20 " water line and Fort Wayne Utilities' billing valve. There are storm sewer lines and inlets along both sides of South Maplecrest running north and south of the intersection.

The New Haven Planning Department has reviewed INDOT's Scoping Report and the 2017 WSP Engineering Review. Based on the information presented, we do not feel a quadrant intersection is the best solution for this intersection. Improving the existing intersection design could be more effective promoting the wellbeing of the community and less costly to implement. Using some of the recommendations made by the consultant would be more aligned with the City's long-term goal for the 930 corridor is to focus on safety and beautification.

Sincerely,


Director of Planning

July 29, 2021
Jason A. Stone
DLZ
2211 East Jefferson Boulevard
South Bend, Indiana 46615
Dear Mr. Stone:
The proposed project to make intersection improvements at State Road 930 and Maplecrest Road in Allen County, Indiana, (Des No 1900107), as referred to in your letter received July 9, 2021 will cause a conversion of prime farmland.

The attached packet of information is for your use competing Parts VI and VII of the AD-1006. After completion, the federal funding agency needs to forward one copy to NRCS for our records.

If you need additional information, please contact John Allen at 317-295-5859.
Sincerely,
RICHARD ${ }^{\text {Digtally signed by }}$
NEILSON
15:44:24-04'00'

RICK NEILSON

State Soil Scientist

Enclosures

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

| PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  | Date Of Land Evaluation Request |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name of Project DES1900107_SR930_MaplecrestRd_R+ |  | Federal Agency Involved |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed Land Use |  | County and State Allen County, Indiana |  |  |  |  |  |
| PART II (To be completed by NRCS) |  | Date Request Received By NRCS 7/23/2021 |  |  | JRA Completing Form: JRA |  |  |
| Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statewide or Local Important Farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form) |  |  |  | Acres lrigated |  | Average Farm Size 182 ac |  |
| Corn | Farmable Land In Govt. Jurisdiction Acres: $411230 \% 97$ |  |  | Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: 39402โ\% 93 |  |  |  |
| Name of Land Evaluation System Used LESA | Name of State or Local Site Assessment System |  |  | Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS 7/29/2021 |  |  |  |
| PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  |  | Alternative Site Rating |  |  |  |
| A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly |  |  |  | 3.52 |  |  |  |
| B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| C. Total Acres In Site |  |  |  | 3.52 |  |  |  |
| PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland |  |  |  | 9.46 |  |  |  |
| B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local Important Farmland |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted |  |  |  | 0.002 |  |  |  |
| D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value |  |  |  | 78 |  |  |  |
| PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Criterion Relative Value of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points) |  |  |  | 74 |  |  |  |
| PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Site Assessment Criteria (Criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5 b. For Corridor project use form NRCS-CPA-106) |  |  | Maximum Points | Site A | Site B | Site C | Site D |
| 1. Area In Non-urban Use |  |  | (15) | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2. Perimeter In Non-urban Use |  |  | ${ }^{(10)}$ | 5 |  |  |  |
| 3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed |  |  | ${ }^{(20)}$ | 10 |  |  |  |
| 4. Protection Provided By State and Local Government |  |  | (20) | 0 |  |  |  |
| 5. Distance From Urban Built-up Area |  |  | (15) | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Distance To Urban Support Services |  |  | (15) | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average |  |  | (10) | 10 |  |  |  |
| 8. Creation Of Non-farmable Farmland |  |  | (10) | 5 |  |  |  |
| 9. Availability Of Farm Support Services |  |  | (5) | 5 |  |  |  |
| 10. On-Farm Investments |  |  | (20) | 0 |  |  |  |
| 11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services |  |  | ${ }^{(10)}$ | 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use |  |  | (10) | 10 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS |  |  | 160 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V) |  |  | 100 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or local site assessment) |  |  | 160 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines) |  |  | 260 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site Selected: Site A | Date Of Selection April 12, 2023 |  |  | Was A Local Site Assessment Used? <br> YES $\square$ NO $\square$ |  |  |  |

NRCS's threshold score for significant impacts to farmland that result in the consideration of alternatives is 160. Since this project score is less than the threshold, no significant loss of prime, unique, statewide, or local important farmland will result from this project. No alternatives other than those previously discussed in this document will be investigated without reevaluating impacts to prime farmland.


# United States Department of the Interior 

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Indiana Ecological Services Field Office 620 South Walker Street
Bloomington, IN 47403-2121
Phone: (812) 334-4261 Fax: (812) 334-4273

In Reply Refer To:
June 23, 2022
Project Code: 2022-0052242
Project Name: SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements, Des No 1900107
Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:
The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations ( 50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

Please use the species list provided and visit the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Region 3 Section 7 Technical Assistance website at - http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/ s7process/index.html. This website contains step-by-step instructions which will help you
determine if your project will have an adverse effect on listed species and will help lead you through the Section 7 process. For all wind energy projects and projects that include installing towers that use guy wires or are over $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ feet in height, please contact this field office directly for assistance, even if no federally listed plants, animals or critical habitat are present within your proposed project or may be affected by your proposed project.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:
http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF
Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts see https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations.php.
The MBTA has no provision for allowing take of migratory birds that may be unintentionally killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures see https://www.fws.gov/birds/bird-enthusiasts/threats-tobirds.php.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of

Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/ executive-orders/e0-13186.php.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands


## Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:
Indiana Ecological Services Field Office
620 South Walker Street
Bloomington, IN 47403-2121
(812) 334-4261

## Project Summary

Project Code: 2022-0052242
Event Code:
Project Name:
Project Type:
None
SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements, Des No 1900107
Project Description: This INDOT project (Des. No. 1900107) is located at the intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road, approximately 3.67 miles west of I-469. The intersection operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. The southbound right turn movement operates at a LOS F at peak hours. There is a high number of left turn movements from SR 930 to Maplecrest Road as evidenced by the two left turn lanes in this direction. A factor contributing to congestion in the eastbound through movement is the merging of SR 930 to one lane approximately one mile east of the intersection. This project will provide congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes.

Within the project area, SR 930 is a two-lane Principal Arterial with a typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway throughout the project area. Maplecrest Road is a two-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area.

The project proposes construction of a quadrant roadway in the southeast intersection quadrant which will eliminate left turn movements through the primary intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road by relocating those maneuvers to new, secondary intersections created by the quadrant roadway south and east of the primary intersection. The primary intersection will then operate as a two-phase intersection with both secondary signals at the end of this connector roadway operating as threephase signals to protect the left turn maneuvers. By using two phases instead of four, the primary signal will decrease delay and congestion. The new quadrant roadway will provide storage length for the turning vehicles. Lanes will be added to Maplecrest Road and SR 930 to accommodate the new traffic patterns. An existing SR 930 3-foot by 3foot concrete box culvert located approximately 480 feet east of Maplecrest Road will be extended approximately 16 feet to the south. An
existing 36 -inch pipe culvert in the southwest intersection quardrant will be replaced. It is anticipated that up to 10 acres of right of way may be acquired. Maintenance of traffic is not anticipated to require a detour as most improvements will occur outside the existing roadway.

On July 8, 2021, the INDOT Fort Wayne District reviewed the USFWS database for recorded captures, roosts, maternity colonies, and hibernacula within 0.5 mile of the project. No such occurrences were found. The SR 930 box culvert was inspected on June 7, 2022, and the 36inch pipe culvert was inspected on June 14, 2022 . No bats or evidence of bat use were observed. There is no suitable summer habitat in or adjacent to the project area. The project may require clearing of up to 0.2 acre of wooded area, on the south side of SR 930, approximtely 675 feet east of the intersection. The dominant species to be removed are black walnut (Juglans nigra), American elm (Ulmus americana) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia). Tree removal will occur during the inactive season prior to construction. The project involves replacement of existing lighting, installation of new permanent lighting and new signalized intersection construction. No temporary lighting is proposed. No mitigation is anticipated to be required. Construction is proposed more than 300 feet from existing roadways. Construction will take place during daylight hours and is anticipated to begin on $3 / 1 / 2024$, and end by 11/30/2024.
Project Location:
Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https:// www.google.com/maps/@41.0688854,-85.05756006242397,14z


Counties: Allen County, Indiana

## Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 3 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.
Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Note that 1 of these species should be considered only under certain conditions.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries ${ }^{1}$, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

## Mammals

NAME
STATUS
Indiana Bat Myotis sodalis
Endangered
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5949

Northern Long-eared Bat Myotis septentrionalis Threatened
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
This species only needs to be considered under the following conditions:

- Incidental take of the NLEB is not prohibited here. Federal agencies may consult using the 4(d) rule streamlined process. Transportation projects may consult using the programmatic process. See www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/mammals/nleb/index.html
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045


## Insects

NAME
STATUS
Monarch Butterfly Danaus plexippus
Candidate
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743

## Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

## Migratory Birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act ${ }^{\underline{1}}$ and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act ${ }^{2}$.

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described below.

1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
2. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.
3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

## The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the

 USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ below. This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the E-bird data mapping tool (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found below.For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

| NAME | BREEDING <br> SEASON |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus <br> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention <br> because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types <br> of development or activities. <br> https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626 | Breeds Oct 15 <br> to Aug 31 |
| Prothonotary Warbler Protonotaria citrea <br> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA <br> and Alaska.Breeds Apr 1 to | Jul 31 |


| NAME | BREEDING <br> SEASON |
| :--- | :--- |
| Red-headed Woodpecker Melanerpes erythrocephalus <br> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA <br> and Alaska. | Breeds May 10 <br> to Sep 10 |
| Wood Thrush Hylocichla mustelina <br> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA <br> and Alaska.Breeds May 10 <br> to Aug 31 |  |

## Probability Of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

## Probability of Presence ( $\quad$ )

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 124 -week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25 .
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05 , and that the probability of presence at week 12 ( 0.25 ) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is $0.25 / 0.25=1$; at week 20 it is $0.05 / 0.25=0.2$.
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

## Breeding Season ( ${ }^{(-)}$

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

## Survey Effort (l)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10 km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.

## No Data (-)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

## Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.


Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-birds/species
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds https://www.fws.gov/library/ collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/ documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf


## Migratory Birds FAQ

Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.
Nationwide Conservation Measures describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in
the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. Additional measures or permits may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

## What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the Avian Knowledge Network (AKN). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of survey, banding, and citizen science datasets and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10 km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle (Eagle Act requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the AKN Phenology Tool.

## What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the Avian Knowledge Network (AKN). This data is derived from a growing collection of survey, banding, and citizen science datasets .

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

## How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering, migrating or present year-round in my project area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may refer to the following resources: The Cornell Lab of Ornithology All About Birds Bird Guide, or (if you are unsuccessful in locating the bird of interest there), the Cornell Lab of Ornithology Neotropical Birds guide. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

## What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
2. "BCC - BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
3. "Non-BCC - Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the Eagle Act requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

## Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the Northeast Ocean Data Portal. The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the Diving Bird Study and the nanotag studies or contact Caleb Spiegel or Pam Loring.

## What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to obtain a permit to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

## Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of
certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

## Wetlands

Impacts to NWI wetlands and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

THERE ARE NO WETLANDS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

## IPaC User Contact Information

Agency: Department of Transportation
Name: Jason Stone
Address: 2211 E Jefferson Blvd
City: South Bend
State: IN
Zip: 46615
Email jstone@dlz.com
Phone: 5742451674

## Lead Agency Contact Information

Lead Agency: Department of Transportation


# United States Department of the Interior 

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Indiana Ecological Services Field Office 620 South Walker Street
Bloomington, IN 47403-2121
Phone: (812) 334-4261 Fax: (812) 334-4273

In Reply Refer To:
June 23, 2022
Project code: 2022-0052242
Project Name: SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements, Des No 1900107
Subject: Consistency letter for the 'SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements, Des
No 1900107' project under the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

To whom it may concern:
The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your request dated June 23, 2022 to verify that the SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements, Des No 1900107 (Proposed Action) may rely on the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (PBO) to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat.884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Based on the information you provided (Project Description shown below), you have determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on the endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) or the threatened Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis). If the Proposed Action is not modified, no consultation is required for these two species. If the Proposed Action is modified, or new information reveals that it may affect the Indiana bat and/or Northern long-eared bat in a manner or to an extent not considered in the PBO, further review to conclude the requirements of ESA Section 7(a)(2) may be required.

For Proposed Actions that include bridge/culvert or structure removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities: If your initial bridge/culvert or structure assessments failed to detect Indiana bats, but you later detect bats prior to, or during construction, please submit the Post Assessment Discovery of Bats at Bridge/Culvert or Structure Form (User Guide Appendix E) to this Service Office within 2 working days of the incident. In these instances, potential incidental take of Indiana bats may be exempted provided that the take is reported to the Service.

If the Proposed Action may affect any other federally-listed or proposed species and/or designated critical habitat, additional consultation between the lead Federal action agency and this Service Office is required. If the proposed action has the potential to take bald or golden
eagles, additional coordination with the Service under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act may also be required. In either of these circumstances, please advise the lead Federal action agency accordingly.

The following species may occur in your project area and are not covered by this determination:

- Monarch Butterfly Danaus plexippus Candidate


## Project Description

The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

## Name

SR 930/Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvements, Des No 1900107

## Description

This INDOT project (Des. No. 1900107) is located at the intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road, approximately 3.67 miles west of I-469. The intersection operates at or near capacity in both the morning and evening peak hours. The southbound right turn movement operates at a LOS F at peak hours. There is a high number of left turn movements from SR 930 to Maplecrest Road as evidenced by the two left turn lanes in this direction. A factor contributing to congestion in the eastbound through movement is the merging of SR 930 to one lane approximately one mile east of the intersection. This project will provide congestion and safety improvements at this intersection to reduce the number and severity of crashes.

Within the project area, SR 930 is a two-lane Principal Arterial with a typical section consisting of two 12 -foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway throughout the project area. Maplecrest Road is a two-lane Minor Arterial with an existing typical section consisting of two 12-foot lanes with a variable-width paved shoulder with curb and gutter. The typical roadway width is 42 feet. Roadway drainage is via sheet flow, and via storm sewer within the downtown area. The apparent existing right-of-way is 85 to 100 feet wide, centered on the roadway, throughout the project area.

The project proposes construction of a quadrant roadway in the southeast intersection quadrant which will eliminate left turn movements through the primary intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road by relocating those maneuvers to new, secondary intersections created by the quadrant roadway south and east of the primary intersection. The primary intersection will then operate as a two-phase intersection with both secondary signals at the end of this connector roadway operating as three-phase signals to protect the left turn maneuvers. By using two phases instead of four, the primary signal will decrease delay and congestion. The new quadrant roadway will provide storage length for the turning vehicles. Lanes will be added to Maplecrest Road and SR 930 to accommodate the new traffic patterns. An existing SR 930 3-foot by 3-foot concrete box culvert located approximately 480 feet east of Maplecrest Road will be extended approximately 16 feet to the south. An existing 36 -inch pipe culvert in the southwest intersection quardrant will be replaced. It is anticipated that up to 10 acres of right of way may be acquired. Maintenance of traffic is not anticipated to require a detour as most improvements will occur outside the existing roadway.

On July 8, 2021, the INDOT Fort Wayne District reviewed the USFWS database for recorded
captures, roosts, maternity colonies, and hibernacula within 0.5 mile of the project. No such occurrences were found. The SR 930 box culvert was inspected on June 7, 2022, and the 36inch pipe culvert was inspected on June 14, 2022 . No bats or evidence of bat use were observed. There is no suitable summer habitat in or adjacent to the project area. The project may require clearing of up to 0.2 acre of wooded area, on the south side of SR 930, approximtely 675 feet east of the intersection. The dominant species to be removed are black walnut (Juglans nigra), American elm (Ulmus americana) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia). Tree removal will occur during the inactive season prior to construction. The project involves replacement of existing lighting, installation of new permanent lighting and new signalized intersection construction. No temporary lighting is proposed. No mitigation is anticipated to be required. Construction is proposed more than 300 feet from existing roadways. Construction will take place during daylight hours and is anticipated to begin on $3 / 1 / 2024$, and end by $11 / 30 / 2024$.

## Determination Key Result

Based on the information you provided, you have determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on the endangered Indiana bat and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat. Therefore, no consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is required for these two species.

## Qualification Interview

1. Is the project within the range of the Indiana bat ${ }^{[1]}$ ?
[1] See Indiana bat species profile

## Automatically answered

Yes
2. Is the project within the range of the Northern long-eared bat ${ }^{[1]}$ ?
[1] See Northern long-eared bat species profile

## Automatically answered

Yes
3. Which Federal Agency is the lead for the action?

## A) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

4. Are all project activities limited to non-construction ${ }^{[1]}$ activities only? (examples of nonconstruction activities include: bridge/abandoned structure assessments, surveys, planning and technical studies, property inspections, and property sales)
[1] Construction refers to activities involving ground disturbance, percussive noise, and/or lighting. No
5. Does the project include any activities that are greater than 300 feet from existing road/ rail surfaces ${ }^{[1]}$ ?
[1] Road surface is defined as the actively used [e.g. motorized vehicles] driving surface and shoulders [may be pavement, gravel, etc.] and rail surface is defined as the edge of the actively used rail ballast.

Yes
6. Are all project activities greater than 300 feet from existing road/rail surfaces ${ }^{[1]}$ ?
[1] Road surface is defined as the actively used [e.g. motorized vehicles] driving surface and shoulders [may be pavement, gravel, etc.] and rail surface is defined as the edge of the actively used rail ballast.
No
7. Does the project include any activities within 0.5 miles of a known Indiana bat and/or NLEB hibernaculum ${ }^{[1]}$ ?
[1] For the purpose of this consultation, a hibernaculum is a site, most often a cave or mine, where bats hibernate during the winter (see suitable habitat), but could also include bridges and structures if bats are found to be hibernating there during the winter.
No
8. Is the project located within a karst area?

No
9. Is there any suitable ${ }^{[1]}$ summer habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB within the project action area ${ }^{[2]}$ ? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)
[1] See the Service's summer survey guidance for our current definitions of suitable habitat.
[2] The action area is defined as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR Section 402.02). Further clarification is provided by the User's Guide for the Range-wide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.
No
10. Does the project include maintenance of the surrounding landscape at existing facilities (e.g., rest areas, stormwater detention basins)?

No
11. Does the project include wetland or stream protection activities associated with compensatory wetland mitigation?
No
12. Does the project include slash pile burning?

No
13. Does the project include any bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities (e.g., any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work)?

Yes
14. Is there any suitable habitat ${ }^{[1]}$ for Indiana bat or NLEB within 1,000 feet of the bridge? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)
[1] See the Service's current summer survey guidance for our current definitions of suitable habitat.
No
15. Does the project include the removal, replacement, and/or maintenance of any structure other than a bridge? (e.g., rest areas, offices, sheds, outbuildings, barns, parking garages, etc.)
No
16. Will the project involve the use of temporary lighting during the active season? No
17. Will the project install new or replace existing permanent lighting?

Yes
18. Is there any suitable habitat within 1,000 feet of the location(s) where permanent lighting will be installed or replaced?
No
19. Does the project include percussives or other activities (not including tree removal/ trimming or bridge/structure work) that will increase noise levels above existing traffic/ background levels?
No
20. Are all project activities that are not associated with habitat removal, tree removal/ trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives, limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species?

Examples: lining roadways, unlighted signage , rail road crossing signals, signal lighting, and minor road repair such as asphalt fill of potholes, etc.

Yes
21. Will the project raise the road profile above the tree canopy?

No
22. Is the location of this project consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?

Automatically answered
Yes, because the project action area is not within suitable Indiana bat and/or NLEB summer habitat and is outside of 0.5 miles of a hibernaculum.
23. Is the bridge removal, replacement, or maintenance activities portion of this project consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?
Automatically answered
Yes, because the bridge is more than 1,000 feet from the nearest suitable habitat and is therefore considered unsuitable for use by bats
24. Is the permanent lighting portion of this project consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?
Automatically answered
Yes, because the lighting will be more than 1,000 feet from the nearest suitable habitat

## Determination Key Description: FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Consultation For Transportation Projects Affecting NLEB Or Indiana Bat

This key was last updated in IPaC on April 28, 2022. Keys are subject to periodic revision.
This decision key is intended for projects/activities funded or authorized by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and/or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which may require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for the endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and the threatened Northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (Myotis septentrionalis).

This decision key should only be used to verify project applicability with the Service's February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects. The programmatic biological opinion covers limited transportation activities that may affect either bat species, and addresses situations that are both likely and not likely to adversely affect either bat species. This decision key will assist in identifying the effect of a specific project/activity and applicability of the programmatic consultation. The programmatic biological opinion is not intended to cover all types of transportation actions. Activities outside the scope of the programmatic biological opinion, or that may affect ESA-listed species other than the Indiana bat or NLEB, or any designated critical habitat, may require additional ESA Section 7 consultation.

## IPaC User Contact Information

Agency: Department of Transportation
Name: Jason Stone
Address: 2211 E Jefferson Blvd
City: South Bend
State: IN
Zip: 46615
Email jstone@dlz.com
Phone: 5742451674

## Lead Agency Contact Information

Lead Agency: Department of Transportation

Bridge/Structure Bat Assessment Form


## Bridge/Structure Bat Assessment Form



| From: | Papadakis, Arianna [APapadakis@indot.IN.gov](mailto:APapadakis@indot.IN.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, June 24, 2022 7:41 AM |
| To: | Jason Stone |
| Subject: | RE: IPaC review - SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West |
|  | of I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 - |

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Hello,

I concur with the NE finding for Des. No. 1900107. The Official Species List and Consistency Letter will be available for your use. It is suggested that these documents be downloaded at this time. This concludes the IPaC phase of coordination with the Fort Wayne environmental office.

Thanks,

## Arianna Papadakis

## Sr Environmental Mngr Supervisor

Fort Wayne District
5333 Hatfield Road
Fort Wayne, IN 46808
Phone: (260) 969-8262
Email: APapadakis@indot.in.gov

From: Jason Stone [jstone@dlz.com](mailto:jstone@dlz.com)
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2022 4:22 PM
To: Papadakis, Arianna [APapadakis@indot.IN.gov](mailto:APapadakis@indot.IN.gov)
Subject: RE: IPaC review - SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 -
**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

## Arianna

I updated the project description per your comments and completed the determination key.

From: Papadakis, Arianna [APapadakis@indot.IN.gov](mailto:APapadakis@indot.IN.gov)
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2022 3:11 PM
To: Jason Stone [istone@dlz.com](mailto:istone@dlz.com)
Subject: RE: IPaC review - SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107 -

| From: | Megan McClellan [megan@fwtrails.org](mailto:megan@fwtrails.org) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, April 22, 2022 2:16 PM |
| To: | Jason Stone |
| Subject: | Re: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of |
|  | I-469 in Allen County, Des No 1900107-Early Coordination |

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Ok, thanks.

On Fri, Apr 22, 2022 at 2:13 PM Jason Stone [jstone@dlz.com](mailto:jstone@dlz.com) wrote:

Hello Megan

Typically we request comments within 30 days. There's no rush. Thanks very much.

From: Megan McClellan [megan@fwtrails.org](mailto:megan@fwtrails.org)
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 2:10 PM
To: Jason Stone < jistone@dlz.com>
Subject: Re: INDOT, SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement, 3.67 Miles West of I-469 in Allen County,
Des No 1900107 - Early Coordination

EXTERNAL: Message origin is from an external network. Use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Received. I will review. Is there a date by which you need comments?

On Fri, Apr 22, 2022 at 8:52 AM Jason Stone [jstone@dlz.com](mailto:jstone@dlz.com) wrote:

Hello Megan

Please review the attached early coordination materials and provide us with any comments you may have. Thanks very much.

## APPENDIX D

## Section 106 Documentation



# FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION'S <br> SECTION 4(F) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (for historic properties) AND <br> SECTION 106 FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS <br> AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT <br> ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS <br> EFFECT FINDING <br> STATE ROAD 930 AND MAPLECREST ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS CITY OF NEW HAVEN, ADAMS TOWNSHIP, ALLEN COUNTY, INDIANA <br> DES. NO.: 1900107; DHPA NO. 27983 

## AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS <br> (Pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.4(a)(1))

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) for this project primarily extends at least 500 feet beyond the project end points to allow for construction staging and traffic, and at least one property deep on both sides of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road. In addition to sightlines to the project which are obscured by wooded areas and surrounding building, the APE was also delineated based upon indirect impacts due to construction traffic and noise which considers distance from the project, natural barriers, and other buildings. The APE for archaeology was the project footprint. A graphic depicting the APE can be found in Appendix A.

## ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS

(Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(c)(2))

Four properties within the APE are listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Holter's Roost (c.1902) at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27104) is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion B for its association with the Holterman family, and under Criterion C as a rare architectural style in the township and county.

House (c. 1923) at 1759 Estella Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27119) is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C as an exemplary example of a Craftsman style bungalow.

Hill House (c.1927) at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27165) is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C as an example of an unaltered Craftsman style bungalow.

Sunnymede Residential Historic District (c.1940-1973) along Medford Drive, Sunnymede Drive, Dellwood Drive, Ridgeview, Sunwood Drive, and New Haven Avenue from Medford Drive to Dellwood Drive (IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-214-27124, \#003-214-27126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196) is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A as a representation of postwar tract planning and development, and under Criterion C for its houses with architectural styles popular in the postwar period, such as American Small House, Cape Cod, and Ranch.

## EFFECT FINDING

Holter's Roost - No Adverse Effect
House at 1759 Estella Avenue - No Adverse Effect
Hill House - No Adverse Effect
Sunnymede Residential Historic District - No Adverse Effect
INDOT, acting on FHWA's behalf, has determined a "No Adverse Effect" finding is appropriate for this undertaking.

INDOT respectfully requests the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer provide written concurrence with the Section 106 determination of effect.

## SECTION 4(F) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (for historic properties)

Holter's Roost - This undertaking will not convert property from Holter's Roost, a Section 4(f) historic property, to a transportation use; INDOT, acting on FHWA's behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is "No Adverse Effect"; therefore, no Section 4(f) evaluation is required for Holter's Roost.

House at 1759 Estella Avenue - This undertaking will not convert property from House at 1759 Estella Avenue, a Section $4(\mathrm{f})$ historic property, to a transportation use; INDOT, acting on FHWA's behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is "No Adverse Effect"; therefore, no Section 4(f) evaluation is required for House at 1759 Estella Avenue.

Hill House - This undertaking will not convert property from Hill House, a Section 4(f) historic property, to a transportation use; INDOT, acting on FHWA's behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is "No Adverse Effect"; therefore, no Section 4(f) evaluation is required for Hill House.

Sunnymede Residential Historic District - This undertaking will not convert property from Sunnymede Residential Historic District, a Section 4(f) historic property, to a transportation use; INDOT, acting on FHWA's behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is "No Adverse Effect"; therefore, no Section 4(f) evaluation is required for Sunnymede Residential Historic District.


Matthew S. Coon, for FHWA
Manager
INDOT Cultural Resources

April 4, 2023
Approved Date

# FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION DOCUMENTATION OF SECTION 106 FINDING OF NO ADVERSE EFFECT SUBMITTED TO THE STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER PURSUANT TO 36 CFR SECTION 800.5(c) STATE ROAD 930 AND MAPLECREST ROAD INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS CITY OF NEW HAVEN, ADAMS TOWNSHIP, ALLEN COUNTY, INDIANA DES. NO.: 1900107; DHPA NO. 27983 

## 1. DESCRIPTION OF THE UNDERTAKING

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), with funding from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) proposes to proceed with a project for improvements to the State Road (SR) 930 intersection with Maplecrest Road in the City of New Haven, Adams Township, Allen County, Indiana (Des. No. 1900107). The project area can be found on the 1998 Fort Wayne East, Indiana, USGS Topographic Quadrangle, in Sections 9 and 10, Township 30 North, Range 13 East. See Appendix A for maps of the project location and Appendix B for project plans.

The undertaking consists of constructing a quadrant roadway (QR) which will eliminate left-turn movements through the primary intersection of SR 930 and Maplecrest by relocating those maneuvers to secondary intersections created by the QR south and east of the primary intersection. The primary intersection will then operate as a two-phase intersection with both secondary signals at the end of this connector roadway operating as three-phase signals to protect the left-turn maneuvers. By using two phases instead of the previous four, the primary signal will decrease delay. The traffic will have less time to queue, helping lower congestion as well. The new QR will also provide storage length for the turning vehicles. Work along the west and east approaches would extend approximately 1,250 and 1,460 feet, respectively, from the intersection. Work along the north and south approaches would extend approximately 700 and 1,180 feet, respectively, from the intersection. Besides construction of the new quadrant road, lanes will be added to Maplecrest Road and SR 930 to accommodate the new traffic patterns. A four-foot sidewalk will be added along the south side of SR 930 from the shared-use path extension and extend east approximately 1,200 feet.

The existing non-historic three-foot by three-foot concrete box culvert (INDOT No. CLV 67632) conveying the Sheridan drain under SR 930 will be extended south to accommodate the proposed sidewalk embankment along SR 930. Drainage on the QR will be collected into an enclosed storm sewer system and will eventually outfall into the Sheridan Drain which leads to the Maumee River, approximately 0.8 mile from the project site. Drainage patterns along SR 930 and Maplecrest Road will be maintained via existing roadside ditches and infrastructure with the intent to maintain existing stormwater drainage patterns. It is anticipated a detention basin will be required along the east leg of SR 930 for stormwater entering the Sheridan Drain. The undertaking includes construction of a concrete box culvert under the proposed new QR just south of its intersection with SR 930 to perpetuate the existing roadside ditch along the south side of SR 930 through that area. The proposed new three-foot by three-foot concrete box culvert will be 130 linear feet in length and will be placed roughly parallel to SR 930 . The undertaking also includes construction of seven new overhead cantilevered sign structures measuring approximately 23 to 26.6 feet tall, and 30 feet wide, located throughout the project area.

Less than five acres of new permanent right of way, and less than 0.5 acre of temporary right of way will be acquired. Neither temporary nor permanent right-of-way will be needed from historic properties within the APE. Since most of the work will take place outside of the road or on the outside auxiliary lane, a detour is not anticipated and reconfiguring the lanes is expected to be completed under traffic.

The effects letter distributed on October 5, 2021 indicated that the project's letting date is March 13, 2024. The currently anticipated project letting date is August 9, 2023.

Federal-aid highway construction projects qualify as "undertakings" as defined in CFR 800.16(y) and are subject to a Section 106 review as per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Federalaid funds will be used for planning and/or construction of the proposed improvements; thus, a Section 106 review is applicable.

The Area of Potential Effects (APE) includes all locations where the project may result in disturbance of the ground; all locations from which elements of the project may be visible or audible; all locations where activity may result in changes in traffic patterns, land use, or public access; and all areas where there may be direct or indirect effects due to elements of the project. For above-ground structures the APE was defined extending at least 500 feet beyond the project end points to allow for construction staging and traffic, and at least one property deep on both sides of SR 930 and Maplecrest Road. In addition to sightlines to the project which are obscured by wooded areas and surrounding building, the APE was also delineated based upon indirect impacts due to construction traffic and noise which considers distance from the project, natural barriers, and other buildings. The APE for archaeology was the project footprint. Aerial maps of the APE are located in Appendix A and project site photographs are located in Appendix C.

## 2. EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY HISTORIC PROPERTIES

## Early Coordination

Per 36 CFR 800.2(c)(1) the Federal agency fulfilling the Section 106 requirements is statutorily obligated to involve stakeholders in consultation. Per the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is responsible for consulting on Federal undertakings that may affect historic properties.

In addition to the SHPO, the parties listed below were invited to participate as consulting parties for this undertaking:

| Invited Consulting Party | Accepted/Decline Invitation |
| :--- | :---: |
| Allen County Historian | No Response |
| African/African-American Historical Museum (Fort Wayne) | No Response |
| Allen County Genealogical Society of Indiana | No Response |
| Besancon Historical Society | No Response |
| Fort Wayne Jewish Historical Society | No Response |
| The Genealogy Center | No Response |
| The History Center (Fort Wayne) / Allen County Historical Society | No Response |
| New Haven Area Heritage Association | No Response |
| Northeastern Indiana Regional Coordinating Council (NIRCC) | Accepted |
| Allen County Commissioners | No Response |
| Indiana Landmarks Northeast Field Office | No Response |
| Allen County Highway Department | No Response |
| Allen County Engineer | No Response |
| Allen County Department of Planning Services | No Response |
| New Haven Mayor's Office | No Response |
| New Haven Public Works Department | No Response |
| Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma | No Response |


| Miami Tribe of Oklahoma | Accepted |
| :--- | :---: |
| Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma | No Response |
| Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians | Accepted |
| Shawnee Tribe | No Response |
| Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma | No Response |
| Delaware Tribe of Indians | No Response |
| Forest County Potawatomi Community | No Response |
| Wyandotte Nation | No Response |

On August 12, 2021, an Early Coordination Letter (ECL) was sent via email to the SHPO and to other stakeholders and interested parties. The INDOT-CRO sent the ECL via email to Tribes on August 12, 2021. The ECL provided project information, project location maps, and invited recipients to become consulting parties to the undertaking. The parties were requested to indicate whether they agreed to participate as a consulting party within 30 days of receipt of the invitation. It was noted that if the invited consulting party did not reply, they would not be considered a consulting party and would not receive further information about the undertaking unless the scope changed. Tribes may elect to participate as consulting parties at any time. A hard copy of the ECL was also mailed to the SHPO on August 12, 2021.

In a letter dated August 17, 2021, NIRCC accepted the invitation to participate as a consulting party and noted the presence of Post-War Era (1940-1973) residential housing sites adjacent to or near the project area. NIRCC recommended coordination with INDOT regarding these properties.

In a letter dated August 23, 2021, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ECL and indicated that ARCH, Inc. should be invited to participate as a consulting party. They also recommended that the owner of any historic properties be added to the list of CPs.

On August 23, 2021, an ECL was sent via email to ARCH, Inc.
In a letter dated August 25, 2021, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma accepted the invitation to participate as a consulting party and stated that if any archaeological sites or objects are inadvertently discovered during the project their office should be notified immediately.

In a letter dated September 10, 2021, the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi accepted the invitation to participate as a consulting party and stated that if any archaeological sites or objects are inadvertently discovered during the project their office should be notified immediately.

No other replies were received in response to the ECL. All consulting party correspondence is located in Appendix F.

## Above and Below Ground Investigations

A Phase la Archaeological Short Report (ASR) was prepared by Samuel Snell of Metric Environmental, LLC (Snell 9/7/2021). Snell is an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.4(b).

On August 11 and 12, 2021, Metric staff conducted field work that included visual inspection and the excavation of shovel test probes. Three previously recorded archaeological sites were noted within the
project area. Site 12-Al-0057 was noted to have been destroyed by commercial development. Sites 12-Al0553 and 12-Al-0554 were considered not eligible for listing in the NRHP.

The archaeological survey conducted for this project did not encounter any evidence of the three previously recorded sites and did not identify any previously unrecorded sites; as such, no additional archaeological work was recommended. The recommendations from the ASR are presented in Appendix E.

In a letter dated October 5, 2021, a request to review and comment on the ASR (SHPO and Tribes only) via IN SCOPE (https://erms12c.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents) was sent to the SHPO and Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days; however, Tribal consulting parties could enter the process at any time and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

On October 18, 2021, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe acknowledged receipt of the ASR and indicated that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if archaeological sites or objects are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

In a letter dated November 12, 2021, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The SHPO indicated that intact portions of archaeological sites 12-Al-0057, 12-Al-0553, and 12-Al-0554 may remain extant within, and immediately adjacent to, portions of the proposed project area. The SHPO expressed its opinion that any portions of these sites which may remain within the proposed project areas likely have been demolished by modern construction activities, and that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at the proposed project area. The SHPO noted that if the boundaries of the proposed project area are altered to include additional portions of archaeological sites 12-Al-0057, 12-Al-0553, and 12-Al0554, then additional archaeological investigations may be required.

On March 7, 2022, the Forest County Potawatomi Community acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The Tribe offered a finding of No Historic Properties Affected that are of significance to the Forest County Potawatomi Community. The Forest County Potawatomi Community noted that, as a standard caveat, in the event that human remains or archaeological materials are exposed as a result of the project, work should cease immediately and the Tribe(s) must be included with the SHPO in any consultation regarding treatment and disposition of the find.

To determine the presence of historic properties within the project's APE, a historic property report (HPR) was prepared by Timothy Miller of Metric Environmental, LLC (Miller 11/30/2021). Miller is a Qualified Professional (QP) architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.4(b).

Miller conducted a literature review by examining the Indiana State Historic Architectural and Archaeological Research Database (SHAARD), Indiana Historic Buildings, Bridges, and Cemeteries Map (IHBBCM), National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) database, INDOT-Cultural Resources Office (CRO) Public Web Map App, and Indiana Historical Bureau's Historic Markers database. The results of the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) for Allen County (1996) were also reviewed.

Additionally, a field survey was conducted on August 9, 2021, for the project.
No properties within the APE are currently listed in the NRHP. The following four properties were recommended to be eligible for listing in the NRHP:

1. Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27104) under Criteria B and C;
2. House at 1759 Estella Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27119) under Criterion C;
3. Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27165) under Criterion C;
4. Sunnymede Residential Historic District along Medford Drive, Sunnymede Drive, Dellwood Drive, Ridgeview, Sunwood Drive, and New Haven Avenue from Medford Drive to Dellwood Drive (IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-214-27124, \#003-214-27126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196) under Criteria A and C.

The summary and conclusion sections of the HPR are presented in Appendix D. The full HPR document may be downloaded from IN SCOPE at https://erms12c.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents (the Des. No. is the most efficient search term, once in IN SCOPE).

In a letter dated March 7, 2022, a request to review and comment on the HPR via IN SCOPE was sent to the SHPO and both Tribal and non-Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. The Lincoln Highway Association and the owners of the identified historic properties were invited to participate as consulting parties. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days; however, Tribal consulting parties could enter the process at any time and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

On March 8, 2022, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if any items which fall under the protection of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

In a letter dated April 4, 2022, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the HPR. The SHPO concurred with the size of the proposed APE, with the eligibility determinations of Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory ["IHSSI"] \#003-214-27104), house at 1759 Estella Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27119), Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue (IHSSI \#003-214-27165, and Sunnymede Residential Historic District (IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-214-27124, \#003-214-27126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196). The SHPO letter also acknowledged an Addendum Archaeology Report was forthcoming.

An ASR Addendum was prepared by Samuel Snell of Metric Environmental, LLC (Snell 3/28/2022) to account for the addition of a detention basin in the southeast project quadrant. The involved area was pedestrian surveyed during the original survey on August 11, 2021 but was not reported because it was outside the boundaries of the project. At that time, the area was a planted soybean field with 40-50 percent visibility along the field edge. The area was revisited by Metric staff on January 21, 2022, to document the current conditions. No archaeological resources were identified as a result of the survey; as such, no additional archaeological work was recommended. The recommendations from the ASR Addendum are presented in Appendix E.

In a letter dated May 20, 2022, a request to review and comment on the ASR Addendum (SHPO and Tribes only) via IN SCOPE (http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/) was sent to the SHPO and Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days; however, Tribal consulting parties could enter the process at any time and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

On May 23, 2022, the Forest County Potawatomi Community acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum. The Tribe offered a finding of No Historic Properties Affected that are of significance to the Forest County Potawatomi Community. Additionally, the Forest County Potawatomi Community expressed its desire to remain as a consulting party for this project.

On May 23, 2022, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum and offered no objection to the project proceeding. The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma requested to be immediately notified and consulted if any items which fall under the protection of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

On May 26, 2022, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if any items which fall under the protection of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

On June 8, 2022, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum and indicated that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. The Tribe offered no objection to the undertaking but requested to be immediately notified and consulted if archaeological sites or objects are discovered during any phase of the proposed project.

On June 13, 2022, the Shawnee Tribe acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum and indicated it concurs that no known historic properties will be negatively impacted by this project. The Tribe noted there is still potential for discovery of unknown resources and requested that in the event that archaeological materials are encountered during construction, use, or maintenance of this location, the Tribe should be notified to resume immediate consultation under such a circumstance.

In a letter dated June 13, 2022, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ASR Addendum. The SHPO indicated they have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the proposed project area; and concurred that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at the proposed project area.

No other consulting party comments were received regarding the ECL, HPR, ASR, or ASR Addendum.

Refer to Appendix F for Consulting Party Correspondence.

## 3. DESCRIBE AFFECTED HISTORIC PROPERTIES

The APE contains four properties eligible for listing in the NRHP.

## Holter's Roost

6623 Old Maumee Avenue
IHSSI \#003-214-27104, rated Outstanding
Located on the south side of Old Maumee Avenue is this two-story multicolored cobblestone house constructed in the Shingle style in c.1902. Holter's Roost is a uniquely designed, castle-like shingle house that appears from the exterior to be unaltered. The house boasts a center shingled tower is capped with a pyramidal hipped asphalt roof with flared eaves broken by shingled battlements, multiple cobblestone chimneys, and a copper finial cap. When constructed the area was rural, and originally the property included multiple farm outbuildings and a stone bridge. As the 1900s progressed the area changed from rural to urban and today the property has been reduced to the lot the house sits upon. None of the outbuildings exist except for a stone footbridge west of the property, which no longer belongs to the property and is within a separate parcel. Thus, the house is the only contributing structure within the proposed NRHP boundary. The proposed NRHP boundary follows the parcel's property line and encompasses 0.43 acre.

The property is eligible for NRHP listing under Criterion B for its association with the Holterman family, who played a significant role in the history of poultry agriculture and education for co-founding Valparaiso University. For its architectural significance and as a rare architectural style in the township and county, the property also meets the requirements for NRHP listing under Criterion C.

## House

## 1759 Estella Avenue

## IHSSI \#003-214-27119, rated Notable

Located on the east side of Estella Avenue is this one-and-a-half-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c.1923. The side-gabled asphalt roof has a full-width shed dormer with large overhanging eaves with brackets and exposed rafter tails. An oversized multicolored rough cut irregularly laid field stone front exterior chimney and two pillars at each end of the facade break the roofline in the front eave. The stone for this house was locally gathered from the riverbeds of the Maumee, St. Joseph, and St. Mary's rivers. The offset front entryway is sheltered beneath an integral, partially open porch on its northwest corner with a multicolored rough cut irregularly laid field stone support column in the northwest corner, with multicolored rough cut irregularly laid field stone steps and rails. The rest of the porch is enclosed. The building has a rectangular footprint with a multicolored rough cut irregularly laid field stone foundation and a basement. The house is covered with stucco over lath boards. The wooden double-hung windows are glazed in 8 -over-1 and 4-over-1 patterns, eight-paned fixed and multipaned windows are present around the chimney. The property's setting was originally rural but is now urban and is characterized by commercial and light industrial buildings. The proposed NRHP boundary follows the parcel's property line and encompasses 0.45 acre. It includes a non-contributing garage.

The property is eligible under Criterion C as an exemplary example of a Craftsman style bungalow. The house is the property's only contributing resource.

## Hill House

6436 Old Maumee Avenue
IHSSI \#003-214-27165, rated Notable
Located on the south side of Old Maumee Avenue is this one-and-a-half-story Craftsman dormer front bungalow constructed $c .1927$ according to the historic inventory and $c .1940$ according to the property record. The side-gabled asphalt roof has a shed dormer with large overhanging eaves and a center
chimney. The building has a rectangular footprint with a decorative concrete foundation and a basement. The house is covered with red brick and clapboard siding. The wooden double hung sash windows are glazed in a 4-over-1 and 1-over-1 pattern with simple wooden surrounds and concrete sills. The house has a full width enclosed front porch with brick supports and rails and 5 -over-2 glazed windows. On the east side of the porch is the front door with two paned sidelights. Southeast of the house is a contributing twobay c. 1940 garage. Due east of the house is another garage that dates to c. 1990 and c.1990, and south of the house is a c. 2016 shed, both of which are non-contributing to the property. The proposed NRHP boundary follows the parcel's property line and encompasses 0.44 acre.

The house is an example of an unaltered Craftsman bungalow with characteristic features such as a large porch, bulky massing, wide eave overhangs, and a dormered roofline. For these reasons, the property is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

## Sunnymede Residential Historic District <br> Medford Drive, Sunnymede Drive, Dellwood Drive, Ridgeview, Sunwood Drive, and New Haven Avenue from Medford Drive to Dellwood Drive <br> IHSSI \#003-214-27058 to 27060, \#003-214-27124, \#003-214-27126, \#003-214-27129, \#003-214-27175 to 27181, \#003-214-27182, \#003-214-27184, \#003-214-27196, rated Contributing

Sunnymede is bound by Medford Drive, Dellwood Drive, the dead-end south of Sunwood Drive, and New Haven Avenue from Sunnymede Drive to Dellwood Drive in New Haven, Indiana. At the west end of Sunwood Drive is Sunnymede Park which consists of two baseball fields. South of the baseball fields was the neighborhood school, which was demolished by 2006 . Sunnymede is a two block east and west, by three blocks north and south, rectangular-grid layout with the houses in each individual block having a similar setback. The residential neighborhood consists of about 60 acres without the Sunnymede Park and Sunnymede School site.

The houses in Sunnymede are similar in size due to the uniform size of the lots, but the footprints vary to the diverse types of houses. The houses mostly date from the late 1940s to the early 1970s, and commonly found architectural styles include Cape Cod, Minimal Traditional, and Ranches. The NRHP boundary follows the neighborhood plat as well as Sunnymede Park (contributing) and the former location of Sunnymede School (non-contributing) to the west, and it encompasses approximately 88 acres.

Sunnymede is a representation of a postwar tract planning and development which makes it eligible as a historic district under the "Residential Planning and Development in Indiana, 1940-1973" Multiple Property Documentation Form under Criteria A for its association with the themes of community planning and development. Additionally, the neighborhood's modest houses shared similar setbacks and lots with mature trees and shrubbery, with no sidewalk or curbs present buildings, and displayed architectural styles popular in the postwar period, such as American Small House, Cape Cod, and Ranch. For these reasons, the Sunnymede is recommended eligible under Criterion C.

## 4. DESCRIBE THE UNDERTAKING'S EFFECTS ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

## Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue

The undertaking will introduce a new road segment - a quadrant roadway (QR) - east of the Maplecrest Road and SR 930 intersection on the south side of SR 930, just southwest of the subject property. The QR would reconfigure the segment of SR 930 between Maplecrest Road and the project's eastern end point, a distance of approximately 1,500 feet. Currently SR 930 in this section consists of two, 12 -foot travel
lanes in each direction with a 24-foot dedicated middle turn lane, and 12-foot paved shoulders on each side, creating a total roadway width of 96 feet. The proposed change would not significantly change the roadway width of SR 930, which is estimated to be within one to two feet of its current width. Signalized traffic lights will be installed on SR 930 at its intersection with the QR. East of the QR the paved shoulder would be dropped for the curb and gutter, as well as construction of a new four-foot sidewalk on the south side of SR 930. The undertaking will also introduce cantilevered sign structures within its viewshed located on both sides of SR 930 approximately 300 feet east of Maplecrest Road, and on the north side of SR 930 approximately 260 feet west of Old Maumee Avenue just to the east of the Holter's Roost property. The cantilevered sign structure adjacent to the property measures approximately 24 feet tall and 30 feet wide, with a reflective sign that measures 16.5 feet wide by 10.5 feet high. An approximate 75 feet of guardrail will be installed where none currently exists at the property's southeast corner, to be placed within right-of-way adjacent to SR 930. The guardrail is located on the west side of the entrance to the property directly east of Holter's Roost.

The proposed undertaking will have no physical impacts to this property, and no contributing features, such as trees, landscaping, or other elements will be altered or removed. The undertaking will not take any permanent or temporary right-of-way from this property. Both of the property's current access points will not change as a result of this project. Therefore, no effects to the property's integrity of location, design, materials, and workmanship would occur.

The proposed changes occurring adjacent to the property, such as the new QR roadway with a signalized intersection will introduce visual changes to its setting. Traffic queuing due to traffic signal installations on SR 930 at the QR will also introduce a visual change. These changes to the property's setting, however, would not significantly alter the property's relationship with it, as the surrounding area has long since shifted from rural to urban. The property's original setting in the early 1900 s of open spaces in a lowdensity rural area resembles nothing of its current setting within a busy, traffic-heavy urban setting, and thus, the addition of traffic queues would not significantly alter the property's viewshed. Likewise, the construction of additional streetlights, ground-level and overhead street signs, guardrail, and sidewalk will have less of an impact than if these changes were impacting a pristine rural setting. The property is set among predominately commercial land uses along a high-traffic corridor, in which road signs, billboards, streetlights, and other roadway facilities are present. Therefore, the visual effects would not dramatically change the property's setting, nor would the look of these changes be incompatible within its existing landscape.

Both noise and vibration exposure to the property will increase during construction-related activities. These impacts would be temporary in nature, however. Any sustained noise and vibratory effects as a result of the undertaking is not anticipated to noticeably increase their current levels or alter the existing setting. Thus, because Holter's Roost's NRHP eligibility rests less upon its setting than upon other factors such as its association with the Holterman family and its outstanding architectural design and use of materials, any visual and auditory effects introduced by the undertaking will not affect the property's significance or integrity.

## House at 1759 Estrella Avenue

The proposed undertaking would have no physical impacts to this property, and no contributing features, such as trees, landscaping, or other elements will be altered or removed. The undertaking will not introduce new elements onto the property, and views to the project area will be limited due to the large
buildings located between the property and SR 930 on its south and east side, and a tree line along the front (west side) of its property. Nevertheless, any visible changes within the property's viewshed would not significantly alter its current setting of modern development in an urban setting to the degree that the property's integrity would be diminished. Since Estrella Avenue is not a through-street it is not anticipated that traffic would increase due to the project. The undertaking will not take any permanent or temporary right-of-way from this property. The property's access will not change during construction or after because of the project.

## Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue

The proposed undertaking would have no physical impacts to this property, and no contributing features, such as trees, landscaping, or other elements will be altered or removed. Old Maumee Avenue's current roadway width will not change as a result of this project. Since Old Maumee Avenue is not a throughstreet it is not anticipated that traffic would increase due to the project. The undertaking will not take any permanent or temporary right-of-way from this property. The property's access will not change during construction or after because of the project. Views to the project area will be partially obscured by trees and buildings, and its distance from construction and operational activities of approximately 400 feet from the QR and 200 feet from the project limits will minimize auditory impacts. Thus, the undertaking will not alter the character of the view nor its setting, and the undertaking will not impact the building's integrity. As a property that is NRHP eligible under Criterion C, its significance is largely derived from its building form and style, and its integrity of design, materials, and workmanship bears the most relevance to conveying that significance.

## Sunnymede Residential Historic District

The proposed undertaking would have no physical impacts to this resource, and no contributing features, such as trees, landscaping, or other elements will be altered or removed. None of the current roadway widths within this neighborhood would change as a result of this project. Since none of the streets within Sunnymede are through streets it is not anticipated that traffic would increase in the neighborhood due to the project. The undertaking will not take any permanent or temporary right-of-way from any property within the historic district. The neighborhood's access points will not change during construction or after because of the project. The undertaking will not introduce new elements onto any property boundaries within the historic district. The undertaking would cause temporary visual and auditory changes during construction work that would be temporary, as the primary activities that will occur immediately adjacent to this resource would be construction traffic and possibly short-term construction staging. Those properties with viewsheds to the project area, including the houses closest to SR 930 and on the east side of Dellwood Drive, will have new facilities, such as cantilevered and ground-level street signs, sidewalk, and a reconfigured layout on SR 930, introduced into their property's viewshed. These transportation features have historically been common features near mid-twentieth century residential developments, and thus, the proposed changes are not incompatible within the setting. As a resource that is NRHP eligible under Criteria A and C, its significance is largely derived from its association with the history of postwar suburban housing and its architectural and landscape design, of which setting is an important part. However, the degree to which the viewshed will be changed by the introduction of these new elements will not appreciably diminish that characteristic since the surrounding area already consists of similar features within its setting, causing the new elements to blend in rather than stand out as incongruent within the surroundings.

## 5. EXPLAIN APPLICATION OF CRITERIA OF ADVERSE EFFECT -- INCLUDE CONDITIONS OR FUTURE ACTIONS TO AVOID, MINIMIZE OR MITIGATE ADVERSE EFFECTS

Section 106 requires federal agencies to determine whether an undertaking has the potential to have an effect, either directly or indirectly, upon historic properties. Per 36 CFR § 800.16 (i), an "effect" is defined by Section 106 regulations as "an alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register." The degree to which a historic property is diminished by an undertaking is used to measure its effect, which can be No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect. The regulation's criteria of Adverse Effect are defined in 36 CFR § 800.5(a), and states:
(1) Criteria of Adverse Effect. An Adverse Effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified after the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

Below are examples of adverse effects given in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2):
(i) Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property;
(ii) Alteration of a property, including the restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four- treatments.htm) (36 CFR Part 68) and applicable guidelines;
(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;
(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;
(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance..."
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.

The criteria of adverse effect, as defined and described in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(1) and in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i) through ( v ), will now be evaluated for each historic property within the APE.

## Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i), the undertaking will not cause "physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(ii), there will be no "restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iii), the property will not be removed from its historic location.
Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iv), the project would not change the "the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance." The project would not change the way the property is currently used, nor would it change any physical features within its setting that are contributing features to its historic significance.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v), there will not be an "introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features." The property's viewshed will change as a result of the changes to SR 930 and construction of the QR, but the property is set along a high-traffic corridor, in which road signs, billboards, streetlights, and other roadway facilities are present. Traffic queuing due to traffic signal installations on SR 930 at the QR will also introduce a visual change. These changes to the property's setting, however, would not significantly alter the property's relationship with it, as the surrounding area has long since shifted from rural to urban. Therefore, the visual effects would not dramatically change the property's setting, nor would the look of these changes be incompatible within its existing landscape. Any sustained noise and vibratory effects as a result of the undertaking is not anticipated to noticeably increase their current levels, and any potential incremental increase would not likely affect the property's historical significance nor its integrity.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vi), there will be no neglect or deterioration of the property.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vii), there will be no "transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of Federal ownership or control."

## House at 1759 Estrella Avenue

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i), the undertaking will not cause "physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(ii), there will be no "restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iii), the property will not be removed from its historic location.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iv), the project would not change the "the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance." The project would not change the way the property is currently used, nor would it change any physical features within its setting that are contributing features to its historic significance.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v), there will not be an "introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features." The property's viewshed to the project area will be limited due to buildings blocking its view to the project area on the east and south, and a tree line screening the property along the west. Additionally, any visible change to the property's viewshed that will occur as a result of the undertaking will not appreciably diminish the property's setting as it is already surrounded by modern development.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vi), there will be no neglect or deterioration of the property.
Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vii), there will be no "transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of Federal ownership or control."

## Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i), the undertaking will not cause "physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(ii), there will be no "restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iii), the property will not be removed from its historic location.
Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iv), the project would not change the "the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance." The project would not change the way the property is currently used, nor would it change any physical features within its setting that are contributing features to its historic significance.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v), there will not be an "introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features." Views to the project area will be partially obscured by trees and buildings, and its distance from construction and operational activities of approximately 400 feet from the QR and 200 feet from the project limits will minimize auditory impacts. Thus, the undertaking will not alter the character of the view nor its setting, and the undertaking will not impact the building's integrity.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vi), there will be no neglect or deterioration of the property.
Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vii), there will be no "transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of Federal ownership or control."

## Sunnymede Residential Historic District

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i), the undertaking will not cause "physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(ii), there will be no "restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines."

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iii), the resource will not be removed from its historic location.
Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(iv), the project would not change the "the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance." The project would not change the way the resource is currently used, nor would it change any physical features within its setting that are contributing features to its historic significance.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v), there will not be an "introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features." The undertaking will cause temporary visual and auditory effects from construction activity adjacent to this resource that includes construction traffic and short-term construction staging. The viewshed to the project area from the historic district will be limited to the houses closest to SR 930 and on Dellwood Drive, will include new roadway facilities such as cantilevered and ground-level street signs, and streetlighting. These transportation features have historically been common features near midtwentieth century residential developments, and thus, the proposed changes are not incompatible within the existing setting. Therefore, the degree to which the viewshed will be changed by the introduction of these new elements will not diminish the property's integrity.

Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vi), there will be no neglect or deterioration of the resource.
Per 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(vii), there will be no "transfer, lease, or sale of the property out of Federal ownership or control."

## 6. SUMMARY OF CONSULTING PARTIES AND PUBLIC VIEWS

On August 12, 2021, an ECL was sent to both non-Tribal and Tribal consulting parties. The SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ECL in a letter dated August 23, 2021, and recommended ARCH, Inc. be invited to participate as a consulting party. The invitation to participate as a consulting party was accepted by NIRCC on August 17, 2021, by the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma on August 25, 2021, and by the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi on September 10, 2021.

In a letter dated October 5, 2021, a request to review and comment upon the ASR (SHPO and Tribes only) via IN SCOPE was sent to the SHPO and Tribal consulting parties. On October 18, 2021, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe indicated that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. In a letter dated November 12, 2021, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the ASR. The SHPO expressed its opinion that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at the proposed project area. On March 7, 2022, the Forest County Potawatomi Community offered a finding of No Historic Properties Affected. On March 8, 2022, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma offered no objection to the undertaking.

In a letter dated March 7, 2022, a request to review and comment upon the HPR via IN SCOPE was sent to the SHPO and both Tribal and non-Tribal consulting parties. In a letter dated April 4, 2022, the SHPO concurred with the size of the proposed APE, with the eligibility determinations of Holter's Roost at 6623 Old Maumee Avenue, house at 1759 Estella Avenue, Hill House at 6436 Old Maumee Avenue, and Sunnymede Residential Historic District.

In a letter dated May 18, 2022, a request to review and comment upon the ASR Addendum (SHPO and Tribes only) via IN SCOPE was sent to the SHPO and Tribal consulting parties. On May 23, 2022, the Forest County Potawatomi Community offered a finding of No Historic Properties Affected. On May 23, 2022, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma offered no objection to the project proceeding. On May 26, 2022, the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma offered no objection to the undertaking. On June 8, 2022, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe indicated that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. On June 13, 2022, the Shawnee Tribe stated that no known historic properties will be negatively impacted by this project. In a letter dated June 13, 2022, the SHPO indicated they have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the proposed project area, and concurred that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary.

An Effects Report was prepared by Candace Hudziak, a Qualified Professional historian with Metric Environmental, LLC, and it was distributed to consulting parties and Tribes on December 2, 2022, with a request to review and comment on the document via IN SCOPE (the report may be downloaded from IN SCOPE at http://erms12c.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/). The SHPO was sent digital and hard copies of the report. The Effects Report provided additional information on project activities, updated design plans, and discussed potential effects on the NRHP-eligible resources located in the project's APE. The Effects Report stated that INDOT, with authority delegated by FHWA, will issue an effect finding as per 36 CFR § 800.5(b) after compiling comments from consulting parties. Recipients of this review request were asked to provide comments within 30 days and were encouraged to respond to the notification with any comments or concerns at their earliest convenience.

In a letter dated December 9, 2022, the SHPO acknowledged receipt of the Effects Report. The SHPO agreed that the project as proposed will not adversely affect the identified historic properties and provided clarification regarding the spelling of Estella Avenue. The SHPO indicated that unless another consulting party expresses a different opinion about this project's effects, it might now be appropriate to ask INDOT for a finding.

In a letter dated January 5, 2023, the Eastern Shawnee Tribe expressed the opinion that the project proposes no adverse effect or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe, and recommended the project may continue as planned. The Tribe noted that, should this project inadvertently discover an archeological site or object(s) the Eastern Shawnee Tribe should be contacted immediately, as well as the appropriate state agencies, and all ground disturbing activity should stop until the Tribe and State agencies are consulted.

Refer to Appendix F for Consulting Party Correspondence.
INDOT's finding of "No Adverse Effect", made on behalf of the FHWA, and supporting 36 CFR § 800.11(e) documentation, is hereby provided to the SHPO and other consulting parties for a final 30-day comment period. Views of the public are being concurrently sought through publication of the Findings in the Ft. Wayne Journal Gazette newspaper. This document will be revised if necessary if public comment warrants it.
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## SECTION 106 APPENDIX A



$\square$ Project Area
$\square$ APE
$\square$ Proposed NR Property

Figure 2. Project area on an aerial photograph NRHP boundary on a portion of an aerial map SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement Project
New Haven, Allen County, Indiana
Metric Project No. 20-0026
Map Date: 07/28/2021

All Locations Approximate 2017 Basemap

Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community


## $\square$ Holter's Roost NR Boundary

Figure 3. Holter's Roost NR boundary on a portion of an aerial map
SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement Project
New Haven, Allen County, Indiana
Metric Project No. 20-0026
Map Date: 6/20/2022

## All Locations Approximate

2017 Basemap
Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye,
Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID,
IGN, and the GIS User Community



## $\square 1759$ Estella Avenue HD

Figure 4. 1759 Estella Avenue's proposed NRHP boundary on a portion of an aerial map SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement Project

New Haven, Allen County, Indiana
Metric Project No. 20-0026
Map Date: 06/20/2022

## All Locations Approximate

2017 Basemap
Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye,
Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID,
IGN, and the GIS User Community



## $\square$ Hill House NR Boundary

Figure 5. Hill House proposed NRHP boundary on a portion of an aerial map
SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement Project
New Haven, Allen County, Indiana Metric Project No.20-0026
Map Date: 06/20/2022

## All Locations Approximate

2017 Basemap
Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye,
Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID,
IGN, and the GIS User Community



## $\square$ Sunnymede Residential HD Boundary

Figure 6. Sunnymede Residential HD proposed NRHP boundary on a portion of an aerial map SR 930 at Maplecrest Road Intersection Improvement Project
New Haven, Allen County, Indiana Metric Project No. 20-0026 Map Date: 06/20/2022

## All Locations Approximate

2017 Basemap
Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community
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| SIGN LEGEND |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GN | DESCRIPTION | SIZE (in x in) |
| X620-2 | "END Constructions sicn | $60 \times 24$ |
| X620-5-B | "WORKSITE" \& R 2-1-B (35mph) "SpeED LIMTT SIGN | $48 \times 16$ |
| XW2-6 | "SPEEDING MAX \$1000 RECKLESS DRIVING MAX 6 YRS" Sign | $60 \times 36$ |
| XN3-5-8(3) | "SPEED LIMIT 35" IIGN | $48 \times 48$ |
| XW2-1a | "ROAD CONSTRUCTION AHEAD" SIGN | $48 \times 48$ |
| XW20-2 | "Detour a heap sign | $48 \times 48$ |

NOTES
Al sings baricades, and pavement maxkings shal conform to
the Indidan Manual on Traticic Control Devices fors steets and


3. Spacing of thannel

Spacingo of channelizing devices on tapers shall be 35 ' unless
onteruse noted

One week prior to all traffic pattern changes, Contractor shall


LEGEND
(12) Temp. Pavement Marking, Removable, Solid, Yellow, sin (34) Temp. Pavement Marking, Removable
(84) X620-2 'END COSSTRUCTTIN' Sign
(89) Xw20-10 'RAAD CONSTRUCTION AHEAD' Sign
(97) XG20-5-B WORKSITE \& R2-1-B(35mph) SPEED LIMTT Sig

$\xrightarrow{-}$ Standard Drum
$\Delta$ Area Under Constructio
$\circledast$ Type 'A' Constuction Warning Light
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Coordinate with INDOT Environmental Services Division. INDOT will then coordinate with the appropriate FHWA Environmental Specialist.
    ${ }^{2}$ Any involvement with a bridge processed under the Historic Bridge Programmatic Agreement.
    ${ }^{3}$ Total permanent impacts to streams (linear feet) and wetlands (acres).
    ${ }^{4}$ US Army Corps of Engineers Individual 404 Permit
    ${ }^{5}$ Total permanent and temporary right-of-way. This does not include reacquisition of existing apparent right-of-way.
    ${ }^{6}$ 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.
    ${ }^{7}$ Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) determined by the IPAC determination key to be required that are not tree AMMs, bridge AMMs, or structure AMMs.
    ${ }^{8}$ 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.
    ${ }^{9}$ Potential for causing a disproportionately high and adverse impact.
    ${ }^{10}$ 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.
    ${ }^{11}$ 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.

