# Indiana Department of Transportation

**County:** Hamilton  
**Route:** SR 37  
**Des. No.:** 1296847

## FHWA-Indiana Environmental Document

### CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

#### GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

- **Road No./County:** SR 37 / Hamilton County  
- **Designation Number:** 1296847

**Project Description/Termini:** Intersection improvement (roundabout) at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Ave. in Hamilton County. Project extends along SR 37 (340° south and 100° north) and along Strawtown Ave. (265° west and 345° east). Project is located 6.34 mi. north of SR 32 / SR 38 (Corner St) along SR 37, RP 181+38.

After completing this form, I conclude that this project qualifies for the following type of Categorical Exclusion (FHWA must review/approve if Level 4 CE):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Required Signatures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exclusion, Level 2</td>
<td>The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatures: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exclusion, Level 3</td>
<td>The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatures: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatures: ESM, ES, FHWA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment (EA)</td>
<td>As per separate FONSIAL. Additional research and documentation is necessary to determine the effects on the environment. Required Signatures: ES, FHWA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Approval

- **ESM Initials:** E  
- **ESM Signature:**  
- **Date:** 11/4/16  
- **ES Initials:** B  
- **ES Signature:**  
- **Date:** 11/9/16  
- **FHWA Initials:** C  
- **FHWA Signature:**  
- **Date:** 9-14-16

### Certification of Public Involvement

- **Office of Public Involvement:**  
- **Date:** 9-14-16

Note: Do not approve until after Section 106 public involvement and all other environmental requirements have been satisfied.

#### INDOT ES/District Env.  
**Reviewer Signature:**  
**Date:** 6/28/16

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer:

- **Mark A. Bećić, PE, CrossRoad Engineers, Inc.**
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**Project Name:** SR 37 at Strawtown Rd, Des. No. 1296847  
**Date:** June 27, 2016
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.**

**Does the project have a historic bridge processed under the Historic Bridges PA**? Yes No **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.

**Remarks:**

Notice of Survey letters were sent out on February 11, 2015, and a copy can be found in Appendix G, page G-1.

The proposed project meets the minimum requirements described in the current Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Manual (2012) which requires INDOT to offer the public an opportunity to submit comment and/or request a public hearing. This was advertised in the Noblesville Times on July 7, 2016 and July 14, 2016, with a deadline for hearing request set for July 25, 2016. Based on public feedback, INDOT decided to schedule a public hearing. A public hearing was held on August 23, 2016. The public hearing was advertised in the Noblesville Times on August 4, 2016 and August 11, 2016. The public hearing handouts are included in Appendix G, pages G-2 through G-13. The public comment period closed on September 9, 2016.

The public comments generally were in regards to either selection of the preferred alternative, or to specific design elements of the preferred alternative. Specifically, comments reflected questions on why a signal and/or flasher was not selected. As stated in the response to comments, a flashing light or signal does not correct the inadequate sight distance currently present at the intersection, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. Specific geometry questions included concerns about tractor-trailers and farm equipment being able to utilize the roundabout comfortably. The roundabout has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Standard Design Vehicle (WB-65). This roundabout does not require the use of the truck apron in the center of the roundabout for the thru-movement. Further consideration regarding the cross slope of the roadway and truck apron have been given and the design is planned such that the truck apron is sloped toward the center to counter the overtopping concern when the trailers utilize the apron. This intersection will be evaluated for navigating permitted loads such as a mobile home. In addition, the splitter island curb will be made mountable, and signage placed as far from the edge of road as practical, to provide additional maneuverability for large farm equipment that utilize the intersection. Comments received by this date, and responses to those comments, can be found in Appendix G, pages G-14 through G-49. The text of both public notices and affidavits of publication are in Appendix G, pages G-50 through G-58.

Comments received did not provide new information regarding environmental resources, and did not impact the analysis of the impacts of the project on the environment, and therefore were determined to not be environmentally substantive.

To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, INDOT’s finding on the behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) of “No Adverse Effect” was advertised for public comment in the Noblesville Times on March 9, 2016. The public comment period closed 30 days later on April 9, 2016. No comments were received by the published deadline. The text of the public notice and affidavit of publication are in Appendix D, pages D-49 and D-50.

**Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds**

Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts? Yes No **X**

**Remarks:** At this time, there is no known public controversy concerning community or natural resources impacts as a result of this project.
Part II - General Project Identification, Description, and Design Information

Sponsor of the Project: Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)  
INDOT District: Greenfield

Local Name of the Facility: SR 37

Funding Source (mark all that apply): Federal [X] State [X] Local [ ] Other* [ ]

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

PURPOSE AND NEED:

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

The need of the project is to address inadequate sight distance that results in an unsafe intersection. A quantitative crash analysis was performed using the “Road Hazard Analysis Tool”, RoadHAT 2.0 computer program. The Index of Crash Frequency and the Index of Crash Cost were found to be 2.30 and 1.80 respectively. Since the Index of Crash Frequency is greater than 2, the intersection may be considered to be a high crash location.

During the 7 year period from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2013, there were 31 reported crashes in proximity of, and that may be attributed to, the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue. Over half of those crashes (16) involved personal injuries including one fatality. In addition, on average there were 2 people injured per each injury collision. The vast majority of crashes (27 of 31) were at right angles due to Strawtown Avenue traffic crossing or turning onto SR 37. One possible reason for this include inadequate sight distance due to inability to see over guardrail and concrete barrier railing that is present at the bridge on the north leg of the intersection. Another possible reason is due to the geometry of the intersection. Strawtown Avenue intersects SR 37 at an acute angle, and also is at a lower elevation than SR 37, both of which make it more difficult for a vehicle to see traffic along SR 37. See Appendix I, page I-2 for crash data.

The speed limit was lowered from 55 mph to 40 mph in 2014 in an effort to slow existing traffic. Discussion with local law officials at the preliminary scoping meeting held December 10, 2014 indicated that high speeds continue to be an issue.

The purpose of the project is to improve safety at the intersection by improving sight distance and reducing speed at the intersection.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):

County: Hamilton  
Municipality: Hamilton County

Limits of Proposed Work: Project extends along SR 37 (340’ south and 100’ north) and along Strawtown Ave. (265’ west and 345’ east).

Total Work Length: 0.20 Mile(s)  
Total Work Area: Approx. 1.98 Acre(s)

Is an Interchange Modification Study / Interchange Justification Study (IMS/IJS) required? Yes*  
If yes, when did the FHWA grant a conditional approval for this project? Date: X

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

In the remarks box below, describe existing conditions, provide in detail the scope of work for the project, including the preferred alternative. Include a discussion of logical termini. Discuss any major issues for the project and how the project will improve safety or roadway deficiencies if these are issues.
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Project name: SR 37 at Strawtown Road, Des. No. 1296847  
Date: November 3, 2016
### Project Description

The project is located at the intersection of Strawtown Avenue and SR 37 in Hamilton County, Indiana. Project is located 6.34 miles north of SR 32 / SR 38 (Conner St) along SR 37, at INDOT Reference Post (RP) 181+38. Specifically it is located in Section 3 in Township 19 North and Range 5 East, as shown on the United States Department of the Interior Geological Survey 7.5 minute Riverwood, Indiana Topographical Quadrangle. The existing intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue is currently stop controlled on both legs of Strawtown Avenue by use of stop signs. SR 37 is not stop controlled, and currently has a dedicated right turn lane for northbound traffic. SR 37 is classified as an Arterial. The existing typical section on SR 37 consists of one 12 foot lane in each direction. There is a 12 foot passing blister for northbound traffic that begins approximately 600 feet south of the intersection. The passing blister is also used as a right turn lane and has minimal shoulder width. The shoulder along the southbound lane varies in width from 4 feet to 13 feet. The shoulders on SR 37 north of the intersection are 10 feet in width. Guardrail protects the steep sideslopes in both the northwest and northeast quadrants of the intersection. The guardrail wraps around the radii and connects to the concrete bridge railing north of the intersection. A private gravel driveway is within the proposed project limits southeast of the intersection. Strawtown Avenue is classified as a Collector. The existing typical section on Strawtown Avenue consists of one 16 foot lane in each direction. There is 2 foot combined curb and gutter that lines both sides of the roadway which also includes spaced drainage structures. A concrete driveway that services Strawtown Pottery is within the proposed project limits northwest of the intersection. The preferred alternative is to build a roundabout at this intersection.

### Project Length:

The project is approximately 440 feet in length along SR 37 (340 feet south and 100 feet north of the intersection) and approximately 610 feet along Strawtown Ave. (265 feet west and 345 feet east of the intersection). See Appendix B, pages B-1 through B-3 for maps. These lengths are deemed the minimum needed to construct the roadway to meet current design standards.

### Vertical and Horizontal Alignment:

Proposed vertical alignment will be approximately the same as the existing. Horizontal alignment will be modified to provide approach curvature that is appropriate at the entries of the roundabout. Curvature, especially in the entry approaches, has been shown to create a safer configuration because it forces traffic to slow prior to entering the roundabout.

### Intersection Sight Distance:

Adequate intersection sight distance will be provided at the roundabout in all directions. This will be accomplished by designing the roundabout to current Indiana Department of Transportation standards for sight lines.

### Lanes and Paved Width:

The roundabout is designed as a single lane roundabout. Proposed lane width for SR 37 varies from 12 feet to 15.6 feet in width northbound, and from 12 feet to 13 feet southbound. Proposed lane width for Strawtown Avenue varies from 16.5 feet to 23 feet eastbound, and from 16.5 feet to 23.2 feet westbound. The central island of the roundabout will feature a mountable curb and paved truck apron to allow for larger vehicles, particularly the Indiana Design Vehicle (a WB-65 tractor-trailer, more commonly referred to as an interstate semi-truck). The project is not expected to incorporate significant changes to either road except at the roundabout. Curb and gutter will be constructed throughout the roundabout limits. See Appendix B, page B-19 for geometrics of the roundabout.

No existing sidewalks or marked crosswalks are present.

### Right-of-way:

Permanent right of way will be required in the southwest and southeast quadrants of the project area. A total of 0.06 acre of permanent right of way will be required. A building to likely be removed in the southwest quadrant is a two story occupied residence and will include relocation of those residents.

Temporary right of way will be required in the northwest, southwest, and southeast quadrants. A total of 0.184 acre of temporary right of way will be required.

There are utilities present within INDOT right-of-way and include Duke Energy, Frontier, Comcast, and Indiana Fiber Network. Utility Coordination is ongoing through INDOT Greenfield District, and any utility relocations required will be coordinated between INDOT, the designer, and the affected utility.
There is a storm system located within INDOT right-of-way, consisting of curb and gutter and storm inlets that empty into roadside ditches. These ditches empty either directly into the White River, directly into an unnamed tributary to the White River, or into roadside ditches that empty into one of those waterbodies. The proposed storm system will also consist of curb and gutter and storm inlets which will empty into one of the aforementioned locations.

Maintenance of Traffic:

There are two driveways within the project limits. During construction, landowners will be provided access to their properties per INDOT Standard Specification 107.08. Maintenance of traffic will be phased. One way traffic along SR 37 will be maintained during construction by use of a temporary one-way signal. Strawtown Avenue will be open to traffic on one approach, depending on what phase is being constructed. More information can be found in the maintenance of traffic section of this report, located on page 7. See Appendix B, pages B-14 through B-16 for the maintenance of traffic plan.

Construction Cost:

Total cost of the project is estimated at $1,202,513, including preliminary engineering ($50,000), land acquisition ($400,000), and construction cost ($752,513). See Appendix H, page H-1 for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) listing.

Satisfaction of project purpose and need:

The preferred alternative addresses the purpose and need of the project. The proposed project will provide improved safety of the intersection by construction of a roundabout. A roundabout offers safety performance by forcing speed reductions and eliminating the possibility of right angle and head on collisions.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

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

Doing nothing would not improve the safety of the existing intersection. Doing nothing would have no cost and would avoid the maintenance of traffic and minor environmental impacts of the preferred alternative, but would not address the purpose and need.

One alternative would include the installation of a new four way fully actuated traffic signal to improve safety and capacity. In accordance with the Indiana MUTCD Section 4C, Warrants for justification to install a traffic signal were checked and it was found that Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicle Volume was satisfied with the qualification that the intersection is considered to be in the built-up area of an isolated community having a population of less than 10,000. The existing pavement would not be disturbed except for installing signal loops and pavement markings. Traffic analysis indicates no need for turn lanes. It is anticipated that no additional right-of-way would be needed for this alternate. The total cost for this alternative is approximately $229,000. Based on this project cost and a 20 year service life, the safety Benefit-Cost Ratio of the alternative was found to be 3.27.

Since Benefit-Cost ratios of both the roundabout and signal alternatives are above 1, they are both feasible alternatives. However, the signal alternative does not improve the sight distance at the intersection. The signal alternative still allows for high speeds and the possibility of right angle crashes, which are the majority of crashes observed at this intersection. It is these types of crashes that most often lead to injury. Therefore this alternative is not considered to meet the purpose and need of the project, and was discarded in favor of the preferred roundabout alternative.

The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable because (Mark all that apply):

- It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies; X
- It would not correct existing safety hazards;
- It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies;
- It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems; or
- It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy.

Other (Describe)
### ROADWAY CHARACTER: SR 37

**Functional Classification:** Minor Arterial  
**Current ADT:** 9,100 VPD (2014)  
**Design Hour Volume (DHV):** 1,225  
**Design Speed (mph):** 40  
**Design Year ADT:** 11,465 VPD (2037)  
**Truck Percentage (%):** 8.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lanes:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Lanes:</strong></td>
<td>1 thru each direction, 1 northbound right turn lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Width:</strong></td>
<td>24 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoulder Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setting:** Urban  
**Topography:** Level  

### ROADWAY CHARACTER: Strawtown Avenue

**Functional Classification:** Major Collector  
**Current ADT:** 1,823 VPD (2014)  
**Design Hour Volume (DHV):** 325  
**Design Speed (mph):** 35  
**Design Year ADT:** 2,297 VPD (2037)  
**Truck Percentage (%):** 5.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lanes:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Lanes:</strong></td>
<td>1 thru each direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Width:</strong></td>
<td>32 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoulder Width:</strong></td>
<td>Curb and gutter ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setting:** Suburban  
**Topography:** Rolling  

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

### DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES:

**Structure/NBI Number(s):** n/a  
**Sufficiency Rating:** n/a (Rating, Source of Information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge Type:</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Spans:</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight Restrictions:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height Restrictions:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curb to Curb Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside to Outside Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoulder Width:</strong></td>
<td>n/a ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Project name: SR 37 at Strawtown Road, Des. No. 1296847  
Date: November 3, 2016
Indiana Department of Transportation

County          Hamilton          Route       SR 37          Des. No.     1296847

Length of Channel Work: n/a ft.

Describe bridges and structures; provide specific location information for small structures.

Remarks:
The bridge that carries SR 37 over the West Fork of the White River is located just north of the intersection with Strawtown Avenue. No structural work will be done to this bridge. Guardrail leading to the bridge will be replaced, and a minor amount of restriping will be performed on the bridge as part of the 100 feet of work north of the intersection.

No other structures will be impacted as part of this project.

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?  Yes  No  N/A

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

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (MOT) DURING CONSTRUCTION:

Is a temporary bridge proposed?  Yes  No  N/A

Is a temporary roadway proposed?  Yes  No  N/A

Will the project involve the use of a detour or require a ramp closure? (describe in remarks)

Provisions will be made for access by local traffic and so posted.

Provisions will be made for through-traffic dependent businesses.

Provisions will be made to accommodate any local special events or festivals.

Will the proposed MOT substantially change the environmental consequences of the action?  Yes  No  N/A

Is there substantial controversy associated with the proposed method for MOT?  Yes  No  N/A

Remarks:
The maintenance of traffic has been designed as a partial closure. The project will be split along SR 37 and one half of the roundabout will be constructed at a time. Through movements along Strawtown Avenue will not be allowed. Traffic along SR 37 will be shifted by use of temporary signal. It is anticipated that each half of the project will take 45 days to construct, impacting traffic for a total of 90 days.

The west marked detour route for Strawtown Avenue will include Madison Street and will add approximately 0.27 miles. The east marked detour route for Strawtown Avenue will include Craig Avenue, East 226th Street, Victory Chapel Road, and East 216th Street and will add approximately 5.29 miles.

There is a commercial driveway located within the westernmost limits of the project along Strawtown Avenue. There is a residential driveway located within the southern limits of SR 37. During construction, landowners will be provided access to their properties per INDOT Standard Specification 107.08.

Koteewi Park is located approximately 0.44 mile west of the project limits along Strawtown Avenue. Per the Hamilton County Koteewi Park website, no major events are currently planned during the anticipated construction time. However, the park is open from dawn to dusk, and offers many amenities including biking, canoeing, fishing, hiking, and archery. Coordination with the park will be done closer to construction to help minimize impacts.

The closure and lane restrictions will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists, including school buses and emergency services, but no significant delays are anticipated. The road contractor will be responsible for contacting school districts and emergency services at least two weeks prior to construction.

See maintenance of traffic plans, located in Appendix B, pages B-14 through B-16.
ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:

Engineering: $50,000 (FY2016)  
Right-of-Way: $400,000 (FY2016)  
Construction: $752,513 (FY2016 & FY2017); Administrative modification needed to transfer funds to FY 2017.  

Anticipated Start Date of Construction: July, 2017  
Date project incorporated into STIP: July 1, 2015  

Is the project in an MPO Area? Yes  
If yes,  
Name of MPO  
Location of Project in TIP  
Date of incorporation by reference into the STIP  

RIGHT OF WAY:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Impacts</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Remarks: Right-of-way was established based on INDOT right-of-way plans for SR 37 from 1972. The existing right-of-way is generally 80 feet wide along SR 37 (40 feet each side of centerline), with a maximum width of 225 feet (75 feet west and 150 feet east of centerline). Existing right-of-way for Strawtown Avenue is generally 65 feet wide (35 feet north and 30 feet south of centerline), with a maximum width of 158 feet (57 feet north and 101 feet south of centerline). The proposed right-of-way areas are corner cuts, and as such the right-of-way widths will remain the same. Current land usage is residential, with homes located in the northeast, northwest, and southwest quadrants. The southeast quadrant is forested.

A total of 0.060 acre of permanent right-of-way will be needed from the adjacent properties in the southwest and southeast quadrants of the intersection to construct the roundabout. The parcel to the southwest is residential and will include removal of the existing two story house. The house is currently an occupied residence and the project will include relocation of those residents. The building will need to be removed to provide drainage through the roundabout.

A total of 0.184 acre of temporary right-of-way will be needed from the adjacent parcels in the southwest, northwest, and...
southeast quadrants of the intersection. The southwest quadrant is residential, the northwest quadrant is residential, with the Strawtown Pottery being zoned commercial, and the southeast quadrant is residential, with a wooded non-developed lot located immediately adjacent to the intersection. The temporary right-of-way for the northwest and southeast parcels will be for drive construction. The temporary right-of-way for the southwest parcel will be for building removal to provide drainage throughout the roundabout.

It is currently estimated that the project will impact four properties adjacent to the project. The right-of-way listed is needed solely for the purpose of the roadway improvements. See Appendix B, page B-13 for right-of-way impacts.

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

#### SECTION A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streams, Rivers, Watercourses &amp; Jurisdictional Ditches</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigable Waterways</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:** Aerial mapping in Appendix B, page B-3 shows the project area. The site was visited by CrossRoad Engineers, PC on August 19, 2015 and the blue line features shown on the USGS 7.5’ Riverwood, Indiana topographical quadrangle map, including the West Fork of the White River and an Unnamed tributary to the West Fork of the White River were observed. See Appendix B, page B-2.

A check of the INDOT Categorical Exclusion Manual, Appendix K, updated June 2013, shows that the West Fork of the White River is classified as an Outstanding River or Stream. In addition, the West Fork of the White River is listed as navigable. This project will not affect this watercourse.

According to the Waters of the US report prepared by AquaTerra and approved by INDOT Environmental Services Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office (E&WPO) on November 6, 2015, the channel of the unnamed tributary to the White River, located in the southeast project quadrant, within the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) is likely to fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and to be considered a water of the United States. The OHWM was measured as three feet wide by fifteen inches deep. The roadside ditches on the southeast and southwest quadrants are not likely to be Waters of the United States as they appear to have been excavated in upland areas for localized drainage, do not have OHWM features, do not have connectivity, and are not shown as blue line features on the USGS 7.5’ Riverwood, Indiana topographical quadrangle map. The INDOT E&WPO approval email and waters report may be found in Appendix F, pages F-2 through F-8.

No impacts to the waterway are anticipated, as it is outside of the project area. In order to address possible impacts to streams and watercourses, early coordination letters were mailed on February 26, 2015 to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife (IDNR, DFW), US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the USACE. A sample early coordination letter may be found in Appendix C, page C-1 and C-2.

IDNR, DFW responded on March 25, 2015 (see Appendix C, page C-17) that the project may require formal approval pursuant to the Flood Control Act. The IDNR, DFW requested additional information, which was sent on March 7, 2016. IDNR, DFW responded on April 4, 2016 (see Appendix C, pages C-18 and C-19) that a mitigation plan be developed and submitted with the permit application if habitat impacts occur.

USFWS responded on March 4, 2015 (see Appendix C, pages C-3 and C-4). USFWS stated that as long as tree clearing stays within 75 feet of the existing pavement the project will fall under the Programmatic policy. Tree clearing will stay within 75 feet of the existing pavement. Temporary erosion and sediment control methods will be implemented during construction of the project.
No response was received from the USACE.

Environmental Commitments resulting from early coordination have been placed in Section J.

Other Surface Waters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Basins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Management Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: Based on a site investigation by CrossRoad Engineers, P.C. on August 19, 2015, no other surface waters were observed within or immediately adjacent to the project limits. Aerial mapping in Appendix B, page B-3 shows the project area. No other surface waters were apparent within or immediately adjacent to the project limits.

The Waters Report did not find any other water resources within the project limits. The Red Flag Investigation (RFI) completed March 3, 2016 found two lakes within a 0.5 mile radius. The closest lake is located 0.45 miles northwest of the project area. Due to the distance from the project, it will not be affected by the project. Appendix E, pages E-10 through E-12 shows the water resources of the surrounding project area.

Early Coordination letters and project information were sent to IDNR, DFW, USFWS, and USACE on February 26, 2015. IDNR, DFW responded on March 25, 2015 (see Appendix C, page C-17) and requested additional information, which was sent on March 7, 2016. IDNR, DFW responded on April 4, 2016 (see Appendix C, pages C-18 and C-19). No recommendations received apply to other surface waters.

USFWS responded on March 4, 2015 (see Appendix C, pages C-3 and C-4). No recommendations received apply to other surface waters.

USACE did not respond.

Wetlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total wetland area: 0 acre(s)</td>
<td>Total wetland area impacted: 0 acre(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Impacted Acres</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetlands (Mark all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Delineation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE Isolated Waters Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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The project not meeting the identified needs.

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

Remarks:

The National Wetlands Inventory maps, topographic quadrangle map, and recent aerial photograph showed no mapped wetlands or visual or topographical evidence of wetlands in or near the project area. The National Wetland Inventory map is located in Appendix F, page F-1. The USGS topographical map is shown in Appendix B, page B-2. Aerial mapping is located in Appendix B, page B-3.

A Waters of the US report was prepared by AquaTerra, and approved by INDOT E&WPO on November 9, 2015. No wetland areas were documented within the project limits. Select pages from the report and the approval are included in Appendix F, pages F-2 through F-8.

Early Coordination letters and project information were sent to IDNR, DFW, USFWS, IDEM, and USACE on February 26, 2015. IDNR, DFW responded on March 25, 2015 (see Appendix C, page C-17) and requested additional information, which was sent on March 7, 2016. IDNR, DFW responded on April 4, 2016 (see Appendix C, pages C-18 and C-19). IDNR, DFW did not provide any comments regarding wetlands.

USFWS responded on March 4, 2015 (see Appendix C, pages C-3 and C-4). USFWS did not provide any comments regarding wetlands.

IDEM responded on February 26, 2016 (See Appendix C, pages C-8 through C-15). The IDEM response is a standardized form generated by the IDEM website that lists IDEM concerns in general. No wetland comments supplied apply, as there are no wetlands present within the project limits.

USACE did not respond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terrestrial Habitat

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

Remarks:

Land use in and near the project is mixed use. Mature trees, including maple and oak, grass covered road right-of-way, and lawns are located within the project limits. Habitat is fragmented by the various streets and buildings present. No wildlife crossings are present. No migratory birds or non-wetland wildlife habitats were observed during the site visit.

The southeast quadrant is forested.

In order to construct the proposed project 1.66 acres of land will be impacted, including 0.10 acre of trees, 0.77 acre of lawn/unmaintained grasses, and 0.79 acres of existing pavement. The southwest quadrant will be seeded after removal of the building.

Early Coordination letters and project information were sent to IDNR, DFW and USFWS on February 26, 2015. IDNR DFW responded on March 25, 2015 that more information would be needed to assess impacts to the southeast quadrant. Plans were sent to IDNR on March 6, 2016. IDNR, DFW responded on April 4, 2016 (see Appendix C, page C-18 and C-19). IDNR, DFW recommended impacts to less than one acre of non-wetland forest removed in a rural setting, mitigation should be at a 1:1 ratio based on area. IDNR, DFW also recommended development and use of appropriate erosion control methods during construction and re-vegetation post construction.

USFWS responded on March 4, 2015 (see Appendix C, pages C-3 and C-4) that if tree clearing stays within 75 feet of the existing pavement, the project will fall under the programmatic policy. Tree clearing will stay within 75 feet of the existing pavement and therefore will fall within the programmatic policy. USFWS also recommended implementation of temporary erosion and sediment control methods within areas of disturbed soil, and revegetation of disturbed soils upon project completion following INDOT standard specifications.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>SR 37</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>1296847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Karst**

Is the proposed project located within or adjacent to the potential Karst Area of Indiana?  
Yes  No

Are karst features located within or adjacent to the footprint of the proposed project?  

If yes, will the project impact any of these karst features?  

Use the remarks box to identify any karst features within the project area.  *(Karst investigation must comply with the Karst MOU, dated October 13, 1993)*

**Remarks:**

The project is located outside of the designated karst area of Indiana as identified in the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between INDOT, IDNR, USFWS, and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM).

The RFI did not indicate the presence of any karst features within ½ mile of the project area. See Appendix E, page E-12.

Early Coordination letter was sent to the Indiana Geological Society (IGS) on February 25, 2015. The IGS responded on March 25, 2016 and did not indicate any karst features located within the project area. The response letter is located in Appendix C, page C-20.

---

**Threatened or Endangered Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the known range of any federal species

Any critical habitat identified within project area

Federal species found in project area (based upon informal consultation)

State species found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR)

Is Section 7 formal consultation required for this action?  
Yes  No

**Remarks:**

Hamilton County falls within the range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), northern riffleshell mussel (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*), snuffbox mussel (*Epioblasma triquetra*), sheepnose mussel (*Plethobasus cyphyus*), clubshell mussel (*Pleurobema clava*), rayed bean mussel (*Villosa fabalis*), the federally threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), rabbitsfoot mussel (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*), seven state endangered mussel species, two state endangered reptile species, five state endangered bird species, and one plant species. A complete list can be found in Appendix E, pages E-17 and E-18. CrossRoad Engineers, P.C. visited the site on August 19, 2015, and none of these species were documented during the site visit.

Early Coordination with the USFWS occurred on February 26, 2015. USFWS responded on March 4, 2015 indicating that the project is within the range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), and also within the range of the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), which is listed as a federally threatened species. USFWS indicated that they have record of a northern long-eared bat about two miles upstream of the project. The project meets interim policy criteria, and therefore is not likely to adversely affect any threatened or endangered species. No further consultation is required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. USFWS early correspondence is in Appendix C, pages C-3 and C-4.

Early Coordination with IDNR, DFW occurred on February 26, 2015. IDNR, DFW indicated on March 25, 2015 that the following mussels have been documented within ½ mile of the project area: Clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*), Northern Riffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*), Rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*), Wavyrayed Lamppmussel (*Lampsilis fasciola*), Kidneyshell (*Ptychobranchus fasciolaris*), and the Little Spectaclecase (*Villosa lienosa*). IDNR, DFW indicated that they do not foresee any impacts to these mussels resulting from the project. Plans were sent to IDNR on March 6, 2016. IDNR, DFW responded on April 4, 2016, and no additional information in regards to threatened or endangered species was provided. IDNR, DFW early correspondence is in Appendix C, pages C-17 through C-19.

There are no expected impacts to these threatened and endangered species.
SECTION B – OTHER RESOURCES

Drinking Water Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

If a SSA is present, answer the following:

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

Remarks:
The project is not located within the St. Joseph Aquifer System, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state of Indiana.

In a letter dated February 27, 2015 the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Ground Water Section stated that the project is located within a Wellhead Protection Area. In addition, the project is located within a Source Water Assessment Area which would relate to a Public Water surface water intake. IDEM’s response is located in Appendix C, page C-16.

Big Maple Mobile Home Park is on the Wellhead Protection list and was contacted on March 7, 2016. This park is located to the west of the project limits on the south side of Strawtown Avenue. A phone call with the property manager on May 18, 2016 confirmed that the wellhead system for the mobile home park was not within the project limits, and will not be affected by construction activities.

Citizens Water utilizes the White River as a public water surface water intake source, which places the project within a source water assessment area. In an email dated May 2, 2016 Citizens requested best management practices to be employed to ensure nothing leaves the site, and that in the case of an emergency that might impact the White River they be contacted immediately. The response is located in Appendix F, page F-14.

The Indiana Map Viewer website (maps.indiana.edu/index.html) was accessed on March 7, 2016 to identify IDNR water wells within the proposed project location. None were found within the project construction zone. See Appendix F, page F-9 for IDNR water wells within the project area.

There are no water distribution facilities within the project limits.

Flood Plains

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

Remarks: According to available floodplain data from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (see Appendix F, page F-10), the project will take place within the floodplain associated with the West Fork of the White River. Work within the floodplain will not involve the replacement or modification of any existing drainage structures, and as such falls under Category 2 per the INDOT Categorical Exclusion Manual. As a result, this project will not affect flood heights or floodplain limits. This project will not increase flood risks or damage, and it will not adversely affect existing emergency services or emergency routes, therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not substantial. IDNR, DFW stated that formal approval by the IDNR under the programs administered by their Division of Water may not be required.

According to the Procedural Manual for Preparing Environmental Studies, discuss impacts according to classification system described in the “Procedural Manual for Preparing Environmental Studies”.
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be required for this project. Their comments are provided in Appendix C, page C-17 and is dated March 25, 2015. A Construction in a Floodway permit is anticipated due to some fill potentially being placed within the floodplain.

Farmland
Agricultural Lands
Prime Farmland (per NRCS)

Presence

Impacts
Yes
No

Total Points (from Section VII of CPA-106/AD-1006*)

*If 160 or greater, see CE Manual for guidance.

See CE Manual for guidance to determine which NRCS form is appropriate for your project.

Remarks:
Aerial mapping in Appendix B, page B-3 shows the project area. No farmland was noted within the project area on the aerial map, and no farmland was noted within the project area during the site visit by CrossRoad Engineers on August 19, 2015.

As is required by the Farmland Protection Policy Act, the NRCS has been coordinated with and the Form NRCS-CPA-106 has been completed. Per Early Coordination with Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) received on March 10, 2015 the project will not result in conversion of prime farmland. Since this project received a total point value of less than 160 points, this site will receive no further consideration for farmland protection. No other alternatives other than those already discussed in this document will be considered without a reevaluation of the project’s potential impacts upon farmland. This project will not have a significant impact to farmland. See Appendix C, page C-6 for the NRCS letter.

SECTION C – CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Projects PA Clearance</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>INDOT Approval Dates</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible and/or Listed
Resource Present

Results of Research

Archaeology
NRHP Buildings/Site(s)

X
NRHP District(s)
NRHP Bridge(s)

Project Effect

No Historic Properties Affected
No Adverse Effect
Adverse Effect

Documentation (mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation (mark all that apply)</th>
<th>ES/FHWA Approval Date(s)</th>
<th>SHPO Approval Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Properties Short Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Property Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Records Check/ Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase Ia Survey Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>June 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase Ic Survey Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase II Investigation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 24, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase III Data Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE, Eligibility and Effect Determination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>March 2, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800.11 Documentation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>March 2, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe all efforts to document cultural resources, including a detailed summary of the Section 106 process, using the categories outlined in the remarks box. The completion of the Section 106 process requires that a Legal Notice be published in local newspapers. Please indicate the publication date, name of paper(s) and the comment period deadline. Likewise include any further Section 106 work which must be completed at a later date, such as mitigation or deep trenching.

Remarks:

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), requires that federal agencies identify and assess the effects of federal projects, programs, and actions on historic resources. This includes projects that are supported by federal funds. The Section 106 process for this project was managed by Green 3 LLC, who is listed on the IDNR Department of Historic Preservation and Archaeology's Roster of Qualified Professionals. See Appendix D for complete Section 106 documentation.

Area of Potential Effect (APE): The APE was established based on the viewshed from the project alignment in all directions. This includes the area of proposed construction as well as adjacent property within the viewshed that could be affected by the project. The viewshed is measured from several points: from the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue, the viewshed extends approximately 880 feet north on SR 37; approximately 675 feet east on Strawtown Avenue; approximately 780 feet south on SR 37; and approximately 850 feet west on Strawtown Avenue. The APE was set as the viewshed. Land uses in the vicinity of the intersection are primarily residential and commercial with the White River directly north of the intersection. The APE includes thirty-eight total resources in all quadrants of the project area. There are nineteen aboveground resources that are 45 years or older. The remaining nineteen resources are under 45 years old. The terrain throughout the project area is flat, and the vegetative coverage includes landscape lawns and forest. The APE is found in Appendix D, pages D-33 and D-34.

Coordination with Consulting Parties: Invitations to become Consulting Parties were sent on June 24, 2015 (refer to Appendix D, page D-9 for list of potential parties). The following parties were invited:

- State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO; automatically considered Consulting Party)
- INDOT Cultural Resources Office (INDOT CRO; automatically considered Consulting Party)
- Hamilton County Council
- Hamilton County Parks and Recreation
- Hamilton County Highway Department
- Hamilton County Plan Commission
- Hamilton County Parks and Recreation
- Indiana Landmarks Central Regional Office
- Hamilton County Historical Society
- David Heighway, Hamilton County Historian
- Hamilton County Board of Commissioners
- Indianapolis MPO
- Delaware Nation of Oklahoma
- Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office

In addition to the automatic consulting parties, the Hamilton County Parks and Recreation, Hamilton County Plan Commission, Hamilton County Historian, Indiana Landmarks, and Hamilton County Historical Society decided to become a consulting party. The Hamilton County Council and the Hamilton County Board of Commissioners declined to become a consulting party. No other responses from invitees were received. During the Section 106 review process, Indiana Landmarks sent a letter on July 14, 2015 requesting additional consideration for the National Register of Historical Places (NRHP) eligibility of the Strawtown Pottery and Antique store (Appendix D, page D-15). Also during Section 106 review, the Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office (Appendix D, page D-48) requested additional archaeological information within the project limits on April 19, 2016.

Archaeology: An Indiana Archaeological Short Report for the project was prepared by Archaeological Consultants of the Midwest. This report with revisions was approved by INDOT CRO on November 24, 2015. The literature review and reconnaissance survey did not locate any archaeological resources in the project area, and the report recommended that...
the project be allowed to proceed as planned (Appendix D, pages D-24 through D-26). This report was submitted to SHPO on November 24, 2015. SHPO concurred with the report on December 29, 2015, stating that they “have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (“NRHP”) within the probable area of potential effects” (Appendix D-17 to D-18). INDOT CRO performed an additional eight shovel probes throughout the project area on April 29, 2016. These probes found disturbance was widespread due to construction of roadways and the bridge approach. Therefore, it was concluded that no additional archaeological investigation is needed (Appendix D, pages D-46 to D-47). The Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office agreed with this assessment in a letter dated May 3, 2016 (Appendix D, page D-45).

**Historic Properties:** A Historic Property Report (HPR) Long Form was prepared for the project (Kroh, June 2015). Thirty-eight individual resources were identified, 19 of which are over 45 years old. Of those 19, 16 lacked sufficient integrity and significance to be recommended at least a “Contributing” rating based on the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) rating system or to be considered eligible for the NRHP. One IHSSI—listed resource was located within the project APE. This resource is the Strawtown Tavern (IHSSI No. 057---541---00047), a. c. 1830 Greek Revival house rated “Outstanding.” The second resource, Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, which serves as a c. 1930 business and a residence, was not rated in IHSSI but after evaluation the recommended rating was “Contributing.” The third resource is a monument that is located on the north side of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, erected in 1928; it was not rated in IHSSI but after evaluation the recommended rating was “Notable.” These three resources were evaluated for NRHP eligibility but were not recommended for the NRHP. INDOT CRO approved the HPR for distribution to SHPO and Consulting Parties on June 24, 2015. Indiana SHPO concurred with the findings of the report in a letter dated July 15, 2015 (Appendix D, page D-16).

During review of the effect finding and in response to a request by Indiana Landmarks on July 14, 2015 (Appendix D, page D-15) for further consideration of the pottery store for eligibility, the SHPO requested additional information regarding the pottery store, which was provided in the form of a memorandum on February 12, 2016 (Appendix D, pages D-36 through D-43). As a result of continued consultation, it was determined that the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A, for its association with commercial activity and community development that have made a significant contribution to the local history of Strawtown and Hamilton County, Indiana (Appendix D, page D-1).

**Documentation, Findings:** As stated, SHPO concurred with the conclusions in the HPR on July 15, 2015 and the Archaeological Report on December 29, 2015. A finding of “No Historic Properties Affected” was signed by INDOT, on behalf of FHWA, on January 15, 2016. SHPO rejected the finding of “No Historic Properties Affected” in their letter dated February 19, 2016 (Appendix D, pages D-19 and D-20), and requested additional information regarding the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building. After receipt of additional information SHPO concluded the characteristics that qualify Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building for inclusion in the NRHP under Criterion A, for its association with commercial activity and community development that have made a significant contribution to the local history of Strawtown and Hamilton County, Indiana (Appendix D, page D-1).

SHPO concurred with the finding of “No Adverse Effect,” on April 6, 2016.

**Public Involvement:** The finding of “No Historic Properties Affected” was published in a public notice in the Times (Noblesville, Hamilton County) on January 22, 2016; the notice invited the public to submit comments regarding this project within the 30-day comment period. The notice informing the public of the “No Adverse Effect” finding and opportunity to comment on the effect finding was published in the Times on March 9, 2016, with the 30-day comment period ending on April 9, 2016 (see Appendix D, pages D-49 and D-50 for notice and publisher’s affidavit). No comments from the public regarding the Effect Finding were received during the 30-day comment period.

The requirements of the FHWA for the Section 106 process have been fulfilled (see Appendix D for complete Section 106 documentation).
## SECTION D – SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES/ SECTION 6(f) RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks &amp; Other Recreational Land</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly owned recreation area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Section 4(f)*</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“De minimis” Impact*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wildlife & Waterfowl Refuges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife &amp; Waterfowl Refuges</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Natural Landmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Wildlife Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Nature Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Section 4(f)*</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“De minimis” Impact*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historic Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Properties</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites eligible and/or listed on the NRHP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Section 4(f)*</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“De minimis” Impact*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Section 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Discuss Programmatic Section 4(f) and “de minimis” Section 4(f) impacts in the remarks box below. Individual Section 4(f) documentation must be separate Draft and Final documents. For further discussions on Programmatic, “de minimis” and Individual Section 4(f) evaluations please refer to the “Procedural Manual for the Preparation of Environmental Studies”. Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 4(f).
Remarks:
Section 4(f) resources are defined by the US Department of Transportation act of 1966, and include publicly owned parks, recreation areas, and wildlife/waterfowl refuges, and National Register eligible or listed historic properties.

There are no parks, other recreational lands, or wildlife/waterfowl refuges within the project limits.

Historic Properties
Per the FHWA’s Section 106 Findings and Determinations, Area of Potential Effect, Eligibility Determinations Effect Finding approved on March 4, 2016 (Appendix D, page D-1), there are two resources that are Section 4(f) historic properties along this project. INDOT, acting on FHWA’s behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is “No Adverse Effect” and no Section 4(f) evaluation is required on any of these properties except the following:

Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building: This undertaking will convert property from an individual resource to a transportation use. Approximately 0.027 acres of temporary right-of-way will be utilized for drive construction. INDOT, acting on FHWA’s behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is “No Adverse Effect”; therefore FHWA hereby intends to issue a “de minimis” finding for the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building, pursuant to SAFETEA-LU, thereby satisfying FHWA’s responsibilities under Section 4(f) for this historic resource. FHWA’s approval of this CE document will constitute its issuance of the 4(f) “de minimis” finding. The Official with Jurisdiction (OWJ), in this case SHPO, concurred with the finding of “No Adverse Effect,” on April 6, 2016.

Section 6(f) Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 6(f). Discuss any Section 6(f) involvement.

Remarks:
Section 6(f) resources are lands that were purchased with or improved using funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The LCWF website (http://waso-lwcf.nrcr.nps.gov/public/index.cfm) was consulted on March 3, 2016, and no 6(f) resources are listed within the project area. See Appendix I, page I-1.

Koteewi Park is located approximately 0.44 miles to the west of the project on Strawtown Avenue. Although the park received funds from LWCF, no right-of-way will be taken from this park. As such, there are no impacts to a 6(f) resource.

The project will not involve any properties acquired by or improved with the LWCF.

SECTION E – Air Quality

Air Quality

Conformity Status of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES, then:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the project in the most current MPO TIP?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project exempt from conformity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the project is NOT exempt from conformity, then:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in the Transportation Plan (TP)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a hot spot analysis required (CO/PM)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of MSAT Analysis required?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1a</th>
<th>Level 1b</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Remarks: The project is located in Hamilton County. Per the latest Attainment map by the Office of Air Quality, Hamilton County is currently in attainment for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) criteria pollutants, with a maintenance plan for particulate matter (PM2.5). Therefore, a carbon monoxide (CO) hotspot analysis is not required. See Appendix H, page H-2 for the IDEM County List of all regulated criteria pollutants (http://www.in.gov/idem/airquality/files/nonattainment_county_list.pdf).

This project is of a type qualifying as a categorical exclusion (Group 1) under 23 CFR 771.117(d), 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.

The project has been identified as being exempt from air quality analysis in accordance with 40 CFR Part 93.126 (Safety improvement program), and this project is not a project of air quality concern (40 CFR Part 93.123). It can therefore be concluded that the project will have no significant impact on air quality, and a PM2.5 hotspot analysis is not required for this project.

The project was added to the INDOT 2016-2019 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) on July 1, 2015. See Appendix H, page H-1 for the STIP listing.

SECTION F - NOISE

Noise

Is a noise analysis required in accordance with FHWA regulations and INDOT’s traffic noise policy?  Yes  No

X

Remarks: This project is a Type III project. In accordance with 23 CFR 772 and the INDOT Traffic Noise Policy, this action does not require a formal noise analysis.

SECTION G – COMMUNITY IMPACTS

Regional, Community & Neighborhood Factors

Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area?  Yes  No

X  X

Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to community cohesion?  Yes  No

X

Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to local tax base or property values?  Yes  No

X  X

Will construction activities impact community events (festivals, fairs, etc.)?  Yes  No

X

Does the community have an approved transition plan?  Yes  No

X

If No, are steps being made to advance the community’s transition plan?  Yes  No

X

Does the project comply with the transition plan? (explain in the remarks box)  Yes  No

X

Remarks: The project is expected to benefit the community with improved mobility and safety with only temporary construction impacts. The nature or functional class of these roads will not be changed by the project. Hamilton County has an ADA transition plan. There are no existing trails or walks within or near the project limits, and none will be constructed with this project; however, room to place these facilities has been accounted for in design along the north and south side of Strawtown Avenue to the east of the intersection, and also on the south side of Strawtown Avenue to the west of the intersection and they may be put in at a later date. In addition, the curb could be cut in the future to place curb ramps for pedestrian usage on the east and south legs of the intersection. There is one relocation proposed to construct the project; therefore, minimal impacts to the local tax base or property values may be reasonably anticipated.

Koteewi Park is located approximately 0.44 mile west of the project limits along Strawtown Avenue. Per the Hamilton County Koteewi Park website, no major events are currently planned during the anticipated construction time. However, the park is open from dawn to dusk, and offers many amenities including biking, canoeing, fishing, hiking, and archery. Coordination with the park will be done closer to construction to help minimize impacts. Per the Hamilton County
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This project involves construction of a roundabout at the intersection, including replacement of pavement and storm sewers. During construction, traffic will be maintained utilizing a temporary signal, which will allow for one way traffic along SR 37. The approach of Strawtown Avenue immediately adjacent to SR 37 construction will be closed to through traffic. Any inconveniences or delays will be temporary in nature, and will cease upon completion of the project. See Appendix B, pages B-14 through B-16 for the maintenance of traffic plan sheets.

Several public utilities will be relocated as part of this project. A utility location service will be contacted by the contractor prior to construction, and the contractor will coordinate with all affected utilities prior to construction to minimize disruption of utilities.

Per the RFI, there are no religious facilities, airports, public transportation, pedestrian, bicycle facilities, school corporations, or governmental buildings located directly along the project corridor. See Appendix E, pages E-1 through E-18. Koteewi Park is located approximately 0.44 mile west of the project limits along Strawtown Avenue. Access will be provided to the park by use of detour routes for Strawtown Avenue, see Appendix B, page B-14 for the detour routes. The contractor will need to coordinate with the park, emergency services, and school districts at least two weeks prior to construction. The contractor is responsible for contacting emergency services and schools at least two weeks prior to construction. As listed above, alternate routes are available for emergency services and the traveling public in general.

An Environmental Justice analysis is required for any project that may result in a disproportionately high adverse impact on a minority or low-income population in or near the project area. An analysis is required for projects involving two or more relocations or requires more than 0.5 acre of right-of-way.

This project has one relocation, and thus does not exceed the threshold for Environmental Justice concerns due to relocations. Right-of-way needed is a total of approximately 0.244 acres; therefore, an Environmental Justice analysis is not required.

Early coordination was sent to the Department of Housing and Urban Development on February 26, 2015. An email reply was received on March 10, 2015 indicating that the office had no concerns or comments on the project. The email is located in Appendix C, page C-7.
Relocation of People, Businesses or Farms

Will the proposed action result in the relocation of people, businesses or farms?  
Yes [x] No [x]  
Is a Business Information Survey (BIS) required?  
Yes [x] No [x]  
Is a Conceptual Stage Relocation Study (CSRS) required?  
Yes [x] No [x]  
Has utility relocation coordination been initiated for this project?  
Yes [x] No [x]  

Number of relocations:  
Residences: 1  Businesses: 0  Farms: 0  Other: 0

If a BIS or CSRS is required, discuss the results in the remarks box.

Remarks: One residence in the southwest quadrant is anticipated to be relocated as part of the project. The residence is in conflict with the proposed roundabout layout and subsequent drainage needs. The acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with 49 CFR 24 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended. Relocation resources are available to all residential and business relocates without discrimination. No person displaced by this project will be required to move from a displaced dwelling unless comparable replacement housing is available to that person. Appendix B, page B-3 shows the relocation marked on aerial photograph.

Several public utilities are located within the project limits, including Frontier north, Telecom Placement, Inc. (for Comcast), Duke Energy, and JC Ellis Inc. (for Indiana Fiber Network). Coordination is ongoing, and proposed design minimizes relocations of as many utilities as possible. Utility relocation maps are not available at this time; however, the existing utilities that will need to be relocated are circled on the plan sheets located in Appendix B, pages B-17 and B-18.

SECTION H – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & REGULATED SUBSTANCES

Hazardous Materials & Regulated Substances (Mark all that apply)  
Red Flag Investigation [x]  
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA)  
Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA)  
Design/Specifications for Remediation required? [No]

Documentation

ES Review of Investigations  
March 28, 2016

Include a summary of findings for each investigation.

Remarks: A site inspection on August 19, 2015 did not show any evidence of hazardous materials within the project limits. Site inspection included a detailed walk-through of all areas and a Red Flag Investigation (RFI). The RFI was approved by INDOT Hazardous Materials Unit on March 28, 2016. See Appendix E, pages E-1 through E-19 for the RFI, and also for the hazmat site visit form.

The RFI revealed that the West Fork of the White River is listed as impaired with E. Coli. Workers who are working in or near water with E Coli. should take care to wear proper PPE, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure.

The RFI identified no hazardous materials sites of concern. If any contaminated soils are discovered during the project, they will be subject to disposal as hazardous waste. Contact IDEM, Office of Land Quality at 317-308-3103 to obtain information on proper disposal procedures.

Further investigation for hazardous materials is not required at this time.
## SECTION I – PERMITS CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permits (mark all that apply)</th>
<th>Likely Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section10 Permit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Permit (IP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Permit (NWP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional General Permit (RGP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction Notification (PCN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream Mitigation required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 401 WQC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Wetlands determination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream Mitigation required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction in a Floodway</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigable Waterway Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Preservation Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please discuss in the remarks box below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

A Notice of Intent under Rule 5 is anticipated to be submitted to IDEM as an acre or more will be disturbed with the construction of this project. An IDNR Construction in a Floodway permit is anticipated due to fill being placed within the delineated floodplain area located in the southeast quadrant of the project. Water resources are not anticipated to be impacted; therefore, Section 401 and Section 404 are not anticipated. INDOT is responsible for obtaining all permits prior to construction.

## SECTION J- ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

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

**Remarks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The current version of the INDOT Standard Specifications will be implemented during construction in order to minimize potential adverse construction impacts upon environmental and community resources including, but not limited to, erosion, sedimentation, construction noise, dust and air pollutants, clearing and disturbance of vegetation and storage and handling of hazardous materials. (INDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All conditions of any regulatory permits acquired for this project must be observed, unless specifically exempt through documented coordination with the permitting agency. Any commitment listed in the environmental document as “recommendations” or “for consideration” is superseded by any similar conditions of any permit obtained for the project. Such conditions shall be treated as mandatory commitments. (INDOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If permanent or temporary right-of-way amounts or the scope of the project change, the INDOT Greenfield District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately (INDOT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, federal law and regulations...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(16 USC 470, et seq.; 36 CFR 800.11, et al.) and State Law (IC 14-21-1) require that work must stop immediately within 100 feet of the discovery and that the discovery must be reported to the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology in the Indiana Department of Natural Resources within 2 business days (IDNR, SHPO).

6. If a spill occurs or contaminated soils or water are encountered during construction, appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) should be utilized. Contaminated materials will need to be properly handled and disposed in accordance with current regulations. IDEM should be notified through the Spill Line at (888)-233-7745 within 24 hours of discovery of contamination (INDOT).

7. Best management practices during construction should be employed to ensure that nothing leaves the site, especially a spill or release that might impact any drainage that would flow to the White River. If a spill occurs, Citizens Water should be contacted immediately at 317-750-5019 (Citizens Water).

8. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat or Northern Long-eared bat roosting (greater than 3 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or with cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 through September 30 (IDNR, DFW).

9. A utility location service will be contacted by the construction contractor in accordance with Indiana Code (IC) 8-1-26 prior to construction to ensure that public water systems and other public utilities are not adversely affected (INDOT).

10. Construction contractor will notify school district officials, local and state emergency services, and the Koteewi Park at least two weeks prior to construction and during construction to minimize impacts to traffic flow and emergency services (INDOT).

For Further Consideration:

11. Do not clear trees or understory vegetation outside the construction zone boundaries. (This restriction is not related to the “tree clearing” restriction for potential Indiana Bat habitat.) (USFWS).

12. Implement temporary erosion and sediment control methods within areas of disturbed soil. All disturbed soil areas upon project completion will be vegetated following INDOT’s standard specifications (USFWS).

13. 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 (IDEM).

14. 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 (IDEM).

15. Reasonable precautions must be taken to minimize fugitive dust emissions from construction and demolition activities. Dirt tracked onto paved roads from unpaved areas should be minimized (IDEM).

16. The use of cutback asphalt, or asphalt emulsion containing more than 7% oil distillate, is prohibited during the months of April through October (IDEM).

17. A mitigation plan should be developed (and submitted with the permit application, if required) if habitat impacts will occur. (IDNR, DFW).

18. Impacts to non-wetland forest of less than one acre in a rural setting should be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio based on area. (IDNR, DFW).

19. Revegetate all bare and disturbed areas with a mixture of grasses (excluding all varieties of tall fescue), legumes, and native shrub and hardwood tree species as soon as possible upon completion (IDNR, DFW).

20. Appropriately designed measures for controlling erosion and sediment must be implemented to prevent sediment from entering the stream or leaving the construction site; maintain these measures until construction is complete and all disturbed areas are stabilized (IDNR, DFW).

21. Seed and protect all disturbed streambanks and slopes that are 3:1 or steeper with erosion control blankets (follow manufacturer’s recommendations for selection and installation); seed and apply mulch on all other disturbed areas (IDNR, DFW).
**SECTION K- EARLY COORDINATION**

Please list the date coordination was sent and all agencies that were contacted as a part of the development of this Environmental Study. Also, include the date of their response or indicate that no response was received. INDOT and FHWA are automatically considered early coordination participants and should only be listed if a response is received.

Remarks:

Early Coordination packets were sent on February 26, 2015. Responses are listed below. A sample early coordination letter, and the responses are all provided in Appendix C, pages C-1 thru C-20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Response Type/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Email response March 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Office of Public Involvement</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Office of Aviation</td>
<td>Email response March 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Co. Engineer</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
<td>Letter &amp; Form NRCS-CPA-106  March 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Email response March 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM</td>
<td>Automated response  February 26, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM, Groundwater Section</td>
<td>Email response February 27, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Forest Service</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corp of Engineers</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Email response March 25, 2015 and April 4, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Geological Survey</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A: INDOT Documentation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical Exclusion Level Thresholds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocations</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>≤ 2</td>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 acre</td>
<td>&lt; 10 acres</td>
<td>≥ 10 acres</td>
<td>≥ 10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Added Through Lane</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Traffic Pattern Alteration</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Alignment</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>&lt; 1 mile</td>
<td>≥ 1 mile&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1 acre</td>
<td>&lt; 1 acre</td>
<td>&lt; 1 acre</td>
<td>≥ 1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream Impacts*</td>
<td>≤ 300 linear feet of stream impacts, no work beyond 75 feet from pavement</td>
<td>&gt; 300 linear feet of stream impacts, no work beyond 75 feet from pavement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Any impacts</td>
<td>Any impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106*</td>
<td>“No Historic Properties Affected” or falls within guidelines of Minor Projects PA</td>
<td>“No Adverse Effect” or “Adverse Effect”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>If ACHP involved or Historic Bridge Involvement&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Analysis Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened/Endangered Species</td>
<td>“Not likely to Adversely Affect”, or Falls within Guidelines of USFWS 9/8/93 Programmatic Response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“Likely to Adversely Affect”&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole Source Aquifer Groundwater Assessment</td>
<td>Detailed Assessment Not Required</td>
<td>Detailed Assessment Not Required</td>
<td>Detailed Assessment Not Required</td>
<td>Detailed Assessment Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ESM&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ES&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FHWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>These thresholds have changed from the March 2011 Manual.
<sup>2</sup>Permanent and/or temporary right-of-way.
<sup>3</sup>If the length of the new alignment is equal to or greater than one mile, contact the FHWA’s Air Quality/Environmental Specialist.
<sup>4</sup>In accordance with INDOT’s Noise Policy.
<sup>5</sup>Environmental Scoping Manager
<sup>6</sup>Environmental Services Division
<sup>7</sup>Any involvement with a bridge processed under the Historic Bridge Programmatic Agreement.
Appendix B: Graphics
1. On SR 37 looking north towards the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue

2. On SR 37 looking north towards the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue
SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Intersection Improvements
Des. No. 1296847

3. Southeast corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking west

4. Southeast corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking east
SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Intersection Improvements
Des. No. 1296847

5. Southeast corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking east at 72” dia. CMP culvert

6. Strawtown Avenue (approx. 200’ east of intersection) looking west at 72” dia. CMP culvert
SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Intersection Improvements
Des. No. 1296847

7. Northeast corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking west

8. Northeast corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking north
SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Intersection Improvements
Des. No. 1296847

9. Northwest corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking southwest

10. Northwest corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection looking west
Intersection Improvement with a Roundabout at State Route 37 and Strawtown Avenue
Located 12.15 Miles North of I-69
Section 3, T-19-N, R-5-E, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana.
The exact location of all utilities shall be field verified by the contractor prior to starting any work.

Sheet signs and square posts shall not be ordered until the exact number of signs and length of each post have been determined upon field investigation.

Sheet signs and square posts shall not be ordered until the exact number of signs and length of each post have been determined upon field investigation.

Utilities

- Frontier North
- Duke Energy
- J. C. Ellis Inc., for Indiana Fiber Network

General Notes

- Sheet signs and square posts shall not be ordered until the exact number of signs and length of each post have been determined upon field investigation.

Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET NO.</th>
<th>DRAWINGS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TITLE SHEET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>INDEX SHEET AND GENERAL NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLAT NO. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION OF WASTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ROADWAY CONDITIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EROSION CONTROL SHEETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CAR PARKING AND SEATING DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LIGHTING PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LOCATIONAL ANALYSIS SHEETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>CROSS SECTIONS (5 SHEETS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilities

- Telecom Placement, Inc., for Comcast
- Frontier North
- Duke Energy
- J. C. Ellis Inc., for Indiana Fiber Network

Contact Information

- Telecom Placement, Inc., for Comcast
  - Tom Spencer
  - 5330 East 65th Street
  - Indianapolis, IN 46220
  - (317) 769-4777

- Frontier North
  - Steve Costlow
  - 20905 Hague Road
  - Noblesville, IN 46062
  - (317) 984-9010

- Duke Energy
  - Gabe Gibson
  - 1419 West Delaware Street
  - Kokomo, IN 46902
  - (317) 741-6133

- J. C. Ellis Inc., for Indiana Fiber Network
  - Steve Garner
  - 6751 West Sweet Creek Drive
  - New Palestine, IN 46163
  - (317) 445-2945

- Duke Energy
  - Gabe Gibson
  - 1419 West Delaware Street
  - Kokomo, IN 46902
  - (317) 741-6133

- J. C. Ellis Inc., for Indiana Fiber Network
  - Steve Garner
  - 6751 West Sweet Creek Drive
  - New Palestine, IN 46163
  - (317) 445-2945
- Close both east and west approaches of Strawtown Avenue
- Install temporary traffic control and temporary medians for one-lane two-way operation
- Implement one-lane two-way operation and install permanent curbs and drains
- Construct left approach of Strawtown Avenue and conditioned direction of SR 35 including west half of the central island traffic lane. Construct embankment and drainage structures on east approach of Strawtown Avenue.
"PHASE 2:
- Install temporary markings for one-lane two-way operations utilizing the southbound lane of SR 35.
- Replace missing markings on southbound lane and install temporary concrete barriers.
- Complete construction of shoulder berms and approaches to northbound direction of SR 35.
- Incorporate construction of the central island median barrier. Permanent final grading of entire project including swale and install all signs, covering those which conflict with MUTCD operations."
February 26, 2015

Environmental Coordinator
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Rm. W264, IGC South
402 W. Washington St.
Indianapolis IN 46204

Re: Early Coordination
SR 37 and Strawtown Road Intersection Improvement Project
Project No.: 1296847
Des. No.: 1296847

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Indiana Department of Transportation is initiating the intersection improvement project at SR 37 and Strawtown Road, in Hamilton County. This letter is part of the early coordination phase of the environmental review process. We are requesting comments from your area of expertise regarding any possible environmental effects associated with this project. 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 on SR 37 at Strawtown road, approximately 12.2 miles north of I-69 in Hamilton County, Indiana. The project is located within the INDOT Greenfield District. This project entails construction of a roundabout at the intersection. During the seven year period from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2013 there were 31 reported crashes including 1 fatality and 35 injuries.

The purpose of the project is to improve safety at the intersection. The need for the project is to address inadequate sight distance, and safety at the intersection.

We have attached the following to assist in review:

- State map with project area
- USGS quadrangle map with project area
- Aerial photos with preliminary project design
- Other attachments as required by Indiana Procedural Manual, Section I.H.
  ‘Early Coordination with Resource Agencies’

Note: The following graphics were sent to review agencies along with this sample early coordination letter:
- Project maps in Appendix B-1 to B-4
- Project area photos in Appendix B-5 to B-9
Land use in the vicinity of the project is mainly residential. There is a wooded area located within the southeast quadrant. The other three quadrants are residential, with some trees and lawns. Proposed permanent and temporary right-of-way is anticipated; however, the exact amount has not been finalized at this time.

CrossRoad Engineers, PC will be preparing the Environmental Document on behalf of INDOT, with Green3 investigating the areas of additional right-of-way for archaeological and historic resources for Section 106 compliance. The results of this investigation will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Officer for review and concurrence.

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 me at (317)-780-1555, x111.

Sincerely,

CrossRoad Engineers, P.C.

Mark A. Beck, PE
Project Manager

Attachments

cc: US Fish and Wildlife Service
    Natural Resource Conservation Service
    Indiana Geological Survey
    INDOT Office of Aviation
    National Park Service
    Federal Highway Administration
    Indiana Dept. of Natural Resources
    US Dept. of Housing & Urban Development
    Indiana Dept. of Environmental Management
    IDEM, Chief of Groundwater Section
    INDOT Public Hearings Manager
    US Forest Service
    US Army Corps of Engineers
    INDOT Greenfield District Environmental Scoping Manager
    Rickie Clark, INDOT Public Hearings Department
    Jim Neal, Hamilton County Engineer
Hi Mark,

The area is in the range of the federally listed Indiana bat and the proposed-to-be-listed northern long-eared bat. If tree-clearing stays within 75 feet of the existing pavement, then the project will fall under our programmatic policy. If you need to clear further, especially into the wooded area in the SE corner, we may ask for seasonal tree-clearing restrictions. We do have a record of a northern long-eared bat about 2 miles upstream of the project.

Below is a list of standard recommendations (where applicable) for projects that fall under our programmatic policy. Please feel free to call or email if you have any questions or concerns.

**Standard Recommendations:**

1. Do not clear trees or understory vegetation outside the construction zone boundaries. *(This restriction is not related to the “tree clearing” restriction for potential Indiana Bat habitat.)*

2. Restrict below low-water work in streams to placement of culverts, piers, pilings and/or footings, shaping of the spill slopes around the bridge abutments, and placement of riprap.

   Culverts should span the active stream channel, should be either embedded or a 3-sided or open-arch culvert, and be installed where practicable on an essentially flat slope. When an open-bottomed culvert or arch is used in a stream, which has a good natural bottom substrate, such as gravel, cobbles and boulders, the existing substrate should be left undisturbed beneath the culvert to provide natural habitat for the aquatic community.

3. Restrict channel work and vegetation clearing to the minimum necessary for installation of the stream crossing structure.

4. Minimize the extent of hard armor (riprap) in bank stabilization by using bioengineering techniques whenever possible. If rip rap is utilized for bank stabilization, extend it below low-water elevation to provide aquatic habitat.

5. Implement temporary erosion and sediment control methods within areas of disturbed soil. All disturbed soil areas upon project completion will be vegetated following INDOT’s standard specifications.

6. Avoid all work within the inundated part of the stream channel (in perennial streams and larger intermittent streams) during the fish spawning season (April 1 through June 30), except for work within sealed structures such as caissons or cofferdams that were installed prior to the spawning season. No equipment shall be operated below Ordinary High Water Mark during this time unless the machinery is within the caissons or on the cofferdams.

7. Evaluate wildlife crossings under bridge/culverts projects in appropriate situations. Suitable crossings include flat areas below bridge abutments with suitable ground cover, high water shelves in culverts, amphibian tunnels and diversion fencing.

The northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) (NLEB) is currently proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The final listing decision for the NLEB is expected in April 2015. At this time, no critical habitat has been proposed for the NLEB. The state of Indiana is within the known range of the NLEB. During the summer, NLEBs typically roost singly or in colonies in cavities, underneather bark, crevices, or hollows of both live and dead trees and/or snags (typically ≥3 inches dbh). Males and non-reproductive females may also roost in cooler places, like caves and mines. This bat seems opportunistic in selecting roosts, using tree species based on presence of cavities or crevices or presence of peeling bark. It has also been occasionally found roosting in structures like barns and sheds (particularly when suitable tree roosts are unavailable). They forage for insects in upland and lowland woodlots and tree lined corridors. During the winter, NLEBs predominately hibernate in caves and abandoned mine portals. Additional habitat types may be identified as new information is obtained.
Pursuant to Section 7(a)(4) of the ESA, federal action agencies are required to confer with the Service if their proposed action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the NLEB (50 CFR 402.10(a)). Action agencies may also voluntarily confer with the Service if the proposed action may affect a proposed species. Species proposed for listing are not afforded protection under the ESA; however as soon as a listing becomes effective, the prohibition against jeopardizing its continued existence and “take” applies regardless of an action’s stage of completion. If the agency retains any discretionary involvement or control over on-the-ground actions that may affect the species after listing, section 7 applies.

If the project meets the criteria for the programmatic policy (I have attached a copy), then no further coordination is required. If project impacts extend beyond 75 feet from the edge of pavement, please re-coordinate.

Sincerely,
Robin McWilliams Munson
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
620 South Walker Street
Bloomington, Indiana 46403
812-334-4261 Fax: 812-334-4273

Monday, Tuesday - 7:30a-3:00p
Wednesday, Thursday - telework 8:30a-3:00p

On Thu, Feb 26, 2015 at 4:44 PM, Mark A. Beck <mbeck@crossroadengineers.com> wrote:

Robin,

I’m sorry, I left off the roundabout exhibit! What is shown is existing r/w lines; we’re very early in the design stage, and are not sure of the exact extents of the project. The plan is to not touch the bridge over the White River, and also to minimize any tree clearing that may be needed, especially in the SE corner.

Mark
Mark,

I have reviewed these projects and I have determined that there is No Impact with the airspace.

Thank You,

James W. Kinder
Chief Airport Inspector
Department of Aviation INDOT
Room Number 955 IGCN
100 N. Senate Ave.
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Jkinder2@indot.in.gov

Jim,

Please find attached the Early Coordination correspondence for this project.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Mark A. Beck, PE
CrossRoad Engineers, PC
3417 Sherman Dr.
Beech Grove IN  46107
(317)-780-1555, ext. 111

Visit our website!
www.crossroadengineers.com
March 10, 2015

Mark A. Beck, P.E.
Project Manager
Crossroad Engineers, PC
3417 Sherman Drive
Beech Grove, Indiana 46107

Dear Mr. Beck:

The proposed project to make intersection improvements at SR 37 and Strawtown Road in Hamilton County, Indiana, as referred to in your letter received March 2, 2015, will not cause a conversion of prime farmland.

If you need additional information, please contact Rick Neilson at 317-295-5875.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JANE E. HARDISTY
State Conservationist

Enclosure
Intersection Improvement
SR 37/Strawtown Road
Hamilton Co., IN

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject proposal. This office has no environmental concerns or comments on the action.

Steve Vahl
Dept. of Housing and Urban Development
Region 5 Environmental Officer
77 West Jackson Blvd, Room 2420
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 913-8728
To Engineers and Consultants Proposing Roadway Construction Projects:

RE: This project is located on SR 37 at Strawtown Road, approximately 12.2 miles north of I-69. The project is located within the INDOT Greenfield District, with Des. No. 1296847. The project entails construction of a roundabout at the intersection.

This letter from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) serves as a standardized response to enquiries inviting IDEM comments on roadway construction, reconstruction, or other improvement projects within existing roadway corridors when the proposed scope of the project is beneath the threshold requiring a formal National Environmental Policy Act-mandated Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. As the letter attempts to address all roadway-related environmental topics of potential concern it is possible that not every topic addressed in the letter will be applicable to your particular roadway project.

For additional information on specific roadway-related topics of interest, please visit the appropriate Web pages cited below, many of which provide contact information for persons within the various program areas who can answer questions not fully addressed in this letter. Also please be mindful that some environmental requirements may be subject to change and so each person intending to include a copy of this letter in their project documentation packet is advised to download the most recently revised version of the letter; found at: http://www.in.gov/idem/5283.htm.

To ensure that all environmentally-related issues are adequately addressed, IDEM recommends that you read this letter in its entirety, and consider each of the following issues as you move forward with the planning of your proposed roadway construction, reconstruction, or improvement project:
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.lrl.usace.army.mil/orf/default.asp) and then click on "Information" from the menu on the right-hand 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, Kosciusko, 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. 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 Wetlands Program. To learn more about the Wetlands Program, visit: http://www.in.gov/idem/4384.htm.

3. If the USACE determines that a wetland or other water body 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 (OWQ) 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 OWQ Wetlands Program at 317-233-8488.

4. If your project will involve over a 0.5 acre of wetland impact, stream relocation, or other large-scale alterations to water bodies such as the creation of a dam or a water diversion, you should seek additional input from the OWQ Wetlands Program staff. Consult the Web at: http://www.in.gov/idem/4384.htm for appropriate staff contact to further discuss your project.

5. Work within the one-hundred year floodway of a given water body is regulated by the Department of
Natural Resources, Division of Water. The Division issues permits for activities regulated under the follow statutes:

- IC 14-26-2 Lakes Preservation Act 312 IAC 11
- IC 14-26-5 Lowering of Ten Acre Lakes Act No related code
- IC 14-28-1 Flood Control Act 310 IAC 6-1
- IC 14-29-1 Navigable Waterways Act 312 IAC 6
- IC 14-29-3 Sand and Gravel Permits Act 312 IAC 6
- IC 14-29-4 Construction of Channels Act No related code

For information on these Indiana (statutory) Code and Indiana Administrative Code citations, see the DNR Web site at: [http://www.in.gov/dnr/water/9451.htm](http://www.in.gov/dnr/water/9451.htm). Contact the DNR Division of Water at 317-232-4160 for further information.

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.

6. 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 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), and as described in 327 IAC 15-5-6.5 (http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/T03270/A00150 [PDF], pages 16 through 19). Before you may apply for a Rule 5 Permit, 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).

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 process.
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.

7. For projects involving impacts to fish and botanical resources, contact the Department of Natural Resource - Division of Fish and Wildlife (317/232-4080) for addition project input.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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 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 ([http://www.in.gov/idem/4148.htm](http://www.in.gov/idem/4148.htm)) under specific conditions. You also can seek an open burning variance from IDEM.

   However, 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) onsite, although burying large quantities of such material can lead to subsidence problems, later on.

   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.

   Additionally, 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 3-5 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 3-5 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) 233-7272.

2. The U.S. EPA and the Surgeon General recommend that people not have long-term exposure to radon at levels above 4 pCi/L. (For a county-by-county map of predicted radon levels in Indiana, visit: http://www.in.gov/idem/4145.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 pCi/L, or higher, EPA recommends a follow-up test. If the second test confirms that radon levels are 4 pCi/L, or higher, 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.) It 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.


3. With respect to asbestos removal: all facilities slated for renovation or demolition (except residential buildings that have (4) four 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 th 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.

However, 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 http://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. All notification remitters will be billed on a quarterly basis.

For more information about IDEM policy regarding asbestos removal and disposal, visit: http://www.in.gov/idem/4983.htm.

4. With respect to lead-based paint removal: IDEM encourages all efforts to minimize human exposure to lead-based 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/isdh/19131.htm.

5. 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 April through October. See 326 IAC 8-5-2, Asphalt Paving Rule (http://www.ai.org/legislative/iac/T03260/A00080.PDF).

6. 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 (View at: 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.

7. For more information on air permits visit: 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 atdem.state.in.us.

**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.

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 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. See: http://www.in.gov/idem/4999.htm.

**FINAL REMARKS**

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

Should the scope of the proposed project be expanded to the extent that a National Environmental Policy Act Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required, IDEM will actively participate in any early interagency coordination review of the project.

Meanwhile, please note that this letter does not constitute a permit, license, endorsement or any other form of approval on the part of the Indiana Department of Environmental Management regarding any project for which a copy of this letter is used. Also note that it is the responsibility of the project engineer or consultant using this letter to ensure that the most current draft of this document, which is located at http://www.in.gov/idem/5284.htm is used.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas W. Easterly
Commissioner

---

**Signature(s) of the Applicant**

I acknowledge that the following proposed roadway project will be financed in part, or in whole, by public monies.

**Project Description**

This project is located on SR 37 at Strawtown Road, approximately 12.2 miles north of I-69. The project is located within the INDOT Greenfield District, with Des. No. 1296847. The project entails construction of a roundabout at the intersection.

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

Date: __________________________

Signature of the INDOT Project Engineer or Other Responsible Agent

JoAnn Wooldridge

Date: 2/6/15

Signature of the
66-33
Mr. Mark Beck
Crossroad Engineers, PC
3417 Sherman Dr.
Beech Grove, IN 46107

Dear Mr. Beck,

RE: Wellhead Protection Area
Proximity Determination
Des. # 1296847
SR 37 and Strawtown Road
Strawtown, Indiana

Upon review of the above referenced site, it has been determined that the proposed project area is located within a Wellhead Protection Area. Additionally, the proposed project area is located within a Source Water Assessment Area which would relate to a Public Water surface water intake. The information is accurate to the best of our knowledge; however, there are in some cases a few factors that could impact the accuracy of this determination. Some Wellhead Protection Area Delineations have not been submitted, and many have not been approved by this office. In these cases we use a 3,000 foot fixed radius buffer to make the proximity determination. To find the status of a Public Water Supply System’s Wellhead Protection Area Delineation please visit our tracking database at http://www.in.gov/idem/4289.htm#databases and scroll to the bottom of the page.

Note: the Drinking Water Branch has launched a new self service feature which allows one to determine wellhead proximity without submitting the application form. Use the following instructions:

1. Go to http://idemmaps.idem.in.gov/whpa/
2. Use the magnifying glass icon in the upper left hand corner of the application to zoom to your site location by way of city, county, or address.
3. Once your site of interest has been located then click on the “i” icon.
4. Use the mouse to click on the site of interest displayed on the map.
5. The wellhead protection area proximity determination response will be displayed in a pop up text box.

In the future please consider using this self service feature if it is suits your needs.

If you have any additional questions please feel free to contact me at the address above or at (317) 232-8728.

Sincerely,

Samuel A. Blazey, Environmental Manager
Ground Water Section
Drinking Water Branch
Office of Water Quality
State of Indiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Early Coordination/Environmental Assessment

DNR #: ER-18159 Request Received: February 26, 2015

Requestor: CrossRoad Engineers, PC
Mark A Beck, PE
3417 South Sherman Drive
Beech Grove, IN 46107-1759

Project: SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection roundabout construction, Strawtown; Des #1296847

County/Site info: Hamilton

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: This proposal may require the formal approval of our agency pursuant to the Flood Control Act (IC 14-28-1) for any proposal to construct, excavate, or fill in or on the floodway of a stream or other flowing waterbody which has a drainage area greater than one square mile. Please submit more detailed plans to the Division of Water’s Technical Services Section if you are unsure whether or not a permit will be required.

Natural Heritage Database: The Natural Heritage Program’s data have been checked.
The species and managed land below have been documented within ½ mile of the project area.
A. MANAGED LAND: Strawtown Kotewi Park and Taylor Natural History
B. MUSSELS:
1) Clubshell (Pleurobema clava); federally and state endangered
2) Northern Rifflshell (Epioblasma torulosa rangiana); fed. and state endangered
3) Rabbittsfoot (Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica); fed. threatened and state endangered
4) Wavrayed Lampmussel (Lampsilis fasciola); state special concern
5) Kidneyshell (Pychobranchus fasciolaris); state special concern
6) Little Spectaclecase (Villosa lienosa); state special concern

Fish & Wildlife Comments: We do not foresee any impacts to the mussels above resulting from the project.

We were not able to adequately assess any impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources with the information provided. As project plans progress, we recommend providing more information for further review. Areas of concern include impacts to habitat within the floodway of the White River and impacts to the wooded area in the southeast quadrant of the existing intersection.

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.

[Signature]
Date: March 25, 2015
Christie L. Stanifer
Environ. Coordinator
Division of Fish and Wildlife

C-17
-State of Indiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Early Coordination/Environmental Assessment

DNR #: ER-18159-1 Request Received: March 7, 2016

Requestor: CrossRoad Engineers, PC
Mark A Beck, PE
3417 South Sherman Drive
Beech Grove, IN 46107-1759

Project: SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue intersection roundabout construction, Strawtown; Des #1296847; updated plans

County/Site Info: Hamilton

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: This proposal may require the formal approval of our agency pursuant to the Flood Control Act (IC 14-28-1) for any proposal to construct, excavate, or fill in or on the floodway of a stream or other flowing waterbody which has a drainage area greater than one square mile. Please submit more detailed plans to the Division of Water's Technical Services Section if you are unsure whether or not a permit will be required.

Natural Heritage Database: The Natural Heritage Program's data have been checked. The species and managed land below have been documented within ½ mile of the project area.
A) MANAGED LAND: Strawtown Koteewi Park and Taylor Natural History
B) MUSSELS:
1. Clubshell (Pleurobema clava); federally & state endangered
2. Northern Riffleshell (Epioblasma torulosa rangiana); federally & state endangered
3. Rabbitsfoot (Quadrula cylindrica cylindrical); federally threatened & state endangered
4. Wavrayed Lampmussel (Lampsilis fasciola); state special concern
5. Kidneyshell (Plychobranchus fasciolaris); state special concern
6. Little Spectaclecase (Villosa lienosa); state special concern

Fish & Wildlife Comments: We do not foresee any impacts to the mussel species above as a result of this project.

We recommend a mitigation plan be developed (and submitted with the permit application, if required) if habitat impacts will occur. The DNR's Floodway Habitat Mitigation guidelines (and plant lists) can be found online at: http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/20140806-IR-312140265NRA.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).

The 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
State of Indiana
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Early Coordination/Environmental Assessment

varieties of tall fescue), legumes, and native shrub and hardwood tree species as soon as possible upon completion.
2. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat or Northern Long-eared bat roosting (greater than 3 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or with cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 through September 30.
3. Appropriately designed measures for controlling erosion and sediment must be implemented to prevent sediment from entering the stream or leaving the construction site; maintain these measures until construction is complete and all disturbed areas are stabilized.
4. Seed and protect all disturbed streambanks and slopes that are 3:1 or steeper with erosion control blankets (follow manufacturer's recommendations for selection and installation); seed and apply mulch on all other disturbed areas.

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.

[Signature]
Date: April 4, 2016

Christie L. Stanifer
Environ. Coordinator
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Project Description: SR 37 and Strawtown Road Intersection Improvement Project, Hamilton County, Indiana

Name of Organization requesting early coordination: Crossroad Engineers, P.C.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE INDIANA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

1) Do unusual and/or problem ( ) geographic, ( ) geological, ( ) geophysical, or ( ) topographic features exist within the project limits? Describe: None

2) Have existing or potential mineral resources been identified in this area? Describe: None

3) Are there any active or abandoned mineral resources extraction sites located nearby? Describe: None

This information was furnished by:

Name: Robin Rupp
Title: Geologist
Address: 611 North Walnut Grove, Bloomington, IN 47405
Phone: 812-855-7428
Date: March 25, 2016
Appendix D: Section 106 Involvement
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
SECTION 4(F) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (for historic properties) AND
SECTION 106 FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS
AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS
ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS
EFFECT FINDING
SR 37 & STRAWTOWN AVENUE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT
TOWN of STRAWTOWN, in WHITE RIVER TOWNSHIP
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA
DES. NO.: 1296847

AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS
(Pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.4(a)(1))

The area of potential effects (APE) for this intersection improvement project was established based on the viewshed from the project alignment in all directions. This includes the area of proposed construction as well as adjacent property within the viewshed that could be affected by the project (See map in Appendix A). The APE was determined to be appropriate based on site observation of the existing conditions, viewshed, and delineation of the field of influence based on the field observations (See Appendix B).

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

The NRHP-eligible historic site consists of two resources: Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building, and the c. 1928 Monument, respectfully. Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building consists of a general store and gas station that was built in 1935. Since then, the building has served as a community center, a feed and supply store, motel, restaurant, and a pottery and antiques store. The building has undergone some alterations, but it has continued to serve as a commercial hub of activity for the small community. In 1928, the property was a park owned by Ollie Stage and his wife Josie, and the monument was built as a tribute to Chief Straw, who was the chief of the Delaware Indian village near Strawtown in the early nineteenth century. The site was recommended eligible under Criterion A, for its association with commercial activity and community development that have made a significant contribution to the local history of Strawtown and Hamilton County, Indiana.

EFFECT FINDING

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 (IN SHPO) provide written concurrence with the Section 106 determination of effect.

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

Strawtown Pottery and Antiques: This undertaking will require the acquisition of temporary right-of-way from this property for driveway reconstruction. INDOT, acting on FHWA’s behalf, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is “No Adverse Effect”; therefore, FHWA hereby intends to issue a “de minimis” finding for the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques property, pursuant to SAFETEA-LU, thereby satisfying FHWA’s responsibilities under Section 4(f) for this historic property.

Consulting parties will be provided a copy of INDOT’s, acting on FHWA’s behalf, finding and determinations in accordance with INDOT and FHWA’s Section 106 procedures. Comments will be accepted for 30 days upon receipt of the findings.

Shaun Miller
Shaun Miller, for FHWA
Acting Manager
INDOT Cultural Resources

3/4/16
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)
SR 37 & STRATOWN AVENUE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT
TOWN of STRATOWN, in WHITE RIVER TOWNSHIP
HAMILTON COUNTY, INDIANA
DES. NO.: 1296847

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE UNDERTAKING

The SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Intersection Improvement Project is located at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue in the Town of Strawtown, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. The project sponsor is the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT). Federal funds will be used for this project under Des. No. 1296847.

The existing intersection is a two-way stop along Strawtown Ave, requiring no stop along SR 37. All directions have a single approach lane. SR 37 is a two-lane highway providing one lane in each direction, approximately 12.5-foot wide each with a 10-foot aggregate shoulder on each side. Approaching the intersection from the south on SR 37, the shoulder is 3.5 feet on the west side, widening to a 10-foot wide shoulder 150 feet south of the intersection. Strawtown Avenue is a two-lane road providing one lane in each direction, approximately 17-foot wide each with no shoulder on either side. The existing pavement on both roadways is asphalt.

The proposed project involves the construction of a roundabout, replacing the current two-way stop at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue. The roundabout will be one lane wide, and each approach from SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue will have one lane entering the roundabout. The widths of the lanes entering the roundabout will be wider than the widths of the currently existing lanes in order to allow for larger vehicles to navigate through the roundabout; widths will range from approximately 13 feet to approximately 23 feet (See Appendix C).

The area of potential effects (APE) for an intersection improvement project was established based on the viewshed from the project alignment in all directions. This includes the area of proposed construction as well as adjacent property within the viewshed that could be affected by the project (See map in Appendix A). The APE was determined to be appropriate based on site observation of the existing conditions, viewshed, and delineation of the field of influence based on the field observations (See Appendix B). Land uses in the vicinity of the intersection are primarily residential and commercial with the White River directly north of the intersection. Located immediately northwest of the intersection is Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, a commercial resource that includes a few trees and yard within the APE. The northeast quadrant contains a few trees and the White River. The southeast quadrant is generally flat and grassy with trees. The southwest quadrant contains several single-family residential resources. The terrain throughout the APE is flat, and the vegetative coverage includes landscape lawns and forest.

The SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Intersection Improvement Project will include the acquisition of limited right-of-way within the boundary of the APE. The limits of the acquisition are currently undetermined. The proposed project will result in physical changes along the project alignment and visual changes within the viewshed. The project will not likely result in aural and vibratory effects, and the traffic pattern will change from a two way stop with no stop along SR 37 into a roundabout. No meaningful environmental or other indirect effects are expected as a result of this project.
2. EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Potential consulting parties were invited to participate in efforts to identify any historical resources that might exist within the area of potential effect (APE) or be affected by the proposed project on June 24, 2015. Consulting parties were identified following the process indicated in the Indiana Cultural Resources Manual. The following parties were invited to become consulting parties: SHPO (automatic), INDOT CRO (automatic), the Indianapolis MPO, Indiana Landmarks Central Regional Office, Hamilton County Historian David Heighway, Hamilton County Historical Society, Hamilton County Board of Commissioners, Hamilton County Council, Hamilton County Highway Department, Hamilton County Plan Commission, and Hamilton County Parks and Recreation. In addition to the automatic consulting parties, the Hamilton County Parks and Recreation, Hamilton County Plan Commission, Hamilton County Historian, Indiana Landmarks, and Hamilton County Historical Society requested to become consulting parties.

A Phase Ia Archaeological Literature Review and Reconnaissance Survey (Jackson, November 2015) recommended the project be allowed to proceed without additional archaeological assessment due to the absence of archaeological resources in the project area. As such, no resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places would be impacted by the proposed project. The report was forwarded to the Indiana SHPO for review. SHPO concurred with the archeology report in its letter dated December 29, 2015 (See Appendix 1). The report introduction and conclusions are available in Appendix 2.

The State and National Registers of Historic Places were checked for resources in Hamilton County. No State or National Register-listed properties or National Historic Landmarks are located in the project APE. The HABS/HAER/HALS database was also checked, and no existing listed properties were located within the project APE. The Indiana Historic Bridge Inventory, INDOT Bridge Inventories, and James Cooper’s inventories—Artistry and Ingenuity in Artificial Stone: Indiana’s Concrete Bridges, 1900-1942 and Iron Monuments to Distant Posterity: Indiana’s Metal Bridges, 1870-1930—were checked and no previously documented historical bridges were found within the project APE.

The Hamilton County Interim Report (1992, White River Township) was also consulted, and only one surveyed property (Strawtown Tavern, IHSSI # 057-541-00047) was located within the project APE. The State Historic Architectural and Archaeological Research Database (SHAARD) also listed the Strawtown Tavern, IHSSI # 057-541-00047 that is located within the APE (See Appendix A). This resource was further investigated for NRHP eligibility. No other structures were listed in any historical reference or survey. No existing surveyed historic districts were located within the APE.

A full historic properties report (HPR) was prepared for the project (Kroh, June 2015). The HPR concluded that none of the following aboveground resources were eligible for inclusion in the National Register (See HPR conclusions in Appendix 3):

- Strawtown Tavern (IHSSI # 057-541-00047), a c. 1830 Greek Revival, I-House rated Outstanding according to the IHSSI scale;
- Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, c. 1920 gable-front two-story cottage-style house with a recommended rating of Contributing according to the IHSSI scale; and
- A c. 1928 Monument located on the north side of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques property with a recommended rating of Notable according to the IHSSI scale.

Indiana SHPO concurred with the findings of the report in a letter dated July 15, 2015 (See Appendix 1).

Raina Regan of Indiana Landmarks responded requesting further clarification of the alterations making the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques aboveground resource ineligible for the NHRP and further
exploration of eligibility under Criterion A for its role in the community development and commerce in the local history of Strawtown (Letter from Regan to Kroh, 7/14/15).

Additional information was provided in the 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1), “No Historic Properties Affected,” on the property history and alterations of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques aboveground resource, determining that it was not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A. INDOT CRO approved the Finding as provided in 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1), “No Historic Properties Affected,” on January 15, 2016 and it was subsequently sent to SHPO on January 19, 2016.

On February 3, 2016, Indiana SHPO contacted Green3 via email and requested additional information on Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building in order to determine its NRHP eligibility. Green3 submitted a Memorandum (See Appendix D) to INDOT CRO and Indiana SHPO on February 16, 2016.

In a letter dated February 19, 2016, Indiana SHPO respectfully objected to the finding of “No Historic Properties Affected,” (See Appendix 1). SHPO concurred with the archaeological short report (Jackson, November, 2015) that no further investigation was necessary. However, SHPO stated the following in regards to buildings and structures: “We noted in the 800.11 documentation that Indiana Landmarks had requested further exploration of the eligibility of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building in a letter dated July 14, 2015. We had not been aware of this request prior to the submission of the 800.11 documentation and felt that Indiana Landmarks’ concerns had not been adequately addressed prior to the finding being made. On February 3, 2016 we contacted Green3 via e-mail and requested additional information regarding the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building to allow our National Register staff to make a determination of eligibility under Criterion A. The additional information was provided via e-mail, by Green3 on February 16, 2016. Based upon this additional information our National Register staff believe that the property is likely eligible under Criterion A for its association with Commerce, but note that should the property be listed in the future additional clarification would be needed.”

SHPO concluded, “we do not believe the characteristics that qualify the identified historic property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places will be diminished as a result of this project,” and will resume review of this project once a revised finding is received.

Since Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building has been determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A, an aerial map has been added to the Memorandum in Appendix D to show the proposed NRHP boundary lines. The C. 1928 Monument, located on the north side of the property of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, is within the proposed NRHP boundary lines. Additionally, the proposed NR boundary has been delineated on the most current project plans (See Appendix C).

3. DESCRIBE AFFECTED HISTORIC PROPERTIES

The NRHP-eligible historic site consists of two resources: Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building, identified in the HPR as ID 016, and the c. 1928 Monument, ID 016A. The proposed NRHP boundary extends approximately 16 feet around the south and west-facing sides of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building; extending approximately 75 feet east of the building, including the parking lot. From the southeastern corner, the boundary extends approximately 110 feet north, which continues northwest for approximately 80 feet, reaching the bank of the White River. From here it continues northwest along the bank for approximately 210 feet. The boundary turns southwest for approximately 123 feet and then turns southeast for approximately 130 feet, connecting with the western boundary (See Aerial Map showing Proposed NR Boundary in Appendix D). The monument is a structure located approximately 100 feet northwest of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building, and since it provides further support to the eligibility of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building, it is included in the proposed NRHP boundary line. Furthermore, the NRHP boundary line extends to the White River because the land was used as a
public park and local newspapers noted how people camped along the banks of the river and enjoyed the view from within the park.

The Monument was given a recommended rating of Notable based on the IHSSI rating system. In 1928, the property was a park owned by Ollie Stage and his wife Josie. The monument was built as a tribute to Chief Straw, who was the chief of the Delaware Indian village near Strawtown in the early nineteenth century. A large crowd attended the dedication and a history teacher from Indianapolis Manual Training High School gave a speech on the early history of Native Americans and their interaction with early American settlers. Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building was given a recommended rating of Contributing. Based on the additional information provided in the Memorandum, SHPO stated in their letter on February 19, 2016, that this resource was eligible for the NRHP (See Appendix 1). The NRHP-eligible historic resource consists of a general store and gas station that was built in 1935 and over the course of the twentieth century and beginning of the twenty-first century, the building has served as a community center, a feed and supply store, motel, restaurant, and a pottery and antiques store. For over 75 years, the building has undergone some alterations, but it has continued to serve as a commercial hub of activity for the small community. Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building was recommended eligible under Criterion A, for its association with commercial activity and community development that have made a significant contribution to the local history of Strawtown and Hamilton County, Indiana.

4. DESCRIBE THE UNDERTAKING’S EFFECTS ON HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building is located on the northwest corner of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue. The proposed undertaking involves the construction of a roundabout, replacing the current two-way stop along Strawtown Avenue at the intersection of SR 37. The roundabout will be one lane wide, and each approach from SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue will have one lane entering the roundabout. The widths of the lanes entering the roundabout will be wider than the widths of the currently existing lanes in order to allow for larger vehicles to navigate through the roundabout.

Based on consultation with project engineers, temporary right-of-way will be taken from the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques property line for driveway reconstruction; most of the construction will take place within existing right-of-way lines. The incidental construction limits are located approximately within the southeastern corner of the proposed NRHP boundary line of this historic resource. This project will not cause any physical destruction, damage or alterations to the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building. This project will not change the historic context of the historic resource or change any elements that contribute to its historic significance. This project will not introduce any visual, atmospheric or audible elements that would diminish the integrity of the elements of the district that contribute to its significance. The project’s construction activities, overlapping the southeastern corner of the proposed boundary line of this historic resource, will consist of reconstructing the driveway approach to Strawtown Avenue and constructing the roundabout. The effect of the driveway reconstruction will be minimal; therefore, no adverse effect will occur because of this overlapping of construction limits and the NRHP boundary line.

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

The finding “No Adverse Effect” is appropriate because none of the project’s impacts on the historic properties meet the definition of an adverse effect, as outlined in 36 CFR 800.5(a). Adverse effects include the alteration of 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. Examples of adverse effects to a property include: (i) physical destruction, (ii) alteration, (iii) removal from its historic location, (iv) change of
character, use, or of setting, (v) introduction of elements that diminish the integrity of significant historic features, (vi) neglect, or (vii) loss of Federal control.

The project impacts to Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building, ID 016, do not meet the definition of an adverse effect as outlined in 36 CFR 800.5(a)(2). The project will not include physical destruction (i) or alteration (ii) of historically significant features of the property. The project will not remove the building/property from its historic location (iii). The project will not change the historic character or use of the property, and will not change the property’s setting (iv). Trees partially block one’s view of the roundabout itself. The project will not introduce elements that diminish the integrity of significant historic features of the property (v). The project will not result in neglect (vi) or loss of Federal control (vii) of the property. The project will have no adverse effect on this property.

6. SUMMARY OF CONSULTING PARTIES AND PUBLIC VIEWS

Consulting party invitations: On June 24, 2015, consulting party invitations along with the Historic Properties Report (HPR) were distributed; the following parties were invited to become consulting parties for the proposed project: SHPO (automatic), INDOT CRO (automatic), the Indianapolis MPO, Indiana Landmarks Central Regional Office, Hamilton County Historian David Heighway, Hamilton County Historical Society, Hamilton County Board of Commissioners, Hamilton County Council, Hamilton County Highway Department, Hamilton County Plan Commission, and Hamilton County Parks and Recreation (see Appendix 1).

Responses to invitations: Allen Patterson of the Hamilton County Parks and Recreation, Chuck Kiphart of the Hamilton County Plan Commission, the Hamilton County Historian, Raina Regan of Indiana Landmarks, Hamilton County Historical Society, Hamilton County Council, and the Hamilton County Board of Commissioners were the non-automatic consulting parties to respond to the invitation to become a consulting party (see Appendix 1). The Hamilton County Council and the Hamilton County Board of Commissioners responded “no;” Chuck Kiphart of the Hamilton County Plan Commission, Allen Patterson of the Hamilton County Parks and Recreation, the Hamilton County Historian, Raina Regan of Indiana Landmarks, and the Hamilton County Historical Society responded “yes.”

Archaeology Report Submission: A Phase Ia Archaeological Literature Review (Jackson, November, 2015) was prepared for the project (see Appendix 2). The report recommended the project be allowed to proceed without additional archaeological assessment due to the absence of archaeological resources in the project area. This report was approved by INDOT-CRO on November 24, 2015 in an email from Jeffrey Laswell to Chris Jackson. The same day, the report was submitted to the Indiana SHPO.

SHPO Archaeology Report Response: SHPO concurred with the findings of the Phase Ia Archaeological Literature Review (Jackson, November, 2015) in their letter dated December 29, 2015. In the letter, SHPO stated, “Based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (“NRHP”) within the proposed project area; and we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Indiana archaeological short report (Jackson, 11/23/2015), that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at this project location.” (See Appendix 1).

HPR approval by INDOT-CRO: A full Historic Property Report (HPR) was prepared (Kroh, June, 2015) and approved by INDOT-CRO in an email from Mary Kennedy to Karen Wood dated June 23, 2015.

SHPO HPR Response: SHPO confirmed its receipt of the HPR in a letter dated June 26, 2015. Indiana SHPO concurred with the findings of the report in a letter dated July 15, 2015 (See Appendix 1). In the letter, SHPO stated, “Based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have
not identified any historic buildings, structures, or districts listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places within the probable area of potential effects.”

Consulting Party Comments: Green3 received a letter dated July 14, 2015, from Indiana Landmarks, in which Raina Regan stated, “for the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building (Resource ID 016), we would like further clarification in regards to alterations made to this structure making it ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Based on the photos provided, we are unsure of the nature of the ‘…additions, door replacements, window replacements, and vinyl siding’ (Kroh, 22). Additionally, we are interested in further exploration of this property as eligible for Criterion A for its role in the community development and commerce in the local history of Strawtown.”

800.11 documentation approval by INDOT: Additional information addressing the July 14, 2015, letter from Indiana Landmarks was provided in the 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1), “No Historic Properties Affected,” on the property history and alterations of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques aboveground resource, determining that it was not eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A. INDOT CRO approved the Finding as provided in 36 CFR Section 800.4(d)(1), “No Historic Properties Affected,” on January 15, 2016 and it was subsequently sent to SHPO on January 19, 2016.

SHPO 800.11 Response: In a letter dated February 19, 2016, Indiana SHPO respectfully objected to the finding of “No Historic Properties Affected,” (See Appendix 1). However, SHPO stated the following in regards to buildings and structures: “On February 3, 2016 we contacted Green3 via e-mail and requested additional information regarding the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building to allow our National Register staff to make a determination of eligibility under Criterion A. The additional information was provided via e-mail, by Green3 on February 16, 2016. Based upon this additional information our National Register staff believe that the property is likely eligible under Criterion A for its association with Commerce, but note that should the property be listed in the future additional clarification would be needed,” (See Appendix D for the Memorandum). SHPO concluded, “we do not believe the characteristics that qualify the identified historic property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places will be diminished as a result of this project,” and will resume review of this project once a revised finding is received.

This finding will be advertised as a legal notice in the local paper, the Times (Noblesville, IN), and the public will be given a 30-day period in which to comment on the finding of effect. This documentation will be revised to reflect any comments received.
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1. Consulting Party Correspondence
2. Archaeology Report Summary and Conclusions (Jackson, November, 2015)
3. Historic Property Report Summary and Conclusions (Kroh, June, 2015)
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   D. Memorandum on Strawtown Pottery and Antiques and Aerial Map of Proposed NR Boundary Line (Wood, February, 2016)
SR 37 / Strawtown Ave RAB
Des. No. 1296847
Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation Sent to the Following:

INDOT CRO
100 North Senate Avenue, Room 642
Indianapolis, IN 46204

State Historic Preservation Officer
Div. of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
402 West Washington Street, Room W274
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Landmarks
Central Regional Office
Indiana Landmarks Center
1201 Central Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46202

Hamilton County Historian
David Heighway
140 N. 15th St.
Noblesville, IN 46060-2610

Hamiton County Historical Society
Attn. Diane Nevitt
P.O. Box 397
Noblesville, IN 46061

Hamilton County Board of Commissioners
1 Hamilton County Sq Suite 157
Noblesville, IN 46060

Hamilton County Council
1 Hamilton County Sq Suite 157
Noblesville, IN 46060

Hamilton County Highway Department
1700 S 10th St.
Noblesville, IN 46060

Hamilton County Plan Commission
1 Hamilton County Sq Suite 306
Noblesville, IN 46060

Anna Gremling
Indianapolis MPO
200 East Washington Street, Suite 1922
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Hamilton County Parks and Recreation
Allen Patterson & Christy Brocken
15513 S. Union St.
Carmel, IN 46033

Nekole Alligood
Delaware Nation of Oklahoma
31064 Hwy 281
PO Box 825
Anadarko, OK 73005

Brice Obermeyer
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office
Emporia State University
1200 Commercial St.
Roosevelt Hall, Room 212
Emporia, KS 66810
June 24, 2015

Re: SR 37 / Strawtown Ave. Intersection Improvement Project, Des. No. 1296847

Dear State Historic Preservation Officer,

The SR 37 / Strawtown Avenue intersection improvement project has been proposed in the Town of Strawtown, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. Federal funds will be used to construct the project; the use of federal funds on these projects requires compliance with all federal regulations governing projects of these types.

The project involves the improvement of the existing intersection from a two-way stop for Strawtown Avenue into a roundabout. The purpose and need of the project is to improve the visibility of the intersection for approaching motorists.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.2(c), you are hereby requested to be a consulting party to participate in the Section 106 process. A copy of the Historic Properties Report draft has been included for your review and comments.

The following agencies have been invited to be consulting parties and a copy of the invitation and Historic Properties Report sent to these organizations:

- Indiana State Historic Preservation Office
- Patrick Carpenter, Manager, INDOT CRO
- Indiana Landmarks, Central Regional Office
- David Heighway, Hamilton County Historian
- Hamilton County Historical Society
- Hamilton County Board of Commissioners
- Hamilton County Council
- Hamilton County Plan Commission
- Hamilton County Parks and Recreation Department
- Anna Gremling, Indianapolis, MPO

Per 36 CFR 800.3 (f), we hereby request that the SHPO notify this office if the SHPO is aware of any other parties that may be entitled to be consulting parties or should be contacted as potential consulting parties for the subject project. Please submit a list of additional parties that SHPO believes should be added as consulting parties to Karen Wood, Qualified Professional, at 1104 Prospect Street, Indianapolis, IN 46203. E-mail responses may be directed to karen@green3studio.com. Your response is requested as soon as possible, but must be received within 30 days.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Karen Wood, DHPA QP
Cc: INDOT CRO
June 24, 2015

Re: SR 37 / Strawtown Ave. Intersection Improvement Project, Des. No. 1296847

Dear Potential Section 106 Consulting Party,

The SR 37 / Strawtown Avenue intersection improvement project has been proposed in the Town of Strawtown, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. Federal funds will be used to construct the project; the use of federal funds on these projects requires compliance with all federal regulations governing projects of these types.

The project involves the improvement of the existing intersection from a two-way stop for Strawtown Avenue into a roundabout. The purpose and need of the project is to improve the visibility of the intersection for approaching motorists.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.2(c), you are hereby requested to be a consulting party to participate in the Section 106 process.

The Historic Properties Report is enclosed as well as a postcard to return if you “do” or “do not” agree to be a consulting party. If you indicate on the postcard that you do not desire to be a consulting party, or if you do not return the postcard at all, you will not be included on the list of consulting parties for this project. You will not receive further information about the project unless the scope changes.

For more information regarding the protection of historic resources, please see the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s guide, Protecting Historic Properties: A Citizen’s Guide to Section 106 Review. It is available online at http://www.achp.gov/citizensguide.pdf.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this invitation, please contact Karen, Qualified Professional, at (317) 634-4110 or direct e-mail to karen@green3studio.com. Your response is requested as soon as possible, but must be received within 30 days if you wish to participate as a consulting party and have your comments fully considered.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Karen Wood, DHPA QP

Cc: INDOT CRO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Des 12A6847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>Hamilton Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 106 - Invitation to Consulting Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RAINA RECON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>Indiana Landmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [X] YES I would like to participate as a consulting party
- [ ] NO I would not like to participate as a consulting party
- [ ] I consent to receive future correspondence via email

email: rrecon@indiana.gov

Green3
Historic Fountain Square
1104 Prospect Street
Indianapolis, IN 46203

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Des 12A6847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>Hamilton Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 106 - Invitation to Consulting Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>Historical Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] YES I would like to participate as a consulting party
- [X] NO I would not like to participate as a consulting party
- [ ] I consent to receive future correspondence via email

email: greensec@history.org

Green3
Historic Fountain Square
1104 Prospect Street
Indianapolis, IN 46203

D-13
PROJECT

Des. 1296847

LOCATION

Hamilton Co.

Section 106 - Invitation to Consulting Parties

NAME

AGENCY Hamilton Co.

Board of Commissioners

YES I would like to participate as a consulting party

NO I would not like to participate as a consulting party

☐ I consent to receive future correspondence via email

email ________________________________

Green3
Historic Fountain Square
1104 Prospect Street
Indianapolis, IN 46203
July 14, 2015

Ms. Dawn Kroh  
Green 3  
1104 Prospect Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46203

RE: Des. Nos. 1296847 SR 37 / Strawtown Ave. Intersection Improvement Project

Dear Ms. Kroh,

Thank you for allowing Indiana Landmarks the opportunity to comment on the above mentioned projects. We studied the documentation provided in the Historic Property Report dated June 9, 2015 and we have some follow up questions as it relates to the National Register eligibility presented within the report.

For the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building (Resource ID 016), we would like further clarification in regards to alterations made to this structure making it ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Based on the photos provided, we are unsure of the nature of the “…additions, door replacements, window replacements, and vinyl siding” (Kroh, 22). Additionally, we are interested in further exploration of this property as eligible for Criterion A for its role in the community development and commerce in the local history of Strawtown.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Raina Regan  
Community Preservation Specialist, Central Regional Office
July 15, 2015

Karen Wood
green-3
1104 Prospect Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46203

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration
Re: Historic property report (Kroh, 6/9/2015) for improvements to the intersection of SR 37 and Sirawtown Avenue (Designation #1296847; DHPA #17884)

Dear Ms. Wood:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108), 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the “Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program in the State of Indiana,” the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer has conducted an analysis of the materials dated June 24, 2015 and received on June 26, 2015, for the above indicated project in White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana.

We have no additional consulting parties to suggest, beyond those whom you already have invited.

Based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any historic buildings, structures, or districts listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places within the probable area of potential effects.

The above comments are strictly in regards to historic structures, since no information has been provided thus far regarding archaeology.

A copy of the revised 36 C.F.R. Part 800 that went into effect on August 5, 2004 may be found on the Internet at www.achp.gov for your reference. If you have questions about archaeological issues please contact Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.in.gov. If you have questions about buildings or structures please contact Ashley Thomas at (317) 234-7034 or asthomas@dnr.in.gov. Additionally, in all future correspondence regarding the above indicated project, please refer to DHPA #17884.

Very truly yours,

Chad W. Shirley
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
MKZ:ADT:adt

emc: Patrick Carpenter, Indiana Department of Transportation
Mary Kennedy, Indiana Department of Transportation
Shaun Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
Shirley Clark, Indiana Department of Transportation
December 29, 2015

Karen Wood
1104 Prospect Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46203

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA")

Re: Indiana archaeological short report (Jackson, 11/23/2015), for improvements to the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue (Designation No. 1296847, DHPA No. 17884)

Dear Ms. Wood:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108), 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the "Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program in the State of Indiana," the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO") has conducted an analysis of the materials dated November 24, 2015, and received on November 30, 2015, for the above indicated project in White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana.

Based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") within the proposed project area; and we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Indiana archaeological short report (Jackson, 11/23/2015), that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at this project location.

Additionally, as previously indicated, based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any historic buildings, structures, or districts listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the probable area of potential effects.

At this time, it would be appropriate for the Indiana Department of Transportation ("INDOT"), on behalf of the FHWA, to analyze the information that has been gathered from the Indiana SHPO, the general public, and any other consulting parties and make the necessary determinations and findings. Please refer to the following comments for guidance:

1) If the INDOT believes that a determination of "no historic properties affected" accurately reflects its assessment, then it shall provide documentation of its finding as set forth in 36 C.F.R. § 800.11 to the Indiana SHPO, notify all consulting parties, and make the documentation available for public inspection (36 C.F.R. §§ 800.4[d][1] and 800.2[d][2]).

2) If, on the other hand, the INDOT finds that an historic property may be affected, then it shall notify the Indiana SHPO, the public and all consulting parties of its finding and seek views on effects in accordance with 36 C.F.R. §§ 800.4(d)(2) and 800.2(d)(2). Thereafter, the INDOT may proceed to apply the criteria of adverse effect and determine whether the project will result in a "no adverse effect" or an "adverse effect" in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.5.

Please be advised that prior to INDOT approving and issuing a finding, the 36 C.F.R. § 800.11 documentation must be submitted to INDOT for review and comment.

If any prehistoric or historic archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29) requires that the discovery be reported to the...
Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations, including but not limited to 36 C.F.R. 800.

A copy of the revised 36 C.F.R. Part 800 that went into effect on August 5, 2004 may be found on the Internet at www.acbp.gov for your reference. If you have questions about archaeological issues please contact Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.IN.gov. If you have questions about buildings or structures please contact Ashley Thomas at (317) 234-7034 or asthomas@dnr.IN.gov. Additionally, in all future correspondence regarding the above indicated project, please refer to DHPA No. 17884.

Very truly yours,

[signature]

Mitchell K. Zoll
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

MKZ:WTT:swt

enc: Shaun Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
      Mary Kennedy, Indiana Department of Transportation
      Shirley Clark, Indiana Department of Transportation
      Chris Jackson, Archaeological Consultants of the Midwest, Inc.
February 19, 2016

Shaun Miller
Acting Cultural Resources Manager
Environmental Services
Indiana Department of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA")

Re: Indiana Department of Transportation’s finding of “no historic properties affected” on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration for improvements to the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue (Designation #1296847; DHPA #17884)

Dear Mr. Miller:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108), 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the "Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Office regarding the implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program in the State of Indiana," the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer has conducted an analysis of the materials dated January 15, 2016 and received on January 20, 2016, for the above indicated project in White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana.

As provided in 36 C.F.R. § 800.4 (d)(1), the State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO") respectfully objects to your finding of "no historic properties affected" as stated in your letter dated January 15, 2016.

As previously indicated, based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") within the proposed project area; and we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Indiana archaeological short report (Jackson, 11/23/2015), that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at this project location.

If any prehistoric or historic archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29) requires that the discovery must be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations, including but not limited to 36 C.F.R. 800.

In regard to buildings and structures, we noted in the 800.11 documentation that Indiana Landmarks had requested further exploration of the eligibility of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building in a letter dated July 14, 2015. We had not been aware of this request prior to the submission of the 800.11 documentation and felt that Indiana Landmarks' concerns had not been adequately addressed prior to the finding being made. On February 3, 2016 we contacted Green3 via e-mail and requested additional information regarding the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building to allow our National Register staff to make a determination of eligibility under Criterion A. The additional information was provided, via e-mail, by Green3 on February 16, 2016. Based upon this additional information our National Register staff believe that the
property is likely eligible under Criterion A for its association with Commerce, but note that should the property be listed in the future additional clarification would be needed.

However, based on the information provided to our office, we do not believe the characteristics that qualify the identified historic property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places will be diminished as a result of this project.

It is our understanding that INDOT plans to issue a revised finding due to the change in eligibility of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Building. Once the revised finding is received, the Indiana SHPO will resume review of this project.

A copy of the revised 36 C.F.R. Part 800 that went into effect on August 5, 2004, may be found on the Internet at www.achp.gov for your reference. If you have questions about archaeological issues please contact Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.IN.gov. If you have questions about buildings or structures please contact Ashley Thomas at (317) 234-7034 or asthomas@dnr.IN.gov. Additionally, in all future correspondence regarding the above indicated project, please refer to DHPA #17884.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mitchell K. Zoll
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

MKZ:ADT:adt

cmc: Shaun Miller, INDOT
    Mary Kennedy, INDOT
    Shirley Clark, Indiana - INDOT
    Karen Wood, Green3
    Raina Regan, Indiana Landmarks, Central Regional Office
    Christy Brocken, Hamilton County Parks Department
April 6, 2016

Shaun Miller
Acting Cultural Resources Manager
Environmental Services
Indiana Department of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA")

Re: Additional information, and Indiana Department of Transportation's finding of "no adverse effect," on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration, for improvements to the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue (Designation No. 1296847; DHPA No. 17884)

Dear Mr. Miller:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108), 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the "Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program in the State of Indiana," the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO") has conducted an analysis of the materials dated March 4, 2016, and received on March 9, 2016, for the above indicated project in White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana.

As previously indicated, we do not believe the characteristics that qualify the identified historic property for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") will be diminished as a result of this project.

Additionally, as previously indicated, based upon the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the proposed project area; and we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Indiana archaeological short report (Jackson, 11/23/2015), that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at this project location.

Therefore, we concur with the INDOT's March 4, 2016 finding, on behalf of the FHWA, that there are no historic buildings, structures, districts, objects, or archaeological resources within the area of potential effects that will be adversely affected by the above indicated project.

If any prehistoric or historic archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29) requires that the discovery be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event,
please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations, including but not limited to 36 C.F.R. 800.

If you have questions about archaeological issues please contact Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.IN.gov. If you have questions about buildings or structures please contact Ashley Thomas at (317) 234-7034 or asthomas@dnr.IN.gov.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mitchell K. Zoll
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

MKZ:ADT:WTT:xtt

enc: Shaun Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
Mary Kennedy, Indiana Department of Transportation
Shirley Clark, Indiana - Indiana Department of Transportation
Karen Wood, Green3, L.L.C.
Ranae Ragan, Indiana Landmarks, Central Regional Office
Christy Brocken, Hamilton County Parks Department
Where applicable, the use of this form is recommended but not required by the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author:</th>
<th>Christopher Jackson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (month, day, year):</td>
<td>November 23, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>A Phase Ia Archaeological Literature Review and Reconnaissance Survey for the Proposed Intersection Improvement and Roundabout at the Intersection of State Road 37 and Strawtown Avenue, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT OVERVIEW**

Project Description: The purpose of the project will be to reduce speeds on State Road 37, simplify the ability to turn left onto the highway, and allow for the ability to construct pedestrian facilities along Strawtown Avenue thereby providing area residents a safe and non-motorized method of crossing the highway and access the nearby County Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDOT Designation Number/Contract Number:</th>
<th>1296847</th>
<th>Project Number:</th>
<th>15-33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHPA Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved DHPA Plan Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared For:</td>
<td>Green 3, LLC</td>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Erin Mulryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Erin Mulryan</td>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1104 Prospect Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>State:</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
<td>317-634-4110</td>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:erin@green3studio.com">erin@green3studio.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
<td>Christopher Jackson</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Christopher Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company/Institution:</td>
<td>Archaeological Consultants of the Midwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: P.O. Box 39146</td>
<td></td>
<td>City: Indianapolis</td>
<td>State:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
<td>(317) 797-5439</td>
<td>E-mail Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:archmidwest@aol.com">archmidwest@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surface Visibility: 0 percent

Factors Affecting Visibility: grass

Visual Walkover ☒ Pedestrian Survey ☐ Shovel Test ☐ Screened ☐ Mesh Size ☐

Interval 5 m ☒ 10 m ☐ 15 m ☐ Other (describe below) ☒

Number of Shovel Test Units Excavated: 0

---

Visual inspection of the project area determined that grass and maintained yards were documented in all four quadrants of the project area. Further examination of the northeastern and southeastern quadrants indicated that the proposed project will be situated within the existing right-of-way, which consists of steep slopes from Strawtown Road. The northeastern quadrant slopes to the north and terminates at the White River; a metal drainage pipe was observed in the project area of this quadrant. Due to the steep terrain and that the project area will be located within the existing right-of-way, no further work (i.e., shovel probes) was undertaken in the northeastern quadrant.

The slope in the southeastern quadrant runs in a southerly direction and ends at the edge of the right-of-way and where a woodlot is located. A shallow intermittent stream with a gravel base was observed running along the northern edge of the woodlot. Due to the terrain and that the project area is to be located in the right-of-way, no additional work (i.e., shovel probes) was conducted in this quadrant.

Visual examination of the southwestern quadrant indicated that the terrain consisted of a somewhat level area just outside of the existing right-of-way. The level area is to be impacted by the proposed project. Because of this, an Oakfield core was excavated in order to determine if intact soils were present at this topographic feature. If intact soils were encountered, then a shovel probe would be excavated. Data collected from the Oakfield core, which was located at UTM coordinates E590046 N4442000, indicated that the area is disturbed. Gravels and fill dirt were encountered in the core. As a result of this, no further work was undertaken on this topographic feature. It should be noted that the disturbance was not unexpected due to the relatively closeness of the existing right-of-way, the presence of the house, and a gravel drive that is situated between the northern edge of the house and the right-of-way along Strawtown Avenue.

An inspection of the northwestern quadrant indicated that the terrain consists of moderate slope in the right-of-way and a marked buried underground utility along the northern edge of the right-of-way. Because the project area will be situated in the right-of-way in this quadrant and it can be determined that the terrain has been altered, no further work (i.e., shovel probes) was conducted in this quadrant.

---

RESULTS

☐ Archaeological records check has determined that the project area does not have the potential to contain archaeological resources.

☐ Archaeological records check has determined that the project area has the potential to contain archaeological resources.

☒ Phase Ia reconnaissance has located no archaeological resources in the project area.

☐ Phase Ia reconnaissance has identified landforms conducive to buried archaeological deposits.

D-25
RECOMMENDATION

☐ The archaeological records check has determined that the project area has the potential to contain archaeological resources and a Phase Ia archaeological reconnaissance is recommended.

☐ The archaeological records check has determined that the project area does not have the potential to contain archaeological resources and no further work is recommended before the project is allowed to proceed.

☒ The Phase Ia archaeological reconnaissance has located no archaeological sites within the project area and it is recommended that the project be allowed to proceed as planned.

☐ The Phase Ia archaeological reconnaissance has determined that the project area includes landforms which have the potential to contain buried archaeological deposits. It is recommended that Phase Ic archaeological subsurface reconnaissance be conducted before the project is allowed to proceed.

☐ The Phase Ia archaeological reconnaissance has determined that the project area is within 100 feet of a cemetery and a Cemetery Development Plan is required per IC-14-21-1-26.5.

Cemetery Name:  

Other Recommendations/Commitments: 

Pursuant to IC-14-21-1, if any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29) requires that the discovery must be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646.

Attachments

☒ Figure showing project location within Indiana.

☒ USGS topographic map showing the project area (1:24,000scale).

☒ Aerial photograph showing the project area, land use and survey methods.

☒ Photographs of the project area.

☒ Project plans (if available)

Other Attachments:  historic cartographic maps
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Executive Summary

The SR 37 and Strawtown Ave Intersection improvement project is located at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Ave in the town of Strawtown in White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. The project sponsor is the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT). Federal funds will be used for this project under INDOT Des. No. 1296847.

The need for this project derives from potentially unsafe road conditions along SR 37, which has posted speed limits of 40 MPH, but common speed is often in excess of 55 MPH, causing hazardous crossing conditions for approaching traffic from Strawtown Ave. Pedestrians are also impeded from crossing due to excessive speeds. Right-of-way acquisition is expected for this project as well as minor modifications to the drainage structures and relocation of some public utilities.

The purpose of this historic property report is to identify historic resources within the APE of the proposed project. The scope of the work covered in this report includes field inventory and photography of the existing sites and structures conducted on April 15, 2015. Delineation and mapping of the APE was prepared and based on field observations. Research of individual sites and structures was undertaken to determine which, if any, properties are currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or have potential to be listed on the NRHP, including examining existing historical survey records. All properties within the APE were documented as appropriate and evaluated for significance.

A total of 38 individual resources within the project APE were identified, as well as one bridge over the White River constructed in 1976. Of these, 19 were constructed more recently than 45 years; all were houses, garages and utility sheds. Of the 19 individual resources over 45 years old, 16 lacked sufficient integrity and significance to be recommended at least a “Contributing” rating based on the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) rating system or to be considered eligible for the NRHP. One IHSSI-listed resource was located within the project APE. This resource is the Strawtown Tavern (IHSSI No. 057-541-00047), a. c. 1830 Greek Revival house rated “Outstanding.” The second resource, Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, which serves as a c. 1930 business and a residence, was not rated in IHSSI but after evaluation the recommended rating was “Contributing.” The third resource is a monument that is located on the north side of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, erected in 1928; it was not rated in IHSSI but after evaluation the recommended rating was “Notable.” These three resources were evaluated for NRHP-eligibility but were not recommended for the NRHP. The bridge in the APE, NBI No. 012500, was determined to fall under the Program Comment for Streamlining Section 106 Review for Actions Affecting Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges (Program Comment) and therefore no individual consideration under Section 106 was required for the bridge.

In addition to individual resources, the project APE was also evaluated for previously unidentified districts, but none were found.
Conclusion

The purpose of this report is to identify historic properties eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) of the proposed project. No such historic properties were identified to be eligible.

The Strawtown Tavern, rated “Outstanding,” (IHSSI No. 057-541-00047) was evaluated for NRHP eligibility but was found not to be eligible. The Strawtown Pottery and Antiques commercial building was recommended a rating of “Contributing,” based on the IHSSI rating system due to its past use as a local gathering place and general store at the junction of two main roadways, SR 37 and Strawtown Ave; however, it was not recommended eligible for NRHP. The monument that is located on the north side of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building was recommended a rating of Notable based on the IHSSI rating system due to its local and state significance commemorating the site of a Delaware Indian village that was located on the south side of the White River where Strawtown now sits; however, it was not recommended eligible for NRHP.
Source: Charles N. Thompson, Sons of the Wilderness, John and William Conner (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society), 1937.

"Indian Towns Near Moravian Mission and Conner Trail"
c. 1800-1820s
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Appendix D – Memorandum and Aerial Map showing Proposed NR Boundary of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques
To: INDOT Cultural Resources Office, State Historic Preservation Office
From: Karen Wood, QP
Date: February 12, 2016
Re: DHPA 17884; Des. 1296847 Strawtown Ave. / SR 37 Project regarding Strawtown Pottery and Antiques Resource

This Memorandum is in reference to Des. 1296847, DHPA 17884 Intersection Improvement Project located at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue in Strawtown, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. Green3 is the Section 106 consultant on the project.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), INDOT Cultural Resources Office (CRO), Indiana Landmarks, and Green3 have communicated via email from February 2, 2016 to February 4, 2016, regarding the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of the Strawtown Pottery and Antiques property per Criterion A. The 800.11 documentation determined that the property was not NRHP eligible based on alterations. However, Indiana Landmarks and SHPO requested additional information to clarify “the alterations that were made to the interior” and “more information on commercial activity and context for Strawtown and the county during that period” (Thomas to Wood, 2/3/16).

Green3 has communicated with Matt and Diane Garrison of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques on the history of the property. They provided several photos of the exterior and interior of the store ranging from the 1930s, 1960s, and present day. They included two newspaper articles on the erection of the monument in 1928 on the north side of the property.

The following materials are included in this memorandum:

1. Interior photos of the store facing southeast from the late 1930s and present day (Figures 1-2)
2. Exterior photos of the store from the south-facing side from the 1930s and present day (Figures 3-4); and the east-facing side from the 1960s and present day (Figures 5-6)
3. Property history of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques
4. Additional Historical Information on the commercial activity/community development of Strawtown and Hamilton County (Figure 7)
**Interior and Exterior Photographs**

Figure 1: Interior of Strawtown General Store ca. 1930s

Source: Photo courtesy of Matt and Diane Garrison

Figure 2: Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, Present Day

Source: Photo courtesy of Matt and Diane Garrison
Figure 3: South-facing Strawtown General Store, ca. 1935

Source: Photo courtesy of Matt and Diane Garrison

Figure 4: South-facing Strawtown General Store, Present Day

Source: Photo taken by Karen Wood during site visit in April 2015
Figure 5: Aerial View of East-Facing Side of Store ca. 1960s

Source: Photo courtesy of Matt and Diane Garrison

Figure 6: East-facing side of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, Present Day

Source: Photo taken by Karen Wood during site visit in April 2015
Property History of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques
Matt and Diane Garrison are the current business and property owners of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques, 12738 Strawtown Avenue, Noblesville, IN 46060. Via telephone and email communications the week of February 8, 2016, they told Green3 that the building was erected in 1935 using recycled lumber from the community building that was also on the property. The general store was owned and operated by Ollie Stage and his wife Josie. Also, there is a stone monument, dedicated to Chief Straw that Mr. Stage had erected in 1928. In the 1960s, owners Kenneth and Donna Spannuth built the north addition to the property (where the pottery workshop is now), in which they ran the store, a restaurant and motel—which utilized five log cabins on the north side of the property adjacent to the monument. The Garrison’s purchased the property in 1983 and said that they have not made any significant changes to the exterior or interior of the house since they bought it. The basement where the general store was has retained its original ceilings, walls, wooden support beams, door and window frames.

Exterior alterations made to the property since the 1930s include a white coat of paint to the wood siding, second story windows, roof replacement, the addition of an attached garage, and the north addition c. 1960s. The Hamilton County GIS Flex Viewer map provides the Parcel Report for 12738 Strawtown Ave., Noblesville, Indiana, 46060, that shows the year of construction was c. 1920 and the effective year was 1970. The Parcel Report’s sketch of the property includes the attached garage.

Additional Historical Information
The commercial activity and community development of Strawtown in Hamilton County has spanned close to 200 years. In the 1820s, pioneers had settled near the present site of Strawtown, building log cabins along the White River. By the early 1830s pioneers poured over Ohio state line into Indiana, using an old Indian Trail that traversed central Indiana from Strawtown to Lafayette. Documented archaeological evidence has demonstrated that Delaware Indians had inhabited land along the banks of the White River near Strawtown. Once the pioneers settled near Strawtown, they traded with the Delaware Indians and when the Indians moved out of the region, the residents of Strawtown began to trade with the emigrants traveling along the Strawtown Road. Bicknell Cole and William Conner laid out the town of Strawtown in 1836, and the county history recorded that residents traded at Strawtown. Several merchants ran their businesses out of Strawtown, trading with local farmers and emigrants traveling the Strawtown Road. The emigrants could rent a room in a tavern and share a hot meal with fellow travelers. Strawtown was a bustling town, but better constructed roads and the railroads halted any growth, forcing the merchants to move their business to Noblesville, the county seat. The country store and blacksmith’s shop remained, leaving Strawtown a small country village to which it continues to exist as today.

In the 1920s and 1930s, Ollie Stage and his wife Josie owned the property on the northeast corner of Strawtown Avenue and SR 37 south of the White River. Local newspapers such as the Call-Leader (Elwood, Indiana) and the Alexandria Times (Alexandria, Indiana), reported that as early as 1925, church, organization, and community picnics and meetings as well as the Stage family reunion were held at Chief Straw Lodge in Strawtown. It was a community
center / park for Strawtown and its surrounding region. Then, on September 9, 1928, the monument—made of cobblestone from the bed of the White River and concrete with a statue of Chief Straw on top—was dedicated to Chief Straw witnessed in front of a large crowd of people. *The Indianapolis Star* reported that C.B. Coleman, the director of the Indiana Historical Society, was supposed to give a speech on-site, but he was unable to make it and so Professor Moore, a history teacher at Manual Training High School in Indianapolis gave the speech, reviewing the history of the Delaware Indians and the interaction with American citizens. He acknowledged that Chief Straw was the chief of the Strawtown settlement and this monument was a tribute to the early history of the region. The monument was placed in the park on Ollie Stage’s property; Charles L. Pierson, a local farmer and mason, constructed the monument.

Figure 7: The Chief Straw Monument, Present Day and Historic Photo, n.d.

In the 1970s, a pamphlet entitled *Indiana Guide to Historical Places* was published which provides information on many of the state parks and attractions. In addition, there is a section that lists every county, describing the historical sites to visit. The following sites were listed in Hamilton County: William Conner’s house at Conner Prairie, the Noblesville County Courthouse, the Railroad and Transportation Museum in Noblesville, the Indian mounds west of Strawtown, and the monument honoring the early Indian chief, Chief Straw in Strawtown.
In a 1996 article in the Daily Herald, a suburban Chicago newspaper wrote a story on Strawtown Pottery and Antiques in Strawtown, Indiana. The author reported that since the building was constructed in 1935, it served as a gas station and general store, Chief Straw Lodge, Strawtown Feed & Supply, motel, community center, restaurant, and even a teen club. Pictures of the gas station from the 1930s; the newspaper articles referencing Chief Straw Lodge in the late 1920s and early 1930s; and verbal communication with Matt and Diane Garrison on the history of their property verify these multi-faceted functions of this property on the corner.

Strawtown was one of the earliest settlements in Hamilton County, Indiana, most likely due to its location along the White River. Strawtown is significant to early Hamilton County history regarding Native American settlements and early commercial/transportation activity in the 1820s through 1850s until railroads became the preferred mode of transportation. The monument, honoring Chief Straw, reflected this early history of Strawtown. In the early twentieth century, Strawtown was a small village in which the building of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques was used as a gas station, general store, and community center. The building itself has changed overtime but has continued to be a commercial hub of activity for the small community for almost 100 years.

References Cited


Indiana Guide to Historical Places, [pamphlet], n.d., Indiana, Historical Sites folder within the Lincoln Financial Foundation Collection, Allen County Public Library, Fort Wayne, Indiana.


Shirts, Augustus Finch. A History of the Formation, Settlement and Development of Hamilton County, Indiana, from the Year 1818 to the Close of the Civil War. Noblesville, IN: Augustus Finch Shirts, 1901.

Newspapers
The Alexandria Times (Alexandria, IN)
The Call-Leader (Elwood, IN)
The Daily Herald (Chicago, IL)
The Indianapolis Star (Indianapolis, IN)
Aerial Map Showing Proposed NR Boundary Line of Strawtown Pottery and Antiques

Proposed NR Boundary Line

SR 37

Strawtown Avenue

c. 1928 Monument

c. 1935 Strawtown Pottery and Antiques building

SR 37 / Strawtown Ave. Intersection Improvement Project
Strawtown, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana
Des. 1296847

February 19, 2016

1:1,000

0 0.0075 0.015 0.03 mi
0 0.0125 0.025 0.05 km

Indiana Spatial Data Portal, UITS, ESRI

D-43
Chris,

Thank you for the submission of the above referenced archaeological report. The revised report was reviewed by INDOT Cultural Resources personnel who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards as per 36 CFR Part 61. It is our opinion that the report is acceptable and the comments dated November 23, 2015 have been addressed. We therefore concur with the evaluations and recommendations made by Jackson (11/24/2015) received by our office on November 24, 2015. Please submit one copy of the archaeology report to SHPO for review and concurrence. In addition, we ask that a copy of the SHPO submittal letter be sent to INDOT, CRO care of Jeff Laswell at jlaswell@indot.in.gov during the time of submission. If there are any questions or concerns regarding this project, please contact me at jlaswell@indot.in.gov or (317) 233-2093.

Sincerely,

Jeff Laswell
Archaeologist
INDOT Environmental Services
Cultural Resources Office
100 N. Senate Ave. IGCN - Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana
46204-2216
(317) 233-2093

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****
May 3, 2016

Indiana Department of Transportation
Attn: Shaun Miller
100 North Senate Avenue
Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: SR 37 / Strawtown Ave. Intersection improvement project, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana, Des No. 1296847

Dear Shaun Miller,

Thank you for providing the survey report for the above referenced project. Our review also indicates that there are no religious or culturally significant sites in this project area and we have no objection to the proposed project. We defer comment to your office as well as to the State Historic Preservation Office and/or the State Archaeologist.

However, we ask that if any human remains are accidentally unearthed during the course of the project that you cease development immediately and inform the Delaware Tribe of Indians of the inadvertent discovery.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact this office by phone at (620) 341-6699 or by e-mail at bobermeyer@delawaretribe.org.

Sincerely,

Brice Obermeyer
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office
1200 Commercial St
Roosevelt Hall, RM 212
Emporia State University
Emporia, KS 66801
Kari and Mark,

Please find attached, a letter from the Delaware Tribe concurring with INDOT-CRO’s additional work confirming soil disturbances. I’ve also include the initial email from the Delaware Tribe prompting the additional shovel testing and below are the result of CRO’s additional work. Please update Section C of the CE with this information.

Thank you,

Shaun Miller
Archaeological Team Lead
INDOT, Cultural Resources Office
smiller@indot.in.gov
(317) 233-6795

From: Brice Obermeyer [mailto:bobermeyer@delawaretribe.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 2:16 PM
To: Laswell, Jeffrey <JLaswell@indot.IN.gov>
Cc: mbeck@crossroadengineers.com; Miller, Shaun (INDOT) <smiller@indot.IN.gov>; Kennedy, Mary <MKENNEDY@indot.IN.gov>; Carmanygeorge, Karstin M <KCarmanyGeorge2@indot.IN.gov>; Barnes, Taylor N <TBarnes1@indot.IN.gov>; Gearlds, Nicole <NGearlds@indot.IN.gov>
Subject: Re: Des. 1296847 Effect Finding for Strawtown Ave. / SR 37 Intersection Improvement Project Revised Finding for review

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

Jeff,

Thank you for the additional work and I am glad to hear that the project will not have an impact on any archaeological resources. We have no objection to the project and will be sending a letter to this effect.

Best regards,
Brice Öbermeyer
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office
Roosevelt Hall, Rm 212
1 Kellog Drive
Emporia, KS 66801
Brice,

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Cultural Resources Office (CRO) conducted an archaeological field investigation on April 29, 2016. As we discussed, the purpose of the investigation was to confirm subsurface disturbance noted in the November 23, 2015 Phase Ia field reconnaissance report conducted by the Archaeological Consultants of the Midwest (ACM). The disturbed noted by ACM (Jackson 2015) was based upon visual inspection of the ground surface and the placement of a single Oakfield soil core in the SW quadrant of the intersection. This left some concern that given the culturally and archaeologically sensitive nature of the area that shovel probing should have been conducted to confirm disturbances within the project area. As a result, INDOT, CRO excavated eight shovel probes throughout various portions of the project area (see attached field investigation map) and found that disturbance was widespread, mostly emanating from the construction of the roadways and bridge approach. All eight of the shovel probes revealed mixed soils with secondary gravel/rock/sand deposits – numerous probes contained asphalt, plastic and concrete. Discussions with long time property owners (30+ years) in the NW & NE quads of the project limits supported that large amounts of dirt had been moved/graded and secondary fill had been deposited in order to build up the roadbeds for SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue. The SE quadrant was a low-lying riparian landform with a large drainage extending south through the area (see attached elevation map). No shovel probes were placed in this quadrant. Based upon the results of the shovel probes and a first-hand visual inspection of the project area, INDOT, CRO concurs with the November 23, 2015 field results and agree that no additional archaeological investigation is needed due to these recorded disturbances.

Jackson, Christopher
2015 A Phase Ia Archaeological Literature Review and Reconnaissance Survey for the Proposed Intersection Improvement and Roundabout at the Intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Ave, White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. Draft on file at the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Please let us know if we can provide any additional information or if you have any other concerns regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Jeff

Jeff Laswell
Archaeologist
INDOT Environmental Services
Cultural Resources Office
100 N. Senate Ave. IGCN - Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana
46204-2216
(317) 233-2093

From: Miller, Shaun (INDOT)
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2016 7:43 AM
To: Carmanygeorge, Karstin M <KCarmangyGeorge2@indot.IN.gov>; mbeck@crossroadengineers.com
Cc: Kennedy, Mary <MKENNEDY@indot.IN.gov>; Barnes, Taylor N < >; Gearlds, Nicole <NGearlds@indot.IN.gov>; Laswell, Jeffrey <JLaswell@indot.IN.gov>
Subject: RE: Des. 1296847 Effect Finding for Strawtown Ave. / SR 37 Intersection Improvement Project Revised Finding for review

Hi Mark,

Attached is an email message from the Delaware Tribe that was received post-106 consultation. Their THPO questions why no shovel probes were dug considering that a historic Delaware village is known to have been in the vicinity of the project.
Hi Shaun,

I'm reviewing the archaeological survey for the SR 37/Strawtown Ave. Intersection Improvement Project and I had a question before I sent our formal response. My concern is that the survey concluded that the project will have no adverse effect on historic properties however this determination was made based on a literature review and visual inspection without shovel testing. Given the proximity to the historic Strawtown Delaware village and the prehistoric resources nearby I was very surprised that no shovel testing was performed. I see in the report that most of the project will occur in the right of way and that much of the APE is steeply sloped and probably disturbed but I wonder if you could give me your thoughts on the need for subsurface testing. At this point I feel like we should do some subsurface testing but I don't want to recommend it without a little more information.

Best Wishes,
Brice Obermeyer
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Office
Roosevelt Hall, Rm 212
1 Kellog Drive
Emporia, KS 66801
Public Notice
Des. No. 1296847

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) is planning to undertake an intersection improvement project, funded in part by the Federal Highway Administration. The project involves the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue. The project is located in the Town of Strawtown in White River Township, Hamilton County, Indiana. The project sponsor is INDOT.

The existing intersection is a two-way stop along Strawtown Ave, requiring no stop along SR 37. All directions have a single approach lane. SR 37 is a two-lane highway providing one lane in each direction, approximately 12.5-foot wide each with a 10-foot aggregate shoulder on each side. Approaching the intersection from the south on SR 37, the shoulder is 3.5 feet on the west side, widening to a 10-foot wide shoulder 150 feet south of the intersection. Strawtown Avenue is a two-lane road providing one lane in each direction, approximately 17-foot wide each with no shoulder on either side. The existing pavement on both roadways is asphalt.

Land uses in the vicinity of the intersection improvement project are primarily residential and commercial properties with the White River directly north of the intersection. The terrain throughout the project area is flat, and the vegetative coverage includes landscape lawns and forest.

The SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue project will include the acquisition of some limited right-of-way within the boundary of the APE. The proposed project will result in physical changes along the project alignment and visual changes within the viewshed. The project will likely not result in aural and vibratory effects.

The proposed action impacts items listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The Federal Highway Administration has issued a “No Adverse Effect” Finding for the project, due to the fact that this project will not adversely affect any historic properties within the area of potential effects of the project. In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, the views of the public are being sought regarding the effect of the proposed project on the historic elements as per 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e) and 800.6(a)(4). Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6(a)(4), the documentation specified in 36 CFR 800.11(e) is available for inspection at the address listed below. This documentation serves as the basis for the Federal Highway Administration’s “No Adverse Effect” finding. The views of the public on this finding are being sought. Please reply to the contact listed below. Please reply no later than April 8, 2016.

Green 3 LLC
1104 Prospect Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46203
317.634.4110
email – karen@green3studio.com

TL9636 3/9 1t  hpxdnp
State of Indiana  )
     ) ss:
Hamilton County    )

Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for said county and state, the
undersigned Tim Timmons who, being duly sworn, says that he is Publisher of The Times
newspaper of general circulation printed and published in the English language in the city
of Noblesville in state and county afore-said, and that the printed matter attached hereto
is a true copy, which was duly published in said paper for 1 time(s), the date(s) of
publication being as follows:

3/9/2016

[Signature]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this Wednesday, March 09, 2016.

[Signature]
Notary Public

My commission expires: 05/28/2020
Jennifer Louise May
Resident of Marion County

Publisher's Fee: $114.40
Appendix E: Red Flag and Hazardous Materials
March 3, 2016

To: Hazardous Materials Unit Supervisor  
Indiana Department of Transportation  
100 N. Senate Ave., Rm. N642  
Indianapolis IN 46204

From: Mark A Beck, PE  
CrossRoad Engineers, P.C.  
3417 Sherman Dr.  
Beech Grove IN 46107  
mbeck@crossroadengineers.com

Re: Red Flag Investigation  
Des No.: 1296847  
SR 37 and Strawtown Road Intersection Improvement  
Hamilton County, Indiana

Narrative:

The location of this project is at the intersection of SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue. The project is located approximately 12.15 miles north of I69 in Strawtown and Hamilton County. The project is located within the INDOT Greenfield District. This project entails intersection improvement by removal of the stop condition on Strawtown Road by construction of a roundabout. The project will include excavation to construct the roundabout. Traffic will be maintained by use of a one way temporary traffic signal.

Land use in the vicinity of the project is a mix of wooded and residential. The West Fork of the White River runs parallel with Strawtown Road approximately 100 feet north of the road. There is wooded area in the southeast quadrant. The northwest, southwest, and northeast quadrants are primarily residential. Proposed permanent and temporary right-of-way is anticipated.
Summary:

**Infrastructure**
Indicate the number of items of concern found within ½ mile, including an explanation why each item within the ½ mile radius will/will not impact the project. If there are no items, please indicate N/A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Facilities</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Recreational Facilities</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Pipelines</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Railroads</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Managed Lands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**

**Trails:** One trail was found within the 1/2 mile search radius. A trail begins approximately 0.40 mile west of the project area, and runs west away from the project limits. Due to the distance from the project, no impact is expected.

**Managed Lands:** An area of managed lands was found within the ½ mile search radius. This area is located approximately 0.30 miles northwest of the project limits. Due to the distance from the project, no impact is expected.

**Water Resources**
Indicate the number of items of concern found within ½ mile, including an explanation why each item within the ½ mile radius will/will not impact the project. If there are no items, please indicate N/A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NWI - Points</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>NWI - Wetlands</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karst Springs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>IDEM 303d Listed Lakes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Structures – Historic</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI - Lines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Floodplain - DFIRM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM 303d Listed Rivers and Streams (Impaired)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cave Entrance Density</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers and Streams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sinkhole Areas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Routes - Historic</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Sinking-Stream Basins</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation**

**NWI – Wetlands:** There are six wetlands shown within ½ mile radius of the project. The closest wetland appears to be 300 feet northwest of the project area. A Waters of the US Report was
approved by INDOT ES Ecology on November 6, 2015. No areas meeting wetland criteria were observed within the proposed project area.

Lakes: There are two lakes shown within the ½ mile radius. The closest lake is 0.45 miles northwest of the project area. Due to the distance from the project it will not be impacted by the project.

NWI Lines: The West Fork of the White River is located within ½ mile radius just north of the project and has a defined wetland line. It is not within the project limits, and will not be impacted by the project.

Floodplain – DFIRM: The project is located within a floodplain as shown in the FIRM maps of the project area. The floodplain will be affected by the project. The approved Waters of the US Report indicates that the West Fork of the White River is regulated as a water of the United States. Coordination with INDOT ES Ecology and Permits will occur.

IDEM 303d Listed Rivers and Streams (Impaired): The West Fork of the White River is listed as impaired with E. Coli and PCBs in fish tissue. A 303d listed river for E. Coli traverses north of the project area. Workers who are working in or near water with E. Coli should take care to wear proper PPE, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure. It is not anticipated that work will be required within the West Fork of the White River.

Rivers and Streams: The West Fork of White River is within the ½ mile radius, and will not be affected by the project. An unnamed tributary to the West Fork of the White River runs through the project limits, and may be affected by the project. The approved Waters of the US Report indicates this unnamed tributary is regulated as a water of the United States. Coordination with INDOT ES Ecology and Permits will occur. The White River is on the National Park Service (NPS) National Rivers Inventory. Early Coordination letters were sent to NPS and USDA on February 25, 2015. No response was received from either agency.

### Mining/Mineral Exploration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines – Surface</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines – Underground</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation

Petroleum Wells: Three petroleum wells were identified within the 0.5 mile radius. The nearest well is located 0.23 mile northwest of the project area. No impact is anticipated.
Petroleum Fields: The project is located within an outlined petroleum field per IndianaMAP that encompasses a large area of east-central Indiana. No impacts to this field are anticipated.

### Hazmat Concerns

Indicate the number of items of concern found within ½ mile, including an explanation why each item within the ½ mile radius will/will not impact the project. If there are no items, please indicate N/A:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazmat Concerns</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Hazmat Concerns</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Restricted Waste Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Action Sites (RCRA)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Septage Waste Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined Feeding Operations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Solid Waste Landfills</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Demolition Waste</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>State Cleanup Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Waste Sites (RCRA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Tire Waste Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Waste Transfer Stations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon/Surface Impoundments</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>RCRA Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Sites (TSDs)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUSTs)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Underground Storage Tanks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Gas Plant Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Voluntary Remediation Program</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES Facilities</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Superfund</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES Pipe Locations</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Institutional Control Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Dump Sites</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation**

Underground Storage Tanks: There is 1 underground storage tank (non-leaking) located within the ½ mile radius of the project. It is located approximately 0.30 miles south of the project limits. Due to the distance from the project, it is not anticipated to be affected by the project.

**Ecological Information**

Early Coordination with IDNR was completed and they responded in a March 25, 2015 letter that they checked the Natural Heritage program’s data. The letter stated that there are 6 species of mussels documented within a ½ mile of the project area. Two are federally and state endangered, one is federally threatened and state endangered, and three are of state special concern. The letter also stated that IDNR does not foresee any impacts to the mussels resulting from the project.

The Hamilton County listing of the Indiana Natural Heritage Data information on endangered, threatened, or rare (ETR) species and high quality natural communities is attached with ETR species highlighted.
Early Coordination with USFWS was completed and they responded in a March 04, 2015 email that the area is in the range of the federally listed Indiana bat and the proposed-to-be-listed northern long-eared bat. If tree-clearing stays within 75 feet of the existing pavement, then the project will fall under the programmatic policy. It is anticipated that clearing will stay within 75 feet of the existing pavement.

Cultural Resources

This project is subject to full Section 106 Coordination requirements and concerns will be addressed in that section of the Environmental Document when completed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Include recommendations from each section. If there are no recommendations, please indicate N/A:

INFRASTRUCTURE: n/a

WATER RESOURCES:
Floodplain - DFIRM: The floodplain is located in or near the project limits. A Waters of the US Report has been completed and coordination with INDOT ES Ecology and Permits will occur.

Rivers and Streams: An unnamed tributary to the West Fork of the White River runs through the project area. A Waters of the US Report has been completed and indicates that this unnamed tributary is regulated as a water of the United States. Coordination with INDOT ES Ecology and Permits will occur. The White River is on the National Park Service (NPS) National Rivers Inventory. Early Coordination has also occurred with NPS and the USDA.

IDEM 303d Listed Rivers and Streams (Impaired): The West Fork of the White River is listed as impaired with E. Coli and PCBs in fish tissue. Workers who are working in or near water with E Coli should take care to wear proper PPE, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure.

MINING/MINERAL EXPLORATION: n/a

HAZMAT CONCERNS: n/a

ECOLOGICAL INFORMATION: Early coordination with USFWS was completed and they responded in a March 04, 2015 email that the area is in the range of the federally listed Indiana bat and the proposed-to-be-listed northern long-eared bat. If tree-clearing stays within 75 feet of the existing pavement, then the project will fall under the programmatic policy. The project will keep clearing within 75 feet of the existing pavement.
CULTURAL RESOURCES: *This project is subject to full Section 106 Coordination requirements and concerns will be addressed in that section of the Environmental Document when completed.*

INDOT Environmental Services concurrence: __________________________ (Signature)

Prepared by:

Mark A. Beck
CrossRoad Engineers, P.C.

**Graphics:**

A map for each report section with a ½ mile radius buffer around all project area(s) showing all items identified as possible items of concern is attached. If there is not a section map included, please change the YES to N/A:
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## Indiana County Endangered, Threatened and Rare Species List

### County: Hamilton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>FED</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>GRANK</th>
<th>SRANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mollusk: Bivalvia (Mussels)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiblasma torulosa rangiana</td>
<td>Northern Rifflershell</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G2T2</td>
<td>SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiblasma triguetra</td>
<td>Snufbox</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamellis fasciola</td>
<td>Wavyrayed Lampmussel</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liguria recta</td>
<td>Black Sandshell</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obovaria subrotunda</td>
<td>Round Hickorynut</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plethobasus cyphus</td>
<td>Sheepnose</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleurobema clava</td>
<td>Clubshead</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptychobranchus fasciolaris</td>
<td>Kidneyshell</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G4G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica</td>
<td>Rabbitsfoot</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G3G4T3</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxolasma lividus</td>
<td>Purple Lilliput</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G3</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villosa fabalis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villosa lienosa</strong></td>
<td>Little Spectaclecase</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insect: Odonata (Dragonflies &amp; Damselflies)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enallagma divagans</td>
<td>Turquoise Bluet</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acris crepitans blanchardi</td>
<td>Northern Cricket Frog</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necturus maculosus</td>
<td>Common mudpuppy</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana pipiens</td>
<td>Northern Leopard Frog</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemmys guttata</td>
<td>Spotted Turtle</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistrurus catenatus catenatus</td>
<td>Eastern Massasauga</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G3G4T3T4Q</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bird</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartramia longicauda</td>
<td>Upland Sandpiper</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteo lineatus</td>
<td>Red-shouldered Hawk</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certhia americana</td>
<td>Brown Creeper</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendroica cerulea</td>
<td>Cerulean Warbler</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</td>
<td>Bald Eagle</td>
<td>LT , PDL</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixobrychus exilis</td>
<td>Least Bittern</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanius ludovicianus</td>
<td>Loggerhead Shrike</td>
<td>No Status</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>S3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nycticorax nycticorax</td>
<td>Black-crowned Night-heron</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thryomanes bewickii</td>
<td>Bewick's Wren</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxidea taxus</td>
<td>American Badger</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vascular Plant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armoracia aquatica</td>
<td>Lake Cress</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G4?</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelone obliqua var. speciosa</td>
<td>Rose Turtlehead</td>
<td>WL</td>
<td>G4T3</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drosera intermedia</td>
<td>Spoon-leaved Sundew</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platanthera leucophaea</td>
<td>Prairie White-fringed Orchid</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>G2G3</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>FED</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>GRANK</td>
<td>SRANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Natural Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest - floodplain wet-mesic</td>
<td>Wet-mesic Floodplain Forest</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest - upland mesic</td>
<td>Mesic Upland Forest</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>G3?</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**
- LE = Endangered; LT = Threatened; C = candidate; PDL = proposed for delisting
- SE = state endangered; ST = state threatened; SR = state rare; SSC = state species of special concern
- SX = state extirpated; SG = state significant; WL = watch list
- GRANK: Global Heritage Rank: G1 = critically imperiled globally; G2 = imperiled globally; G3 = rare or uncommon globally; G4 = widespread and abundant globally but with long term concerns; G5 = widespread and abundant globally; G7 = unranked; GX = extinct; Q = uncertain rank; T = taxonomic subunit rank
- SRANK: State Heritage Rank: S1 = critically imperiled in state; S2 = imperiled in state; S3 = rare or uncommon in state; G4 = widespread and abundant in state but with long term concern; SG = state significant; SH = historical in state; SX = state extirpated; B = breeding status; S7 = unranked; SNR = unranked; SNA = nonbreeding status unranked
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITE VISIT FORM

Des # 1296847          Project # 1296847
Road # SR 37 and Strawtown Rd. Type of Road Project Intersection improvement

Description of area (either general location or exact location of parcel)
Intersection located within Strawtown, approx. 4.5 miles north of Noblesville on SR 37.

Person completing this Field Check: Mark Beck

1. Has a Red Flag Investigation been completed? X Yes □ No

Notes:

2. Right-of-Way Requirements:
□ No New ROW □ Strip ROW □ Minor Take X Whole Parcel Take □ Information Not Available

Notes: Roundabout to be constructed.

3. Land Use History and Development: (Industrial, Light Industry, Commercial, Agricultural, Residential, Other – also, indicate source of data: visual inspection, aerial photos, U.S.G.S. topo maps, etc.)

Setting (rural or urban): Rural / suburban

Current Land Uses: Roadway, front yards, wooded

Previous Land Uses: Roadway front yards, wooded

Adjacent Land Uses: Wooded, homes

Describe any structures on the property: One two-story home to be removed (SW corner)

4. Visual Inspection: Property Adjoining Property Property Adjoining Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storage Structures</th>
<th>Underground Tanks</th>
<th>Surface Tanks</th>
<th>Transformers</th>
<th>Sumps</th>
<th>Ponds/Lagoons</th>
<th>Drums</th>
<th>Basins</th>
<th>Landfills</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Contamination</th>
<th>Junkyard</th>
<th>Auto Graveyard</th>
<th>Surface Staining</th>
<th>Oil Sheen</th>
<th>Odors</th>
<th>Vegetation Damage</th>
<th>Dumps</th>
<th>Fill Dirt Evidence</th>
<th>Vent pipes or fill pipes</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Is a Phase I, Initial Site Assessment required? □ Yes X No
Appendix F: Water Resources
This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.
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INTRODUCTION

DELINEATION REQUESTED BY:

Company Name: Crossroad Engineers, PC.
Contact Person: Mr. Mark Beck
Address: 3417 Sherman Drive
City: Beech Grove State: IN Zip: 46107
Phone: 317/ 780-1555 Email: mbeck@crossroadengineers.com
Project Name: State Road 37 & Strawtown Road Interchange Improvement
INDOT Des#: 1296847

SITE LOCATION:

County: Hamilton
Civil Township: White River Section: SE 1/4 3
Township: 18 North Range: 5 East Quad: Riverwood, IN
Directions: SR 37 at Strawtown Road, in Strawtown
Watershed: Upper White River; 8-Digit HUC#: 05120201
Lat/Long: 85°56'33.8825"W 40°7'24.9543"N
Field Review Dates: June 4, 2015

Executed by: Randy Jones 151 North Home Avenue
             AquaTerra Consulting, Inc. Franklin, IN 46131
             (317) 502-7897 (phone) (866) 827-5608 (fax)

Signed: [Signature]

Wetland Delineation Report
Des#: 1296847
METHODS

A wetland delineation of existing conditions, according to the procedures of the US Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual (Midwest Regional Supplement), was conducted in June, 2015. Sample points were chosen to represent predominant features of the project area, including representative points. Existing mapping resources, including USGS topographic maps, National Wetland Inventory maps, aerial photographs, and the Hamilton County Soil Survey were also used to provide frame of reference.

RESULTS/DISCUSSION

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

1. **Topography:** The topography at the site is fairly rolling, generally slopes to the creek channel on southeast quad and to the White River to the north. Slopes range from 0-18%. Road embankments are fairly steep and the top of the road lies 5-10 feet above the surrounding landscape.

2. **Existing Land-Use:** The existing land use at the site is a mix of residential maintained lawns, with some riparian forest.

3. **Plant Communities:** Vegetation in the forested area of the site is dominated by Box Elder (FAC), walnut (FACU), and honey locust (FACU) trees and shrubs, with primarily wetland herbaceous species in the understory, including impatiens (FACW), stinging nettle (FACW), and white avens (FAC). Right-of-way areas adjacent to the roadway are maintained lawn.

4. **Soils:** Soils mapped in the project area according to the Hamilton County Soil Survey include the Somewhat Poorly Drained Shoals Silt Loam (Sh), and Fox Clay Loam (FxC3), neither mapped soil is listed as a hydric soil, according to NRCS. See Appendices for details.

5. **Hydrology:** Hydrology appears to be driven by runoff from roadway areas to roadside ditches, draining through culverts to the north to White River. An intermittent tributary channel is present on the southeast side of the site, which originates from the southeast, and enters a culvert pipe under Strawtown Road, and empties to the White River.

   The eastern portion of site is mapped within a the 100 year floodway, according to the DFIRM map.

6. **Existing Wetland Mapping:** No potential wetlands are mapped at the site, according to the US Fish & Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory (NWI) map.

7. **Watershed:** Upper White River; 8-Digit HUC#: 05120201.
SITE CONDITIONS

According to www.weather.com, the Noblesville, IN area experienced approximately 1.87 inches of precipitation in the week previous to the site inspection. No precipitation was recorded in the 24 hours prior to the site inspection. Site conditions were typical for this time of year. Water levels in the un-named tributary were near the Ordinary High Water Mark.

BACKGROUND

The project site consists of an intersection of State Road 37 and Strawtown Road, and associated right-of-way areas. The existing intersection is proposed to be reconstructed.

FINDINGS

Three Sample Points (A1, A2, & B1), representative of dominant conditions, were chosen to represent conditions at the site. Sample points were mapped using a GPS unit and exported to ArcGIS.

Areas on the west side of the site are fully dominated by residential lawn areas, no wetland indicators were observed. A small roadside drainage ditch is present on the southwest quadrant, which enters a culvert under Strawtown Road and empties to the White River on the north side. This ditch supports ephemeral flow, following storm events, and appears to have been excavated in upland areas to provide drainage only for the roadway and immediately adjacent areas. It is lined with concrete.

The northeast quadrant contains side-slopes of the road embankment, transitioning into a small wooded/scrub riparian area adjacent to the White River. The area with the project site lies 8-10 feet above the Ordinary High Water Mark of the White River. No hydric soils and no hydrophytic vegetation were observed in this area. Vegetation dominated by crown vetch (UPL), and honey locust (FACU) trees & shrubs. The culvert pipe outlet for the un-named tributary discharges to the White River in this area. No wetland indicators were observed. This area is represented by Sample Point B1.

The southeast quadrant contains a wooded area adjacent to the channel of an un-named tributary to the White River. The channel of the tributary enters a culvert under Strawtown Road, and discharges to the White River to the north. The stream channel is approximately 3-4 feet wide at the Ordinary High Water Mark, and appears to support intermittent flow. The substrate in this area is dominated by rip-rap and cobble; no riffle/pool features were observed. Water level in the channel was at or
near to the Ordinary High Water Mark at the time of the inspection. A road-side ditch is present on the east side, and empties to the culvert. This ditch supports ephemeral flow, following storm events, and appears to have been excavated in upland areas to provide drainage only for the roadway and immediately adjacent areas. It is lined with rip-rap.

The wooded area, represented by Sample Point A1, slopes from the road embankment to the channel of the un-named tributary. The areas immediately adjacent to the stream channel contain a plant community typically associated with riparian areas, and is slightly dominated by wetland species, including: box elder (FAC), walnut (FACU), and white mulberry (FAC) trees, bush honeysuckle (UPL) and box elder (FAC) shrubs, with primarily wetland herbaceous species in the understory, including impatiens (FACW), stinging nettle (FACW), and white avens (FAC). Soil features in the test pit did not display any hydric indicators. The stream channel appears to flood out of bank occasionally, but appears to drain rapidly through the culvert pipe; no evidence of sustained saturation or inundation was evident. No wetland areas adjacent to the stream channel were observed.

Open/meadow areas of the right-of-way on the southeast quadrant are represented by Sample Point A2, and are dominated by law grasses and weeds, including bluegrass (FAC), perennial rye (FACU), fescue (FACU), clover (FACU), and dandelion (FACU). No hydric soil indicators and no indicators of wetland hydrology were observed.

CONCLUSIONS

The channel of the un-named tributary to the White River, located in the southeast project quadrant, below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM), is regulated as a “water of the United States”. The roadsides ditches on the southeast and southwest quadrants appear to have been excavated in upland areas for localized drainage, and do not appear to be “waters of the United States”. No areas meeting wetland criteria were observed within the proposed project area.

Although this report collaborates evidence from on-site conditions, available site maps, aerial photography, and other sources, and asserts a jurisdictional claim based on this evidence, final jurisdictional status and corresponding permit requirements remains with the US Army Corps of Engineers and/or the Indiana Department of Environmental Management.

Maps were removed from report. Duplicates can be found in Appendix B.
The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:15,800.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Hamilton County, Indiana
Survey Area Data: Version 16, Sep 9, 2015

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Sep 17, 2011—Mar 10, 2012

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.
## Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FxC3</td>
<td>Fox clay loam, 8 to 18 percent slopes, severely eroded</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HeF</td>
<td>Hennepin loam, 18 to 50 percent slopes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MmB2</td>
<td>Miami silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, eroded</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MmC2</td>
<td>Miami silt loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MmD2</td>
<td>Miami silt loam, 12 to 18 percent slopes, eroded</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OcA</td>
<td>Ockley silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Shoals silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded, brief duration</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Area of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark,

Thank you for your inquiry. This project is very close the White River north of Noblesville and the roundabout would be of concern for Citizens during its construction. During construction, best management practices should be employed on the site to ensure that nothing leaves the site, especially a spill or release that might impact any drainage that would flow to the White River. In the case of an emergency that might impact the White River, we would request that you contact Chris Barron from Citizens Water immediately at 317-750-5019.

We appreciate notification of the upcoming project and request that extra emphasis and oversight of best management practices that will be utilized to prevent any environmental impact.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Thank you.

Cheryl Carlson

Cheryl Carlson
Manager, Environmental Compliance
2150 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street
Indianapolis, IN  46202
V:(317)429-3569|C:(317)213-2044
ccarlson@citizensenergygroup.com

Cheryl,

We are working on a project for the Indiana Department of Transportation at this intersection. We have received correspondence from IDEM Wellhead indicating that our project is within a source water assessment area. We are to either provide justification that this project will not affect the area, or if it will, discussion of what management practices would be required. If you could, please provide a map of the area, and if you feel that the area may be affected by this project, any management practices we would need to make sure that the contractor would need to follow.

I've included the letter from IDEM, and also a conceptual drawing of the proposed project.

If you have any questions, please just let me know!

Thank you,

Mark
Appendix G: Public Involvement
February 11, 2015
NOTICE OF PROJECT

RE: Project and Survey Notification
Intersection of State Road 37 and Strawtown Avenue
Hamilton County, IN

Dear Property Owner:

Our information indicates that you own or occupy property near this proposed intersection improvement project. CrossRoad Engineers, P.C. will be doing a survey of the project area in the near future. It may be necessary to come onto your property to complete this work. This is allowed by law by Indiana Code IC 8-23-7-26. We will show you identification, if you are available, before coming onto the property. If you have sold this property, or it is occupied by someone else, please let us know the name and address of the new owner or current occupant so we can contact them about the survey.

At this stage we generally do not know exactly what effect, if any, our project may eventually have on your property. As we continue with the development of the project, we will continue to keep property owners and the general public informed on the schedule and project details.

The survey work will include mapping the location of features such as trees, buildings, fences and drives, and obtaining ground elevations. The survey is needed for the proper planning and design of this roadway improvements project. Please be assured of our sincere desire to cause you as little inconvenience as possible during this survey. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address shown below.

Sincerely yours,

Trent E. Newport, P. E., L. S.
Vice-President
Tuesday, August 23, 2016

Dear Local Resident, Interested Citizen, and Elected / Local Public Official:

Welcome to the Indiana Department of Transportation’s (INDOT) Public Hearing regarding a proposed intersection improvement project on S.R. 37 at Strawtown Avenue, approximately 6 miles north of SR 32 / SR 38 located in Hamilton County.

The purpose of this public hearing is to offer the community the opportunity to comment on the environmental document and preliminary design plans for the proposed roundabout intersection improvement treatment. INDOT welcomes the opportunity to meet with the community during this public hearing and looks forward to continued community engagement.

There are several ways your comments may be presented this evening and over the next several weeks. You may submit comments in the following manner:

1. Complete a comment form and return it to an INDOT representative attending the public hearing. Comment forms are available at the sign-in table.

2. Mail your comments to the INDOT Office of Public Involvement, Attention Rickie Clark, 100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204; PHONE (317) 232-6601. INDOT respectfully requests comments be submitted by Friday, September 9, 2016.

3. Participate during the Public Comment Session and have your comments recorded for inclusion into the official hearings transcript / public record.

4. Comments may also be e-mailed to the INDOT Office of Public Involvement at: rclark@indot.in.gov.

5. Contact the INDOT Greenfield District Office Customer Service Center at 1-855-4636848 eastcentralin@indot.in.gov should you have questions regarding this project and/or other INDOT projects in East Central Indiana.


All public comments submitted during this evening’s comment session and during the public comment period will be included in the official hearing transcript (public record) and will be reviewed, evaluated and given full consideration by INDOT officials.

Thank you for attending tonight’s public hearing.
Intersection Improvement Project
SR 37 at Strawtown Avenue
Hamilton North Public Library
Tuesday, Aug. 23, 2016

Public Hearing
- Sign-in at attendance table to be added to project mailing list
- A public hearing notice was mailed to known property owners within project area
- Announcement of this hearing was posted to INDOT website. A media release was also issued.
- A copy of presentation and project documentation is available on-line via INDOT website
- Legal notice publishing:
  - The Times (Noblesville)
    - Thursday, Aug. 4 & Thursday, Aug. 11

Welcome
- Rickie Clark, INDOT Office of Public Involvement
- Purpose/explanation of public hearing
  - Intersection Improvement, SR 37 at Strawtown Avenue, 6 miles north of SR 32/SR 38, Hamilton Co
- Public hearing format
- Visit our sign-in table
- Informational handouts
- Submitting public comments for hearings transcript
- Project display area

Project Stakeholders
- Indiana Department of Transportation
- Indiana Division, Federal Highway Administration
- Hamilton County
- Elected & local officials
- Community residents & citizens
- Commuters
- Businesses
- Emergency services
- Schools

Welcome
- Introduction of INDOT Project Team
  - Project Management
  - Public Involvement
  - Greenfield District - INDOT Regional Office
  - Environmental Services
  - Real Estate
  - CrossRoad Engineers
    - Design Team
  - Recognition of elected & local public officials

Project Development Process

G-3
Requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- Requires INDOT to analyze and evaluate the impacts of a proposed project to the natural and socio-economic environments
- Impacts are described in environmental document
- Environmental document released for public involvement
  - June 2016
  - Is available for review via public repositories

Environmental Process
- Establish Purpose & Need
  - Develop a number of possible alternatives
    - The "Do Nothing" alternative is a baseline for comparison
  - Evaluate and screen alternatives
  - Identify a preferred alternative
  - Solicit public comment on environmental document and preliminary design plan
  - Solicit, address and fully consider public comment as a part of decision-making process
  - Finalize and approve environmental document

Project Overview
- Safety Project
- Intersection Improvement
  - Purpose and Need:
    - To improve safety at the intersection by improving sight distance and reducing speed at the intersection.
    - Accident data suggest significant number of right angle collisions due to Strawtown Avenue traffic crossing or turning onto SR 37.
    - Speed limit was lowered from 55 mph to 40 mph in 2014; however high speeds continue at this intersection.

Environmental Documentation
- No Build
  - Would not improve safety at intersection
  - New four-way traffic signal
    - Is a feasible alternative
    - Does not improve the sight distance at intersection
    - Allows for high speeds & possibility of right angle crashes
    - Improves traffic flow on SR 37
- Roundabout
  - Meets purpose & need of project
  - Enhances safety at intersection
  - Reduces speed at intersection while contributing towards efficient traffic flow
  - Reduces severity of vehicular collisions
  - Addresses sight distance

A number of items are evaluated
- Right-of-way
- Streams, wetlands, and other waters
- Floodplains
- Endangered species
- Farmland
- Cultural resources (Historic/archaeological)
- Parks and recreational lands (Trails)
- Air quality
- Noise
- Community impacts
- Environmental justice
- Hazardous materials
- Permits
- Mitigation
- Public involvement
- Commercial development
Roundabout Alternative
- INDOT Preferred Alternative

What is NOT a Roundabout?
- Traffic circle
  - Stop control or signalized
  - D Circle, Washington, D.C.
  - Monument Circle – Indianapolis
- Rotary
  - Common in New England states
  - Entering traffic has right-of-way

What is a Roundabout?
- One-way circular intersection
- Traffic flows counter-clockwise around a center island
- Yield at entrance
- No Parking
- No “activity” in center island

Roundabouts
U.S. DOT Federal Highway Administration Statistics
- Traditional intersections account for:
  - 45% of all crashes – FHWA
  - 33% of all traffic fatalities – FHWA
- Compared to traditional intersections roundabouts:
  - Reduce fatalities and injuries by 82% – FHWA
  - Reduce total crashes by 44% – FHWA
  - Require vehicles to travel at lower speeds

For more information:
http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/

Roundabouts Enhance Safety
- Collisions at traditional intersections are severe because:
  - High speed
  - Angle of impact
Roundabouts Enhance Safety

- Conflict points are dramatically reduced because all vehicles travel in the same direction.

Intersection Accident History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Total</th>
<th>Crash Type</th>
<th>Crash Severity (Fatality Type)</th>
<th>Number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-3A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-4A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-3A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- All six and collisions on the located test intersection may be divided as a pedestrian struck and 
  involved in an impact.
- If four and vehicles involving a vehicle struck a vehicle and 3-4A involving a pedestrian are
  involved in an impact.
- If a vehicle involved in 3-4A involving a vehicle struck a vehicle struck a vehicle as a result of
testing an impact.

Traffic Patterns - PM Peak

Truck Turning Movements - NB

Truck Turning Movements - SB

Truck Turning Movements - EB
- "Uniform Act of 1970"
  - All federal, state, and local governments must comply
  - Requires an offer for just compensation
- Acquisition Process
  - Appraisals
  - Review appraisals
  - Negotiations
- INDOT Real Estate Team to work with impacted property owners
**Real Estate Impact**

- **Right-of-way**
  - Permanent R/W: 0.06 acre
  - Residential
  - Temporary R/W: 0.2 acre
  - Residential
  - Project proposes removal of building in southwest quadrant of intersection
  - Proposed residential relocation

**Submit Public Comments**

- Submit public comments using the options described in first page of information packet:
  - Public Comment Form
  - Via e-mail
  - Participating during public comment session via microphone
  - Verbal comments recorded and transcribed for inclusion into public hearing transcript

INDOT respectfully requests comments be submitted by Friday, Sept. 9, 2016.

All comments submitted will become part of public record, entered into transcript, reviewed, evaluated and given full consideration during decision-making process.

**Project Schedule**

- Public Hearing: 8/23/16
- Public comments requested by COB 9/9/16
- INDOT review and consideration of comments; finalize environmental document and design; reach project decision – Fall 2016
- Real estate acquisition phase – 2017
- Construction: 2018

**Next Steps**

- Public and project stakeholder input
  - Submit comments via options described on page 1 of information packet

INDOT review and evaluation
  - All comments are given full consideration during decision-making process
  - Address comments, finalize/approve environmental document, complete project design

Communicate a decision
  - INDOT will notify project stakeholders of decision
  - Work through local media, social media outlets; paid legal notice
  - Make project documents accessible via repositories

Questions? Contact Public Involvement Team

**Feedback**

- INDOT would like to hear from you
  - Talk with INDOT project team members
  - Comment sheet in Information packet
  - E-mail or mail comments to INDOT
  - Sign-in list to be added to project mailing list
  - Visit INDOT Greenfield District page at [http://www.indot.in.gov/indot/gfd.htm](http://www.indot.in.gov/indot/gfd.htm) and project webpage at [http://www.indot.in.gov/indot/3573.htm](http://www.indot.in.gov/indot/3573.htm)
  - All comments are very much appreciated and will be given full consideration by the project team

**Public Involvement Team**

- Rickie Clark
  - INDOT Office of Public Involvement
  - (317) 232-6501
  - rclark@indot.in.gov

- Chris Myers
  - Communications Director
  - INDOT Greenfield District Office
  - (855) 463-6848
  - eastcentralin@indot.in.gov
Thank You

- Please visit with INDOT project officials following the public comment session
- Project Open House
  - Project maps, displays, real estate acquisition table, INDOT project team, and informal Q & A
  - INDOT Greenfield District page: http://www.in.gov/indot/2704.htm
  - Project webpage: http://www.in.gov/indot/3573.htm

Public Comment Session
- Conflict points are dramatically reduced because all vehicles travel in the same direction.
Thank you for attending this public hearing regarding proposed intersection improvement. Please submit comments by using the space provided below. INDOT appreciates your attendance and participation this evening. INDOT respectfully requests comments be submitted by Friday, September 9, 2016 for inclusion into the official hearings transcript / public record.

TODAY’S DATE: Tuesday, August 23, 2016

COMMENT:

SIGNATURE:
SR 37 and Strawtown Avenue Proposed Intersection Improvement Project Public Hearing

Tuesday, August 23, 2016
6:00pm

Hamilton North Public Library
209 West Brinton Street
Cicero, IN 46034

Deon Hodson – Ok, if you’re coming across that bridge........there’s ice on the road, you’re in a semi........you’re driving 40 miles per hour, you’re not going to stop........you’re going to go right through the middle of that........that roundabout. Another thing, you’re not going to do this until 2018. If you’re on Strawtown Avenue and you’re going east......when you pull up to State Road 37.......you cannot see either direction. If you’re looking south........there’s a small curve .............its private property there........its MIC Garage.............there’s trees there that need to be trimmed........one of them is dead. If you’re looking north.......there’s an island in the river there......the trees have grown up there...you can’t see looking north. So if you’re not going to do this until 2018, trim the trees out for safety until then. Also I think.........and this is just my opinion..........put up........not a stop light there but rather a red blinking light on Strawtown Avenue going east and west....... then have a yellow caution going north and south from about a quarter of a mile in each direction on 37 ...............have a yellow flasher on top of the speed limit. They don’t slow down........and put a state cop of there about every other day and let them wrote a boat load of tickets................that’s it, that’s all I have to say. I’m sorry, I have one more comment.....on that bridge, there’s a big old hole in the middle of the intersection near the bridge........they’ve patched about ten times.......and I came through there tonight and if I had hit it I would have had a flat tire. It needs to be fixed properly.

Bill Penn – My wife and I own property over in the northeast corner of the intersection here........we’ve seen two accidents at this location........we’ve been first response too many times........ok. Years ago after a very bad accident........Sheriff Carter, Doug Carter was out there........I talked with him and at that time, I said why don’t they put up a caution light or something to warn people because we see people all the time going eastbound and westbound........and they don’t even stop. I don’t what causes this........maybe some type of brain malfunction but we see them run this all of the time and quite occasionally there’s just been very severe accidents there. Well Sheriff Carter told me years ago that INDOT’s thinking was.....that caution lights will cause people to get on their brakes and they slide across the bridge and crash
more often. Well there’s a solution to that problem you know.........INDOT has salt, they have calcium chloride........get out there and put it down........put it down. There’s good weather forecasting now.......they know when this weather is coming in.........get it out there........get the ice off the bridge..........either put in larger stop signs here or put in red flashing lights........like Deon said........it’s needed. Also, yellow caution lights warning people........you know caution......ice on bridge........INDOT’s got plenty of those signs all over the place. After that bad accidents when Doug Carter told me that........people in the front can see this............this is a moose crossing sign that I put up on the telephone pole in my yard........that’s a moose skull I have up there to. It got people’s attention, it was kind of a joke but you know what........that was my way of saying that somebody needs to wake up and look here a little bit. That sign only cost me ten bucks ........didn’t cost a million dollars. So let’s get some salt down. This animation with the semis in here..........this guy in the animation is banging again the inside of the roundabout. I drive a truck for a living ..........semis don’t do well in roundabouts......the trailer trying to get through there.........I mean this is hilarious......this is a cartoon. I mean if you have low-boys coming in through here........there’s all kinds of farmers out here..........that are hauling heavy construction equipment through here........that’s a big problem, having to curve it out here. The next Cadillac that Steven Dillinger buys from Lockhart..........I don’t want to see it all dinged up from having to curve it out trying to get through this roundabout................that’s a joke folks. But this is what I’m seeing........I’m seeing a big waste of money........let’s put in some lights, let’s salt the bridge down, keep the ice off of it, give people ample warning........I’m talking about having an “Ice on Bridge” sign up here before the southbound traffic comes to the river........warn people that 40 miles per hour will be strictly enforced. I had to burn rubber coming across 37 last night .......I was coming home and some car was doing over 60 miles per hour through here...............so enforcing the laws in place is a part of this. But primarily, give people some warning........you know like I said, bigger stop signs for crying out loud........and also lights out there........that’s all I have to say.

Speaker did not give name - My husband and me farm.........we also have a business, we have a mobile home park..........we have heavy machinery and we need to use these roads and it’s impossible to safely go down there with a mobile home that’s 80ft long and you have a tractor in front pulling..........you have heavy machinery........our farm machinery is big.........we’ve got semis and I do not believe that a roundabout belongs on a state highway. It should never be on a state highway..........you can build cloverleafs ..........you should build cloverleafs if you want a safe road but this does not belong on a state highway. We have one of these roundabouts to the north........there’s three in a row on 32 east of Noblesville........there are accidents there all of the time. I don’t who in the heck give them permission to put them on a state highway. A state
highway is related to the interstate............I’ve fine with roundabouts in the cities and in towns but not on a state highway. It is dangerous and it is a waste of money. In places like Paris........they’ve taken them out because the traffic is too heavy........you can’t get on........so where the traffic is heavy, they’ve taken them out. But you need to figure out a different way........I know you spent a lot of money on this already but we are very fortunate in Noblesville to have mining, farming and industry and you need to make it easy for these truckers to get to their destinations. I don’t know what the motives are for roundabouts, maybe if you want a bedroom community and stop all the heavy traffic from coming through...........I don’t know, But I do not approve of this proposal because it’s dangerous.......it’s more dangerous than it is now. If you’re familiar with 37, it’s an open highway there now..............people drive fast........there’s nothing to stop them. Now, they can improve the highway like others have said with warning lights or shoulders on the road so you have somewhere to pull off and get over...........I would agree that there should be a light there or flasher probably...........but there should never be a roundabout........it’s a waste of money.

Sherry Johnson – I’m Sherry Johnson and my husband and I are the owners of the house located in the southeast quadrant and I have a question regarding this picture here. It shows a temporary right-of-way.........I would like to know what a temporary right-of-way is because the little arrow if pointing to the parking area of the house........ok, I want to know that and then I also have a question regarding your alternatives that you’ve considered that you say did not improve the sight distance issues at the intersection, which I think Deon addressed in his comments. However, what’s wrong with putting up a stoplight........all over places you see........the stoplight in Cicero, it says no turn on red........you’ve concerned about someone turning right on red and somebody hitting them. Any car that is coming down south on 37 and crossing that bridge over White River, unless it’s a high profile vehicle........unless it’s a van........you can’t see it........have you ever sat there at that intersection in a car heading east..............no you haven’t........I can tell. I don’t know if any of these other guys have either. But if you’re sitting there in a car and you want to cross there at Strawtown Avenue or you want to turn right there on 37 ............let’s say there’s a Toyota or something sitting there........you’re not going to see him because he is not above the concrete on the bridge. That is very, very dangerous........I’ve been a property owner living in the Strawtown area since 1976, so I know what I’m talking about................thank you. But I do want to know about this right-of-way business..............thank you. One more thing........if you have this temporary right-of-way, what happens to people’s drive and their access to their drives? How do you get in and out of the drive? Let me say this........back in 1994 when they widened State Road 37, in front of this house and they put in a right turn lane. My husband and I go to work one morning........we were living in the house at that time........we go to work and we come home and we cannot get into the drive because they decided to widen that turn in the turn lane. We as property owners did not receive any
notification. And then when they widened it, they inform us that we are encroaching on highway property........six inches of the gutter off of the house........ok, I'll sit down now, that's all I got for now........thank you.

**Speaker did not give name:** I'm this lady's better half and I can tell you how it is to have a car come off that road into the kitchen. I don't think this will help that situation out a bit. In 1998 I asked the state to give me a guardrail........I'm sorry it was in 1994..........you see that......this is why she's my better half. Now..........I can't understand..........somebody said........it might have been you or one of these other gentlemen..............said that we can control the speed through the roundabout......you have to slow down before you get there. Well if they can do that then why can't they control it for a stop sign? The way I look at it ..........it's about a million dollars difference. I understand that you all are enthusiast of building roundabouts so..........that's fine because you need something there. The intersection is very bad......I've been there plenty of times sitting there looking at cars coming on the bridge at about 60 miles an hour and I can't move across fast enough...............I mean it's a bad situation...............do I have anything else? She says I don't have anything so I think I'm done........thank you.

**Stacy Hoch:** Hi, my name is Stacy Hoch and I don't live in the intersection area but I do drive through it multiple times a day to and from work........my husband does to. We have a fifteen (15) year old whose currently practicing driving and the thought of him going through that........literally brings tears to my eyes because I've seen so many accidents in that location so I don't really care what happens..........and I'm sorry if the roundabout impacts your property but it at least needs to be a red light on 37..........I think. A complete light for everybody to stop. I'm happy with a roundabout, I don't care about the money, I'm sorry about your property but I care about my child and I don't want him to get killed at that intersection........thank you.

**Speaker did not give name:** I have a question..............if this goes forward........which I hope it does because like the roundabout but well the road be raised? I want to make a suggestion...........something that between now and 2018, we still need to have something better than what we have right now..............because I'm going to say that we have an accident there at least once a month. So let's prevent that at all cost if we can........thank you.

**Tony Wiltshire:** My name is Tony Wiltshire and I live on State Road 213 north and I can hear the accidents from my property on a regular basis. It's always been my understanding that the purpose of a roundabout........as an actual fact is to increase the traffic flow and reduce the congestion at the junction. That's not the problem we have here........the problem here is that
traffic coming from east to west and west to east just don’t realize that there is a junction there. There’s insufficient signage on the approach from east and west. I’ve witnessed on two occasions vehicles going straight across as if they didn’t even know that 37 existed. There are other issues at the junction and I think other people have already pointed it out .........if you’re in a lower vehicle coming out from the west and looking up to the north across the bridge, it is tough ...........even the guardrails there make it difficult sometimes to see over the top ...........in particular motorcycles coming down through there ..............you miss those .......so in the last six years I believe there’s been 31 accidents there and we’ve lived up there for eight years and I haven’t noticed any significant improvements of signage at that intersection ...........though we’ve had 31 accidents, one fatal. So somebody is not doing their job back at INDOT in looking at these situations. I don’t think you’ve studied well enough to understand the root cause of the problem in putting a roundabout in ...........and in my opinion, would not cure the problem.

**Diane Garrison:** Hello my name is Diane Garrison and we live right on the corner of State Road 37 and Strawtown Avenue and I do want to agree with Mr. Wiltshire ..........a major problem is the east to west traffic just running right through that stop sign. There’s really no warning ..........I mean there’s a sign about a block in a half showing a stop sign ..........that you’re coming to a stop sign. But there’s one major issue ..........there’s only one stop ......or traffic ..........I mean not a traffic light but a street light on the southwest corner. There is a street light on the northeast corner and that has been out for over two years. I have called INDOT and I was really excited the first time I called because a lady called me back and said ..........yes we’ve checked that out and it is out and we’ll have another crew come out to repair it. No one ever came to repair it and that’s been two years. I’ve called several times and so I went out ...........and I have a picture that I’ll show you before I leave ......but if you go out on Strawtown Avenue and look at that intersection at night ..........boy is it dark. It is very, very dark ..........and that’s when I’m looking west to the east and I think it’s probably even darker the other way. So that’s something that probably needs to be taken of right away because that is very dangerous ..........so I wanted to say that. But I did have another question ..........what about bicycles that go through there ..........it is major bike route.

**Carol Schmidt:** My name is Carol Schmidt and I’ve lived in the area for years ..........I grew up on that road, I don’t live there now ..........and I appreciate that you guys are looking at this because this has been a very dangerous intersection. I’ve personally have friends who were nearly killed at the intersection so this is a concern to me. I agree with the people that say something needs to be done now, I would love to see a red flasher light and a yellow flasher light on 37 immediately. The lighting would be great. Your cross ..........and I agree coming out of Strawtown and heading east bound, you have great issues because of where that stop sign is sitting at, people don’t see it ..........and if you guys would drive across it ..........have any of you
guys ever driven through the intersection.........if you drive that then you will see that where the stop sign is sitting at ..........is not appropriate. But yet........what do you do? We have lots of intersections like that throughout the county that have the stop signs sitting in such a place........that someone who is not familiar with it, is not going to see it. So my real question is what........I mean like roundabouts in certain situations.......I do not like roundabouts on the highway. I’ve heard many complaints and I have complaints myself about the two on 32 that are east of town........I’ve heard many complaints about the one at 421 and 32, in fact many people say that the congestion there is now worse after...............trying to get through that intersection is now worse afterwards........I have concerns about the congestion that this will cause during rush hour traffic........that you will have long lines.......you know even to 213 trying to get through there during high traffic times........your busy times on the road. But where else in Indiana do you guys have a roundabout on a state highway where you’re going 55 miles an hour or 60 or 70 or however fast they’re going out there........where else do you have one and has it........because I tried to contact someone and nobody responded back .............but where else do you have one on a very busy highway? State Road 32 doesn’t count right there because its already slowed down between 37 and 38.........but where do you have one and is it performing as you expected...............is it providing the necessary results without causing major other issues like traffic congestions or the other issues.

Speaker did not give name: I really do not have a comment or statement but rather a question for CrossRoads........with regard to the truck apron..........could you tell us how that truck apron joins the pavement? Is it elevated, is there are curb there or is that a smooth transition for the trailer? Also, one general question..........is this kind of a generic design for roundabouts around the state or is this a custom design because we are seeing these pop up elsewhere in the state and third question..........how much do these cost within a million dollars? Within a half million dollars?

Aaron Sheller: Hi my name is Aaron Sheller and some of the family has already spoke........we’ve lived in this area since forever........I guess looking at this intersection, my kids......our kids pass through this everyday either on a bus or with my wife.......it’s also obviously a major concern for my entire family......the safety of it and I think everybody’s said that so I’m just going keep beating bush to death........beating the horse to death. When I look at this for me, I think about rural America and I think about achieving success in rural America because we are in Hamilton County but we’re in northern Hamilton County.......we’re not in southern Hamilton County where some of the congestion issues persist. I personally chose different routes to get to destinations with and without semi traffic now so I don’t have to deal with roundabouts. Yes.......you can make that turn and I’ll agree with you 100% .....in theory you can make that turn. But it also comes down to the quality of that driver that’s driving that
semi. So a lot of my family on both this side and also the opposite side of the river..........so big questions for me are how long is this going to be shut down. In your map showing a detour map showing an alternate route taking Craig Avenue ..........I encourage all of you to take semi through there.........and figure out how that’s going to work. Now even taking a semi without the trailer would be huge challenge. Now we understand that we’re going to take our own route because we live there and we’re going to figure out a way around it. But someone whose hauling from Anderson to Cicero may not........if that’s where they hit the detour then that’s what they’re going to take and that’s not going to work. So for us.......those are the big things..........I’ve been looking at these design plans back here........this is the first I’ve seen them and I noticed the design speed is 40 miles per hour..........right there on the design template and then 35 versus the 25 you guys were projecting...............so a 40 mile an hour roundabout, single lane..........I’ve talked to my friends at work about the one at 421 and 32 and it is an absolute nightmare. I guess if we’ve not had success with these in the past...............I am however glad to hear that there could still be some changes and fine tuning to take place with this ..........and I am hearing that you will make it different to make sure we can have success...........I guess I just struggle with understanding how a million dollars is going to make it that much more successful. Left hand turns coming from northbound are going to be an absolute nightmare with a 40ft trailer on a semi and trying to have success there. So when you look at the width of the actual lanes...............so my combine is about 17 and a half feet wide.......I have Implements that I do tours with that are about 15ft wide or right at 15ft wide...........how am I supposed to get there between the curbs especially if I’ve got the combine.........do I drive up on the grass..........I’ll figure it out but specifically the really large tilling equipment.........you’re going to have a heck of a time with me not tearing up my rear end equipment on the back end...............trying to make through those turns..............have you taken into account that this rural, a rural area? This is as much a rural area as it is urban.

Tami Clark: Hi my name is Tami Clark and we live just off this intersection on Craig Avenue ........and I drive through this intersection on a daily basis multiple times so I agree that going east and west it’s very difficult to see the stop signs. They’re like right up at the intersection so if you’re not familiar with that area and you’re coming up........you see the stop sign at the last minute and you can’t get stopped. Plus as someone else has said........at night there’s no lights in that area.........it is completely dark. Given that I don’t see how a roundabout is going to help.........my concern is that it’s going to make the congestion worse and I’m concerned that there is going to be more accidents there than there is now because you have people...........granted the speed limit is 40.......but we all know that people don’t do 40..........so they’re coming through there at 60 miles per hour.......they come up on this roundabout.......if they’re not going to slow down for 40.......they’re not going to slow down for this roundabout ..........so they’re going to be flying through that roundabout...........so there’s going to be more accidents than there is now
and with semis........I don’t know what you put up for vision to give them notice.......but my concern is that they are flying down on 37 and they’re going to get to this roundabout and there’s going to be some more serious accidents than there are now. So I agree that a flasher in both directions........north, south, east and west .........to me that would be a better solution than a roundabout.

Art Hall: My name is Art Hall and my comment is directed towards your engineers........I’m sure you’re familiar with benchmarking and how important that is in comparing your design to designs from other states and localities........I’m originally from the New Jersey and still have a lot of family out there.....years ago they went through a spell of building these things.....they used to call them traffic circles, but they would build them on state highways and county highways........well New Jersey grew just like Indiana is going to grow and they’re in the process now of tearing these things out and now trying to put roads through the middle of them........double stop lights and it’s a real mess and I think........I don’t think this is really looking to the future as to what’s going to happen to State Road 37 as everything keeps moving north.

Jeanne Flanders: My name is Jeanne Flanders and there is a map down there at the Hamilton County courthouse showing 37 bypassing Strawtown coming right up to our farm........four lanes. In your map........why are those plans not being shown here with your plan?

Speaker did not give name: I’m all for roundabouts and I’m a school bus driver........I drive for Hamilton Heights and I know for a fact that one of the buses that goes through that area........two buses that go through that area........will be impacted during your construction of this........and our students will be on the bus longer because with them closing that one side........all bus drivers are going to have to completely go over to Riverwood and come back around to get to the other side or go down on the other side of the river and come back around. So I would like for you to talk to the schools transportation to see how this is going to impact your construction for our schools........also I live in Strawtown, I have the privilege of having my bus at home and in the morning when I leave, I have to leave 5 minutes earlier just because I have to sit there at that intersection, five minutes trying to turn left in the morning, in the dark........and it is true that you cannot see, even in a school bus, I cannot see the traffic coming because of those trees........and then also a bus doesn’t get going very fast, very quickly........so you’re out there just hoping and praying........so I do feel that you guys need to look at it before 2018, but also please talk to the school corporation about your construction and these detours because our
kids.........I mean in the afternoon the primary elementary kids, that route itself is an hour to an hour and a half long.......and that's a long time for little ones to be on a bus.

**Speaker did not give name:**

One thing I forgot to mention is that we need to check with FEMA as it is my understanding that State Road 37 is an emergency evacuation route in the event of an emergency if 69 is deadlocked.........people are going to be sent over to 37 and installing a roundabout here is not going to facilitate the safe movement of traffic in that instance. Has FEMA been contacted about this and what do they think about it?
August 31, 2016

Mr. Rickie Clark
Office of Public Involvement
Indiana Department of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Mr. Clark:

RG Transport is a wholly owned sister company to Red Gold, Inc. Red Gold is a full-line tomato processor headquartered in Elwood, Indiana which ships approximately 350 semi-truck loads of finished canned and bottled tomato products daily. Those shipments depart via several directions from our Alexandria Distribution Center and our processing facility in Elwood. Some of those trucks use Highway 37 and cross the Strawtown intersection.

RG Transport and Red Gold respectfully request that the proposed Strawtown roundabout be designed to eliminate load shift that occurs in other roundabouts. When semi-trailers pass through narrow roundabouts, the inside trailer tire climbs the inner roll-up curb and tilts the trailer causing goods to rock, slide and shift. Product on skids are wrapped with heavy duty shrink wrap to stabilize the merchandise during transport, but a tilted rolling trailer causes certain internal load movement that plastic wrap cannot prevent. A shifted load has to be hand stacked and fixed before it can be unloaded with a fork truck, it is an expensive exercise.

Thank you for every consideration you can give this potential problem during your design phase.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Steve Austin
Government Affairs
Thank you for attending this public hearing regarding proposed intersection improvement. Please submit comments by using the space provided below. INDOT appreciates your attendance and participation this evening. INDOT respectfully requests comments be submitted by Friday, September 9, 2016 for inclusion into the official hearings transcript / public record.

TODAY'S DATE: Tuesday, August 23, 2016

COMMENT:

My husband and I are in favor of a roundabout at 5037 and St. Andrew Avenue. We have seen many serious accidents at this dangerous intersection.

SIGNATURE: Stacy L. Rock
Clark, Rickie

From: Christine Stiles
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 4:33 PM
To: Clark, Rickie
Subject: Strawtown Ave and Highway 37 Roundabout

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

To whom it may concern:

I have a few comments with regard to the purposed roundabout at Strawtown Ave and Highway 37. It seemed to me that most of those who attended the meeting in Cicero were more in favor of a traffic signal. I thought that the concerns of the truck drivers and farmers, who would be traversing through there were quite valid. I also agree with those who expressed concern about a state highway being no place for a roundabout. I second the complaint with regard to the disruption of traffic with the single lane on 37 and the detouring of the Strawtown Ave traffic. I just have a few more comments of my own to add to what was aired at the meeting:

I know that the county/state does not view the little house on the southwest corner, which is to be demolished should the plan proceed, as an historical landmark, but I certainly do, as may a few others. This building used to be a restaurant some time ago, which catered to highway travelers. My Grandmother was the cook there. I would be interested to know more about this building's history before you smash it to rubble.

I have lived just North of this intersection my entire life, nearly 48 years, my Mother even longer. We have managed to traverse that intersection safely all these years. One fatality in the last nine years does not seem to warrant a complete 360 degree change in the infrastructure of that intersection. I think that you are underestimating the amount of accidents you will have initially simply due to the fact that drivers will not expect it. Most would not expect to see a roundabout on a state highway out in what most consider the middle of nowhere, aka the country, the rural parts, the boonies...

I think that this is also what has hindered the 40 mph zone from "catching on" as well; people just don't expect to have to slow down through there. I am in complete agreement that they should. I do my part every time I drive through there to educate the drivers behind me that the speed limit is now 40. There is not a good enough "warning system" in place for that 40 mph zone. There is only one caution sign on the approach from the South and none from the North; all that is there is the speed limit sign, which BAM! there it is, and you should already be doing 40 by the time you get to that sign. I guess the highway department expects people who don't drive through there on a regular basis to psychically know they need to be slowing to 40 in order to be in compliance when they reach the sign. I really don't think you have given that enough time or proper advisement/warning for motorists to adhere to it.

I believe you must also look at the costs of this roundabout. It seems to me that this money could be better spent elsewhere, and that a traffic signal with appropriate warning signs would be less costly and serve the same purpose to slow the flow of traffic and allow for vehicles coming off of Strawtown Ave to join that flow on 37. I feel like the state and Hamilton County in particular have gone a little roundabout crazy. Too much of a good thing becomes a bad thing. I recall another comment at the meeting regarding the removal of roundabouts in New Jersey. I feel like some owner of roundabout engineering company has teamed up with the representatives of Hamilton County to make a lot of money regardless of public opinion and protest. The general consensus of meeting attendees was that it didn't really matter what we said, the decision had already been made. That said,
these comments may fall on deaf ears, but hopefully they will be retained on record somewhere; so when it turns out to be a bad idea, at least I can say 'I told you so.'

--

Christine Stiles
Instructor, Information Technology Programming
Southwestern Michigan College
Dear Mr. Clark,

Thank you for taking the time to come to Cicero on August 23rd to hold a public meeting for the proposed roundabout at SR 37 and Strawtown Ave.

We do not think a roundabout is the best solution for this intersection. At the meeting several comments and suggestions were made that would improve the safety of this intersection. If these improvements were made and warning lights alerting drivers of the upcoming intersection were installed, we feel that a traffic signal would be an appropriate and more cost effective solution.

I commented that the street light on the north east corner of the intersection has been out for over two years. This creates a very dark and dangerous intersection at night. I have made several calls about it and nothing has been done. People approaching on Strawtown Ave. at night fail to see that it is a stop and run the stop, never touching their brakes. In fact on Aug 5, 2016 at 10:26 p.m., Hamilton County Sheriff DoPt. incident # 2016-00019693, a car heading west on Strawtown Ave., ran the stop and hit a car traveling on SR 37.

After the public meeting, I got the feeling that INDOT would do things right now to make the intersection safer. As of Sept 8, 2016 the light bulb has not been replaced at the intersection. Please see if some improvements can be done now to now to make this intersection safer.

Thank you,

Diane Garrison
Matt Garrison
Strawtown Pottery
**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

the need in Indiana is fixing the roads. One million would help. The noblesville current stated that round would prevent accidents. All you have to do is ask body shops. It is a dream for repair.
I try to avoid them when ever possible. To have to enter them at your own risk. If you are waiting to enter all it takes is the person with more guts. No body has rights. You can some time sit there for 2-3 and sometimes more before you dare venture.

They need a turn signal in lakeview drive and connor you want to turn left you have sit half way out and then turn on yellow if lucky or turn on red.

To go north on lakeview from connor. There is a stop sign where lakeview that turns left. You could make a fortune on all the cars that not only do not slow down but fail to stop
Hello,
First let me apologize - I read the article about the proposed roundabout in Current in Noblesville, but your name is not mentioned, so I cannot address you properly.
I am a resident of Fishers, but grew up on Wid Green's farm which is just north west a bit of the Strawtown Ave & state road 37 intersection. That area is dear to my heart. I sincerely hope that this project does not effect the Strawtown Pottery store on the north west quadrant of the intersection. But having read that a 2-story house & its residents will be effected is disheartening. There is no way that this neighborhood could have become so much busier that it warrants building another roundabout. And the reason that was listed in the article involved semis - but I cannot imagine how driving gigantic, overflowed semis through a roundabout makes their travel easier... or prevents accidents. ?
As someone who lived for about a year in Massachusetts, where rotaries are very common... my friends who still live in Massachusetts are baffled when I tell them about the rotaries going in at every intersection up & down 37. Because the decades of rotary driving out East have *proven* that MORE accidents happen. And East coast towns are shelling out big bucks to remove rotaries and opt for old-school intersections. Rotaries are not the way to go if preventing accidents is a concern. We simply need widened roads & intersections.
I implore you to reconsider the roundabout in Strawtown. It is not needed.
Sincerely,
Sunni Waterman

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S™ III, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Clark, Rickie

From: Shirley Moore
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 4:00 PM
To: Clark, Rickie
Subject: Aug. 23, SR37&Stawtown Ave Roundabout Meeting

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

I want to thank INDOT for a great presentation. I was ashamed of Hamilton County - there was not one representative of our government present.

I like the idea of the project and wish it could be accomplished sooner to prevent more accidents NOW, I almost lost my eldest daughter and her baby at this intersection.

There were a few (very few) of those in attendance that were against the roundabout and they spoke the longest and loudest. However, I believe most of us were there to listen and learn, which we did.

My major concern comes when we learned that this project would not start until 2018. I ask if something (such as flashers) could be done now until the project is done to avoid the accidents that could take place during this time.

Again thanks to INDOT for their project explanations and thanks for listening.

Shirley E Moore

Noblesville, In 46060

--

In GOD we trust!

Have A Great Day!

Shirley
Clark, Rickie

From: Bailey Van Meter  
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2016 9:15 PM  
To: Clark, Rickie  
Subject: roundabout on Indiana 37

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed roundabout on Indiana 37 at Strawtown Ave. This roundabout will be very expensive and I do think it will solve the issues you have identified. Adding this roundabout will only make traffic worse at this intersection. Traffic does not slow down and I do not think a roundabout will solve this issue. It will only lead to more congestion and more accidents. Semis will continue to travel this area and will not know the roundabout is there and may have accidents. I do not see them being able to go through the roundabout at 25 mph which will lead to more congestion and possibly more accidents. I think the better solutions are increased lighting and blinkers on 37 and Strawtown Ave. There needs to be more notice about the intersection because there is essentially no notice now until you get to the intersection. Your proposed detour of Craig Ave is unreasonable. There is no way semis will be able to make the turns on Craig Ave. It is also unreasonable to expect semis to use a narrow country road as a detour.

I would appreciate if you consider the public comments because it was obvious at the public hearing that the public is opposed to this roundabout. We live in this area and travel it every day and feel that we have a better idea of the needs of this intersection. Please listen to us.

Thank you
Danny Clark
I am writing regarding the proposed roundabout at Indiana 37 and Strawtown Ave. I live on Craig Ave just off Strawtown Ave so I pass through this intersection every day multiple times. While I do not have issues with the intersection, I do understand the safety concerns.

I am opposed to this roundabout for the following reasons:
1. A state highway is not the place for a roundabout. I understand the use of roundabouts in cities to help with traffic flow etc but a roundabout is not the answer to the issues at this intersection.
2. I understand you are trying to slow down traffic in this area but a roundabout is not the way to do this. My concern is there will be more serious accidents because cars will not slow down for the roundabout.
3. The roundabout will likely cause more traffic congestion than there is currently. Slowing traffic on a state highway will only cause more congestion and frustration among drivers leading to less safe driving.
4. Semis will not know the roundabout is there and there will be more accidents, likely more serious accidents.
5. There is lot of bicycle traffic in this area. At the meeting you indicated bicycles could go through the roundabout with the cars and just integrate with the traffic. This will be more dangerous and cause more accidents and lead to more congestion because cars will have to wait on the bicycles.
6. Your proposed detour on Craig Ave is not feasible. We live on Craig Ave and I am concerned about the increased traffic. There are several children on this road and there is increased risk of them being injured due to the increased traffic. There are also sharp turns on this road and semis will likely not be able to make the sharp turns.
7. This is a rural community and there is a lot of farm equipment that pass through this intersection. As large as their equipment is, it is likely going to be prohibitive for them to use the intersection. If they are able to maneuver the intersection, it will likely cause more congestion because of the speed they will have to travel. The increased congestion increases the risk for more traffic accidents.

I do agree something should be done with this intersection but I do not believe a roundabout is the answer. I would suggest the following:
1. Increased lighting so the intersection is more visible at night.
2. Yellow blinker light on 37 and red blinker light on Strawtown Ave. These will both give more notice about the intersection.
3. More notice on Strawtown Ave that you are coming up to intersection. There is essentially no notice right now until you are the intersection.

I think there are more reasonable and cost effective measures you can take before spending $1.3M on a roundabout. Rather than jumping to the extreme of a roundabout, I don't understand why you are not willing to try other options such as blinkers. If these do not work then as a last resort you can always try the roundabout.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at should you have questions.

Thank you
Tami Clark
Clark, Rickie

From: Thursday, August 25, 2016 10:43 AM
To: Clark, Rickie
Subject: RE: Aug 23 Public Meeting:

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

Rickie, thank you for the acknowledgement, I did not make a public statement during the meeting, for a reason, there was enough said, and in any and all of these meetings you always get some “rebel’s” that like to get up and beat on the drums and hear their own voice which is fine and is their right, often does not mean much, basically the same group that sits around the coffee shop or bar with, “you know what they ought a do!"

Having been in your position with one of the most controversial issues ever in the state of IN., the White River Fish Kill, I prefer a more direct approach of simply sitting down and discussing the options without all the drama. That was my job, bring some common sense to the different proposals brought before the White River Council, work through them with the state and federal agencies.

You are very good and took their comments in stride and made them feel you were truly listening, well done.

I am not saying that the roundabout concept would not work and it may truly be the best way, but several of the different concepts and ideas need to be weighed out and considered as well. Safety is the big concern and certainly INDOT wants to build something that works, and lasts, and makes the thing safer, not build something that just creates another potential hazard, or has to be taken out because of a 4 lane.

I will work with you and help you in whatever you need to find out.

Sincerely, John E. Bundy

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

---

From: Clark, Rickie
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 9:20 AM
To:
Subject: RE: Aug 23 Public Meeting:

Good Morning Mr. Bundy,

Thank you for attending Tuesday evening’s public hearing and also submitting comments in regards to INDOT’s proposal. I wanted to send a brief note to acknowledge receipt of your e-mail.

Your e-mail has been entered in to the official public hearings transcript and will be reviewed, evaluated and given full consideration by INDOT project officials. The project team will review your e-mail and responses to your inquiries will be prepared.

INDOT looks forward to contacting you once responses have been prepared to your inquiries.

Kind Regards,

Rickie Clark, Indiana Department of Transportation
Office of Public Involvement / Communications
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Phone: (317) 232-6601; Email: rclark@indot.in.gov

From:
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 7:00 PM
To:
Cc: Clark, Rickie <RCLARK@indot.IN.gov>
Subject: Aug 23 Public Meeting:

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

Good Evening Mark & Rickie
I want to thank you again for the way the meeting was conducted at Cicero last evening. Having been through dozens, actually over 100 public meetings over the years, and seen some get pretty “out of hand”, you did very well. Rickie, you are as good as any I’ve seen in keeping the meeting “on point” and moving forward.

There were several very well thought out legitimate points made last night pertaining to what could and should be done to help this situation, NOW, which with a minimal amount of money spent, and help satisfy your most important part of the project, improving safety, that you clearly stated.

I felt you needed to know the hydraulics of the river at the point where this work is being done and have a realization of what White River is going to do in the future. The river cannot cut any deeper at this point, due to the bedrock bottom, so it will cut into the south bank towards the south end of the bridge. At the moment it looks like a quiet waterway, however at 20’ over flood stage the actual pressure it can develop is greater than many rivers of the world, like the Danube. The reason for this is once again, the bedrock bottom, there is nothing else that it can do but spill out into the surrounding areas and anything can happen and does, so please take the geology into consideration

I was taken aback with your statement that you “did not believe that 37 would be made into a 4 lane at any time in the foreseeable future”. So was Mike Garland, who owns the sawmill on the east side of 37 just south of the roundabout. We have both sat through meeting after meeting much like this one where that exact concept was presented by INDOT, maps, drawings, totally drawn out and detailed, showing the 4 lane going to Marion. All of you should visit this and be clear on the future intentions for 37. It would be a shame to do all the work to build this roundabout, then have it rendered useless in a decade and torn out. The fact is that the 4 lane ends 4.5 miles from the center of the roundabout at this time, possibly a little less, since 4.5 is from a speedometer.

Yes there would be some impact around the little town of Clare, and possibly a few places along 37, then it is clear all the way to Elwood, that fact is hardly a deterrent to the power of the state highway. I use 31 as an example.

This concept was the basis of the Hamilton County Plan Commission and the creation of some of the most restrictive zoning in the state. “White River Township is going to be developed totally and this zoning “must” be enacted to keep people from building in areas where there will be major future development.” “Olio Road will be extended to Strawtown Ave. and a new 4 lane bridge will be built across White River.” “We have created a business area along 37 for business development, therefore all business can move to this area.” We all heard this loud and clear.

This was all part of the presentation at 2 years worth of monthly meetings, by the Plan Commission. In my case they refused to grant me my M-1 commercial zoning for my business, and I ended up having to talk to the Commissioners and they went over the plan commission’s wishes and gave me the proper zoning. Going head to head with the County would not be my choice, but I have already been to the Supreme Court in the past, and could win this case on zoning, they knew that.
I would think you could easily research the records of these past proceedings and before you decide that this roundabout is the chosen way to resolve this problem at this intersection, take a good look at the future plans for this road. If you have any trouble finding this information, it can certainly be found in the Hamilton County Records. Please take a look at this.

In the meantime I would hope all of you would give some serious consideration to some of the simple ideas for helping the situation now. You might be saving lives, it might be my own. Need more info, you can find me.

Sincerely, John Bundy, President, Bundy & Company Inc. and President, White River Rescue, Inc.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Good Evening Mark & Rickie

I want to thank you again for the way the meeting was conducted at Cicero last evening. Having been through dozens, actually over 100 public meetings over the years, and seen some get pretty “out of hand”, you did very well. Rickie, you are as good as any I've seen in keeping the meeting “on point” and moving forward.

There were several very well thought out legitimate points made last night pertaining to what could and should be done to help this situation, NOW, which with a minimal amount of money spent, and help satisfy your most important part of the project, improving safety, that you clearly stated.

I felt you needed to know the hydraulics of the river at the point where this work is being done and have a realization of what White River is going to do in the future. The river cannot cut any deeper at this point, due to the bedrock bottom, so it will cut into the south bank towards the south end of the bridge. At the moment it looks like a quiet waterway, however at 20’ over flood stage the actual pressure it can develop is greater than many rivers of the world, like the Danube. The reason for this is once again, the bedrock bottom, there is nothing else that it can do but spill out into the surrounding areas and anything can happen and does, so please take the geology into consideration.

I was taken aback with your statement that you “did not believe that 37 would be made into a 4 lane at any time in the foreseeable future”. So was Mike Garland, who owns the sawmill on the east side of 37 just south of the roundabout. We have both sat through meeting after meeting much like this one where that exact concept was presented by INDOT, maps, drawings, totally drawn out and detailed, showing the 4 lane going to Marion. All of you should visit this and be clear on the future intentions for 37. It would be a shame to do all the work to build this roundabout, then have it rendered useless in a decade and torn out. The fact is that the 4 lane ends 4.5 miles from the center of the roundabout at this time, possibly a little less, since 4.5 is from a speedometer.

Yes there would be some impact around the little town of Clare, and possibly a few places along 37, then it is clear all the way to Elwood, that fact is hardly a deterrent to the power of the state highway. I use 31 as an example.

This concept was the basis of the Hamilton County Plan Commission and the creation of some of the most restrictive zoning in the state. “White River Township is going to be developed totally and this zoning “must” be enacted to keep people from building in areas where there will be major future development.” “Olio Road will be extended to Strawtown Ave. and a new 4 lane bridge will be built across White River.” “We have created a business area along 37 for business development, therefore all business can move to this area.” We all heard this loud and clear.

This was all part of the presentation at 2 years worth of monthly meetings, by the Plan Commission. In my case they refused to grant me my M-1 commercial zoning for my business, and I ended up having to talk to the Commissioners and they went over the plan commission’s wishes and gave me the proper zoning. Going head to head with the County would not be my choice, but I have already been to the Supreme Court in the past, and could win this case on zoning, they knew that.

I would think you could easily research the records of these past proceedings and before you decide that this roundabout is the chosen way to resolve this problem at this intersection, take a good look at the future plans for this
road. If you have any trouble finding this information, it can certainly be found in the Hamilton County Records. Please take a look at this.

In the meantime I would hope all of you would give some serious consideration to some of the simple ideas for helping the situation now. You might be saving lives, it might be my own. Need more info, you can find me.

Sincerely, John Bundy, President, Bundy & Company Inc. and President, White River Rescue, Inc.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Clark, Rickie

From: Flanders
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 3:25 PM
To: Clark, Rickie
Subject: SR 37 & Strawtown Avenue intersection improvements

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

I am Jeanne Flanders, Noblesville, IN, 46060,
located about 2 1/2 miles east of this intersection. This community
needs improvements NOW and we do not want to wait another 2 years.
In the meantime, I have commented previously and I will reiterate those 3 actions.

1. Enforce the present 40 mph speed limit.
   (I like seeing the signs that say:
   You are driving _____ mph.
   The speed limit in this area is ______.)

2. Permanently remove the volunteer trees growing along SR 37,
   behind the bridge guard rails, and under the bridge.
   (I do not agree that you cannot remove trees from
   private property. The utility companies remove trees from
   private property all the time. It is necessary for the safety of the
   linemen and the citizens. Same way with highway intersections.)
   (I do not believe the bat habitat is more important than human lives.)

3. If a "temporary signal" can be installed for the construction
   of a roundabout, then permanent signals are feasible to slow traffic
   and allow traffic on Strawtown Avenue to safely cross SR 37.

I agree with comments that there are no large eye catching signs
announcing the approaching intersection from any direction.
Even the little sign announcing the 40 mph speed limit ahead is easily
missed at 55 or higher mph. I have slowed down to 40 mph only
to look in my rearview mirror to see only the front grill of a vehicle.
Rumble strips would get the drivers' attention.

Repair and install dusk to dawn lighting.

Fix hole in bridge.

Meet with the Hamilton Heights School Administration, School board, and
Transportation Department. They know the neighborhood and problems
they already have with this intersection.
I have attended meetings working toward rerouting SR 37 starting at the end of the 4 lanes north to bypass Clare and Strawtown. We were not in favor, but where are these plans now.

Another safety factor for vehicles on Strawtown Avenue is to raise SR 37 road surface north of bridge so vehicles from north are visible further away. As it is now a southbound vehicle is not visible until it is on the bridge, quite a surprise if you are driving in a slower vehicle, farm equipment, or long truck.

Make all these suggested improvements NOW in 2016. Do not wait.

Concerning the Strawtown Avenue Detour Route:

If you cannot be persuaded to abandon the roundabout idea there are other problems with this presentation. Did anyone involved with this proposal actually drive this route especially at night. No dusk to dawn lighting for the roadway. This area is a neighborhood with over 60 homes and lots of children. Roadway is narrow with numerous turns. Once through the curves and onto the straightaway, 216th Street approaching SR 37 is a steep hill with no warning it is dropping off down to a busy highway. Very dangerous if not familiar with the area. Getting onto SR 37 is a bear, especially with rush hour traffic making their way from Grant County to Indianapolis and back. A better roadway would be 206th Street with the traffic light to return to SR 37 (I will cover that in a few paragraphs.)

I propose Craig Avenue be well marked FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS ONLY TURN AROUND AND GO BACK TO MARKED DETOUR ROUTE.

For through traffic (from Madison County through to Cicero and beyond or for traffic intending to go north or south on SR 37) I propose the detour be two different ones:

From the east, Strawtown Avenue should be detoured beginning at SR 13, directing traffic either north or south onto SR 13.

North bound should be directed to the intersection of SR 13 with SR 37 at 256th Street (Hamilton County), south (Left) onto SR 37 back to Strawtown.

You did say the SR 37 traffic would always be open to through traffic and then folks can use the little side street southeast side of Strawtown
to continue west.

South bound should be directed south to the intersection of SR 13 with 206th Street (Hamilton County), west on 206th Street (there will be one stop sign at Prairie Baptist Road), further west to a traffic signal at SR 37, then back north onto SR 37 to Strawtown.

These directions will afford those who want to actually travel SR 37 either north or south, a simpler, safer, and easier route in the direction they want to go.

If someone gets onto Strawtown Avenue without following the detour they can still make their way to 206th Street via Cyntheanne Road or Prairie Baptist Road.

Jeanne Flanders
Hi Rickie,

First I want to thank you for your and your coworkers time tonight. I heard a few comment that they thought it was a productive meeting.

I was the one who requested examples of roundabouts on state highways that:
- Have a speed limit of 55 (not posted speed but typical speed) before and after
- Have an awkward approach (like the raised bridge, curves and not 90 degree approaches
- Have heavy traffic during rush hour – like the Marion to Indianapolis traffic is.

Specifically I wish to know the after-effects of the round-a-bouts as to whether or not they successfully alleviated the safety concerns and minimized traffic congestion.

Finally, I highly recommend steps NOW to please alleviate some of the immediate safety concerns such as dusk-to-dawn lighting and red-yellow flasher lights.

The friends of mine who have been involved in various serious accidents at that intersection were mostly involved where someone did NOT stop heading east on Strawtown Avenue. The other one just did not have good line of sight eastbound on Strawtown and could not see the low profile southbound vehicle after she stopped. She was also in a low-profile vehicle.

I appreciate your time tonight.

Thank you,

Carol

Carol Schmidt CPA, PC

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information in this e-mail, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and legally privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information in any manner is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

When addressed to our clients, any opinions or advice contained in this e-mail, including any attachments, are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in our client engagement letter.
Deon Hudson Response: Deceleration approaching a roundabout is similar to deceleration for a signal. The splitter islands are designed to provide deflection for an errant vehicle in this condition to avoid a more severe “T-Bone” collision than that of a stop controlled or signalized intersection. The center island can provide a buffer for a vehicle not able to successfully decelerate prior to entering the roundabout. The slower speed of vehicles operating in a roundabout versus the high speeds of a signal further reduce the severity of collisions. INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed between now and the construction year of 2018. Enforcement can reduce the failure to obey the speed limit, however, it is not a reliable way to improve the safety of an intersection. Studies have shown that drivers will drive the speed that feels most comfortable given the condition of the roadway. This is why failures to obey speed limits generally occur. It is not considered a best practice to control speed with a sign; other roadway design techniques are recommended to help control speed. Currently, Strawtown is a stop condition with a stop sign. Inadequate sight distance to cross S.R. 37 and the inability to get an adequate gap in traffic during peak times contribute to accidents. A red flashing light would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. A flashing beacon on the speed limit sign can draw more attention to the regulation. This will be a consideration for design for this project. A bridge rehabilitation project is programmed for 2018.

Bill Penn Response: Currently, Strawtown is a stop condition with a stop sign. Inadequate sight distance to cross S.R. 37 and the inability to get an adequate gap in traffic during peak times contribute to accidents. A red flashing light or larger stop sign would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. Freezing of ice on the bridge is a maintenance issue, and INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed. This intersection has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Standard Design Vehicle (WB-65). This roundabout does not require the use of the truck apron in the center of the roundabout for the thru-movement. Further consideration regarding the cross slope of the roadway and truck apron have been given and the design is planned such that the truck apron is sloped toward the center to counter the overtopping concern when the trailers utilize the apron. Studies have shown that drivers will drive the speed that feels most comfortable given the condition of the roadway. This is why failures to obey speed limits generally occur. It is not considered a best practice to control speed with a sign; other roadway design techniques are recommended to help control speed.

Unnamed Speaker 1 Response: Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where roundabouts are installed. This includes roundabouts installed on state highways. Many roundabouts have been successfully installed on state highways throughout the United States where semi traffic is frequent. This intersection has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Standard Design Vehicle (WB-65). This roundabout does not require the use of the truck apron in the center of the roundabout for the thru-movement. Further consideration regarding the cross slope of the roadway and truck apron have been given and the design is planned such that the truck apron is sloped toward the center to counter the overtopping concern when the trailers utilize the apron. This intersection will be evaluated for navigating permitted loads such as a mobile home. Traffic capacity analysis was performed for the current year and the 20 post construction years. The minimum
Level of Service at the Design Year is C for SR 37 and D for Strawtown Ave. The proposed single lane configuration is expected to provide Level of Service B at the design year 2037.

**Sherry Johnson Response:** Temporary right-of-way is property acquired temporarily for use during construction. It is to be used and then once construction is complete returned to the original owner in similar condition prior to construction. A stop light with a right turn restriction would have a potential to reduce some of the conflicts at this intersection; however, there is still a potential for failure to obey this regulation especially during off peak hours. The severity of accidents due to this would not be reduced. Coordination of work during construction is required to occur with affected property owners. This will be a task for the contractor and site representative at the time of construction.

**Unnamed Speaker 2 Response:** The approach design speed for this roundabout is 25 mph. The entry deflection approaching the roundabout causes drivers to slow down in order to navigate the roundabout successfully. The current intersection doesn’t utilize approach curvature to control approach speed and relies solely on the driver’s awareness of a sign to control speed which is proven to be ineffective.

**Sandy Hoch:** No questions asked; no responses required.

**Unnamed Speaker 3 Response:** The profile of the planned improvement will mostly be the same as the existing roadway.

**Tony Wiltshire Response:** One of the advantages of a roundabout is a reduction in congestion. That being said, it’s not the only advantage. Other advantages are improved safety, reduced pollution and fuel use, cheaper maintenance costs than signals, and a reduced speed through the intersection, which in turn reduces the sight line requirement. Currently, this intersection has poor sight lines which the roundabout will address without the need to alter the existing bridge. Another issue with the current intersection is the failure to stop. With a roundabout there are distinct objects in the vehicle’s path and line of sight to alert the driver of an intersection and does not solely rely on a sign or light.

**Diane Garrison Response:** With a roundabout there are distinct objects in the vehicle’s path and line of sight to alert the driver of an intersection and does not solely rely on a sign or light to direct a driver to stop. If a driver does fail to yield or navigate the roundabout properly, there are curb deflections designed to eliminate the right-angle collision common with stop lights and stop signs which makes these mistakes inherently safer. As part of this project the intersection and approaches will be illuminated with lighting. Bicyclists can safely navigate roundabouts. The reduced speed makes roundabouts more friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists. Bicyclists will typically join traffic and navigate the roundabout just as a vehicle would.

**Carol Schmidt Response:** Currently, Strawtown is a stop condition with a stop sign. Inadequate sight distance to cross S.R. 37 and the inability to get an adequate gap in traffic during peak times contribute to accidents. A red flashing light or larger stop sign would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow issue, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. As part of this project the intersection and approaches will be illuminated with lighting. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where roundabouts are installed. This includes roundabouts installed on state highways. Many roundabouts have been successfully installed on state
highways throughout the United States where semi traffic is frequent. Some in Indiana are US 31 and CR400S, SR144 and Kitchen Road, SR 265 and SR 62, SR 25 and Old SR 25, and US 421 and SR 62.

Unnamed Speaker 4 Response: The truck apron currently is separated from the asphalt pavement by a mountable curb. It is four inches in height. Further research is being conducted regarding utilization of an alternative curb height. Each roundabout is typically designed specifically for the location while finding the best balance of cost, safety, and other factors. The current estimated construction cost of this project is approximately $850,000.

Aaron Sheller Response: The estimated duration for construction is 45 days for each half with a total closure of Strawtown Avenue for approximately 3 months (90 days). There will be miscellaneous construction going on outside of the closure timeframes, so construction should be expected to last for the spring and summer of 2018. Truck traffic should utilize SR 37 during construction and not take a local detour for Strawtown. The design speed of SR 37 is 40 mph and 35 mph for Strawtown Ave. The design speed of the intersection, however, is 25 mph. This roundabout will be different than the one at 421 and 32. As is common with all roundabouts each one is designed specifically for the location while finding the best balance of cost, safety, and other factors. All the curbing of this roundabout is designed to be mountable. Signage will be installed far enough away from the edge of the roadway to allow for oversized vehicles to navigate the roundabout successfully. This roundabout has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Design Vehicle (WB-65). The roundabout was designed such that a WB-65 will not need to utilize the apron on thru movements on SR 37. The left turn in a 53-foot trailer semi will utilize the truck apron when turning from southbound SR 37 to eastbound Strawtown Avenue.

Tami Clark Response: With a roundabout there are distinct objects in the vehicle’s path and line of sight to alert the driver of an intersection and does not solely rely on a sign or light to direct a driver to stop. If a driver does fail to yield or navigate the roundabout properly, there are curb deflections designed to eliminate the right-angle collision common with stop lights and stop signs which makes these mistakes inherently safer. As part of this project the intersection and approaches will be illuminated with lighting. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where roundabouts are installed. This includes roundabouts installed on state highways. Many roundabouts have been successfully installed on state highways throughout the United States where semi traffic is frequent. A red flashing light or larger stop sign would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow issue, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project.

Art Hall Response: The intersections in New Jersey where traffic circles were installed do not function as a modern roundabout functions. News reports indicate traffic circles in New Jersey are being phased out in favor of modern roundabouts. The design takes into account the current traffic conditions as well as a forecasted traffic based off of development trends in the area 20 years after construction. This intersection is designed to operate at the required level of service for this classification of roadway at the forecasted growth.

Jeanne Flanders Response: A representative with INDOT checked with Corridor Development, and they have no plans to submit any added travel lanes (ATL) project on SR 37 north of the end of the 4 lane section. There have been some previous ATL projects from the end of the 4 lanes, but they only went as far north as 206th Street.
Unnamed Speaker 5 Response: Coordination of detour routes is ongoing as well as coordination with local school districts, emergency response, police and fire. Details will be refined as design progresses. INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed between now and the construction year of 2018.

Unnamed Speaker 6 Response: All required agencies have been coordinated with or will be coordinated with regarding this intersection as part of the Environmental process.

Steve Austin Response: This intersection has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Standard Design Vehicle (WB-65). This roundabout does not require the use of the truck apron in the center of the roundabout for the thru-movement along SR 37. Further consideration regarding the cross slope of the roadway and truck apron have been given and the design is planned such that the truck apron is sloped toward the center to counter the overtopping concern when the trailers utilize the apron. The truck apron currently is separated from the asphalt pavement by a mountable curb. It is four inches in height. Further research is being conducted regarding utilization of an alternative height curb.

Stacy Hoch: No questions asked; no response required.

Christine Stiles Response: A stop light at this intersection would create an adequate gap to cross S.R. 37, however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow issue and therefore does not meet the purpose and need of the project. It also is a burden on traffic during off peak hours. A roundabout will solve the sight distance issue without the need to reconstruct the bridge and will also create adequate gaps to enter the intersection during peak times. This intersection has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Standard Design Vehicle (WB-65). This roundabout does not require the use of the truck apron in the center of the roundabout for the thru-movement. As is typical with most construction projects, maintaining traffic is a must. The cost to benefit of a detour vs a full closure is always weighed. Any improvement at this intersection would require some temporary disruption to the existing traffic pattern to safely construct the improvement. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where roundabouts are installed. An advantage of a roundabout is to not only reduce fatalities, but also accidents with injury. Studies have shown that drivers will drive the speed that feels most comfortable given the condition of the roadway. This is why failures to obey speed limits generally occur. It is not considered a best practice to control speed with a sign; other roadway design techniques are recommended to help control speed. The initial cost of a roundabout is typically more than a standard signalized intersection, however, the cost of maintenance and electricity to the signalized intersection quickly make up and exceed that cost difference. The intersections in New Jersey where traffic circles were installed do not function as a modern roundabout. Also, the traffic conditions for those locations were commonly not balanced which makes them very congested. The design takes into account the current traffic conditions as well as a forecasted traffic based off of development trends in the area 20 years after construction. This intersection is designed to operate at the required level of service for this classification of roadway at the forecasted growth.

Diane Garrison Response: A stop light at this intersection would create an adequate gap to cross S.R. 37, however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow issue and therefore does not meet the purpose and need of the project. It also is a burden on traffic during off peak hours. A roundabout will solve the sight distance issue without the need to reconstruct the bridge and will also create adequate gaps to enter the intersection during peak times. The initial cost of a roundabout is
typically more than a standard signalized intersection, however, the cost of maintenance and electricity to the signalized intersection quickly make up and exceed that cost difference. INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed between now and the construction year of 2018.

Delvin Dompier Response: The intersection of Lakeview and Connor is outside the scope of this project.

Sunni Waterman Response: This project will not affect the Strawtown Pottery store aside from the installation of a new driveway. The warrant for this intersection to be improved is safety and traffic along SR 37. This roundabout has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Design Vehicle (WB-65) which is a semi with a 53-foot trailer. The intersections in Massachusetts and New Jersey where rotaries and traffic circles were installed do not function as a modern roundabout functions. Also, the traffic conditions for those locations were commonly not balanced which makes the intersections very congested. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where modern roundabouts are installed.

Shirley Moore Response: INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed between now and the construction year of 2018.

Danny Clark Response: The initial cost of a roundabout is typically more than a standard signalized intersection, however, the cost of maintenance and electricity to the signalized intersection quickly make up and exceed that cost difference. Studies have shown that drivers will drive the speed that feels most comfortable given the condition of the roadway. This is why failures to obey speed limits generally occur. It is not considered a best practice to control speed with a sign; other roadway design techniques are recommended to help control speed. The entry deflection approaching the roundabout causes drivers to slow down in order to navigate the roundabout successfully. The current intersection doesn’t utilize approach curvature to control approach speed and relies solely on the driver’s awareness of a sign to control speed which is proven to be ineffective. One of the advantages of a roundabout is a reduction in congestion, specifically congestion related to the amount of traffic and the capacity of a roadway to handle that traffic. Slowing traffic at an intersection will not add more traffic to the roadway which would result in increased congestion; rather, it will improve the gaps and sight lines and allow drivers on Strawtown Avenue to safely merge into the flow of traffic on SR 37. A red flashing light or larger stop sign would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where modern roundabouts are installed. SR 37 is planned to be open to traffic for the entire duration of the project. Semis should not need to detour away from SR 37 at any time.

Tami Clark Response: Many roundabouts have been successfully installed on state highways throughout the United States where semi traffic is frequent. Some in Indiana are US 31 and CR400S, SR144 and Kitchen Road, SR 265 and SR 62, SR 25 and Old SR 25, and US 421 and SR 62. Studies have shown that drivers will drive the speed that feels most comfortable given the condition of the roadway. This is why failures to obey speed limits generally occur. It is not considered a best practice to control speed with a sign; other roadway design techniques are recommended to help control speed. The entry deflection approaching the roundabout causes drivers to slow down in order to navigate the roundabout successfully. The current intersection doesn’t utilize approach curvature to control speed.
approach speed and relies solely on the driver’s awareness of a sign to control speed which is proven to be ineffective. If a driver does fail to yield or navigate the roundabout properly, there are curb deflections designed to eliminate the right-angle collision common with stop lights and stop signs which makes these mistakes inherently safer. One of the advantages of a roundabout is a reduction in congestion. Congestion relates to the amount of traffic and the capacity of a roadway to handle that traffic. Slowing traffic at an intersection does not add more traffic to the roadway which would result in increased congestion; rather, it will improve the gaps and sight lines and allow drivers on Strawtown Avenue to safely merge into the flow of traffic on SR 37. This roundabout has been designed to accommodate the INDOT Design Vehicle (WB-65) which is a semi with a 53-foot trailer. Advanced warning signs will be in place to alert drivers of the intersection. As part of this project the intersection and approaches will be illuminated with lighting. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where roundabouts are installed. Bicyclists can safely navigate roundabouts. The reduced speed makes roundabouts more friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists. Bicyclists will typically join traffic and navigate the roundabout just as a vehicle would. SR 37 is planned to be open to traffic for the entire duration of the project. Semis should not need to detour away from SR 37 at any time. Congestion is not a function of speed; it is a function of the number of vehicles utilizing a roadway. Slowing a vehicle does not increase the number of vehicles on a roadway it only increases the time it takes to get from one location to another. A red flashing light or larger stop sign would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. The initial cost of a roundabout is typically more than a standard signalized intersection, however, the cost of maintenance and electricity to the signalized intersection quickly make up and exceed that cost difference. The funding sources require a thorough evaluation of alternatives in order to provide a solution to the purpose and need of a project.

John Bundy Response: The funding sources require a thorough evaluation of alternatives in order provide a solution to the purpose and need of a project. A representative with INDOT checked with Corridor Development, and they have no plans to submit any added travel lanes (ATL) project on SR 37 north of the end of the 4 lane section. There have been some previous ATL projects from the end of the 4 lanes, but they only went as far north as 206th Street.

Jeanne Flanders Response 2: INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed between now and the construction year of 2018. Enforcement can reduce the failure to obey the speed limit, however, it is not an economical and reliable way to improve the safety of an intersection. Studies have shown that drivers will drive the speed that feels most comfortable given the condition of the roadway. This is why failures to obey speed limits generally occur. It is not considered a best practice to control speed with a sign; other roadway design techniques are recommended to help control speed. A red flashing light or larger stop sign would draw more attention to the stop condition on Strawtown; however, this does not correct the sight distance and traffic flow, and therefore does not serve the need and purpose of the project. As part of this project the intersection and approaches will be illuminated with lighting. A bridge rehabilitation project is programmed for 2018. A representative with INDOT checked with Corridor Development, and they have no plans to submit any added travel lanes (ATL) project on SR 37 north of the end of the 4 lane section. There have been some previous ATL projects from the end of the 4 lanes, but they only went as far north as 206th Street. Coordination of detour routes is ongoing as well as coordination with local school
districts, emergency response, police and fire. Details will be refined as design progresses. SR 37 is planned to be open to traffic for the entire duration of the project. Semis should not need to detour away from SR 37 at any time.

Carol Schmidt Response 2: Many roundabouts have been successfully installed on state highways throughout the United States where semi traffic is frequent. Some in Indiana are US 31 and CR400S, SR144 and Kitchen Road, SR 265 and SR 62, SR 25 and Old SR 25, and US 421 and SR 62. INDOT Greenfield District can be notified directly of any maintenance issues needing addressed between now and the construction year of 2018. Studies have reported a reduction in accidents with injury by 76% and a reduction in fatalities by over 90% where roundabouts are installed.
LEGAL NOTICE
OF
PUBLIC HEARING

The Indiana Department of Transportation will hold a public hearing on **Tuesday, August 23, 2016, starting at 6:00 p.m. at the Hamilton North Public Library, 209 West Brinton Street, Cicero, Indiana 46034.** The doors will be open at 5:30 p.m. in order to view displays and talk to the representatives prior to the start of the hearing.

The purpose of the public hearing is to offer all interested persons an opportunity to comment on current design plans for a proposed intersection improvement at State Road (SR) 37 and Strawtown Avenue, 6.34 miles north of SR 32/SR 38, located in Hamilton County. In response to public comment, it was determined to be in the best interest to facilitate a public hearing in regard to the project to share more information and to consider the concerns brought forth by the local stakeholders. The project proposes a single lane roundabout with a central island featuring a mountable curb. A paved truck apron will allow larger vehicles, such as WB-65 tractor-trailers or more commonly referred to as an interstate semi-truck to maneuver through the roundabout. Curb and gutter will also be constructed throughout the roundabout limits. Construction of the project will require approximately 0.06 acre of new permanent right-of-way. A building is proposed to be removed in the southwest quadrant as part of the project which is currently occupied as a two story residence and the project will include relocation of those of those residents. The maintenance of traffic will allow traffic on SR 37 to remain open via the use of a temporary signal by constructing one half of the roundabout at a time. Through movements along Strawtown Avenue will be restricted during construction. It is anticipated that each half of the project will take 45 days to construct, therefore impacting traffic for approximately 90 days. Driveway access would be maintained to all local properties. School corporations and emergency services will be notified prior to any construction that would block or limit access.

The Categorical Exclusion Level 4 environmental document and preliminary design plans are available to view prior to the public hearing at the following locations:

1. Hamilton North Public Library, 209 West Brinton Street, Cicero, IN 46034.
   Phone # (317) 984-5623
2. Hamilton East Public Library, 1 Library Plaza, Noblesville, IN 46060.
   Phone # (317) 773-1384
3. Indiana Department of Transportation Greenfield District Office, 32 South Broadway,
   Greenfield, IN 46140. Customer Service # 1-855-463-6848
4. Hearings Examiner, Indiana Government Center North, N642, 100 North Senate Ave., Indianapolis, IN 46204-2216. Phone # (317) 234-0796

Public statements for the record will be taken as part of the public hearing procedure. All verbal statements recorded during the public hearing and all written comments submitted prior to, during
and for a period of two (2) weeks following the hearing date, will be evaluated, considered and addressed in subsequent environmental documentation. Written comments in regard to the project may be submitted prior to the public hearing and within the comment period to: INDOT Public Hearings, IGCN Room N642, 100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204.

With advance notice, INDOT can provide special accommodation for persons with disabilities and/or limited English speaking ability and persons needing auxiliary aids or services such as interpreters, signers, readers, or large print. Should special accommodation be needed please contact Rickie Clark, Office of Public Involvement at (317) 232-6601, or email relark@indot.in.gov preferably by Wednesday, August 17, 2016.

This notice is published in compliance with Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Section 771 (CFR 771.111(h)(1) states: “Each State must have procedures approved by the FHWA to carry out a public involvement/public hearing program.” 23 CFR 450.212(a)(7) states: “Public involvement procedures shall provide for periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all and revision of the process as necessary.”, approved by the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation on August 16, 2012. INDOT, Public Hearings Manager, Rickie Clark, Phone # (317) 232-6601, email: relark@indot.IN.gov
LEGAL NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Indiana Department of Transportation will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, August 16, 2016, starting at 6:00 p.m. at Hamilton North Public Library, 209 West Britton Street, Noblesville, IN 46060. The doors will be open at 5:30 p.m. in order to view display and talk to the representatives prior to the start of the hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to offer all interested persons an opportunity to comment on current design plans for a proposed intersection improvement at State Road 37 and Strawtown Avenue, 5.34 miles north of SR 32/SR 34, located in Hamilton County. In response to public comment, it was determined to be in the best interest to facilitate a public hearing in regard to the project to share more information and to consider the comments brought forth by the local stakeholders. The project proposes a single lane roundabout with a central island featuring a measurable curb. A paved truck ramp will allow larger vehicles, such as WB-65 tractor-trailers or more commonly referred to as an interstate semi-truck to maneuver through the roundabout. Curb and gutter will also be constructed throughout the roundabout limits. Construction of the project will require approximately 0.06 acre of new pavement right-of-way. A building is proposed to be removed in the southwest quadrant as part of the project which is currently occupied as a two-story residence and the project will include relocation of those of those residents. The in-service traffic which will allow traffic on SR 37 to remain open via the use of a temporary signed by constructing one half of the roundabout at a time. Through movements along Strawtown Avenue will be restricted during construction. It is anticipated that each half of the project will take 45 days to construct, therefore impacting traffic for approximately 99 days. Driveway access would be maintained to all local properties. School corporations and emergency services will be notified prior to any construction that would block or limit access. The Categorical Exclusion Level 4 environmental document and preliminary design plans are available to view prior to the public hearing at the following locations:

1. Hamilton North Public Library, 209 West Britton Street, Noblesville, IN 46060
   Phone Number: (317) 984-5633
2. Hamilton East Public Library, 1 Library Plaza, Noblesville, IN 46060
   Phone Number: (317) 773-1384
3. Indiana Department of Transportation Greenfield District Office, 32 South Broadway, Greenfield, IN 46140
   Customer Service # 1-833-463-6444
4. Hearing Examiner, Indiana Government Center North, 4641, 100 North Senate Ave., Indianapolis, IN 46204 2216.
   Phone Number: (317) 234 6796

Public statements for the record will be taken as part of the public hearing procedure. All verbal statements recorded during the public hearing and all written comments submitted prior to, during and for a period of two (2) weeks following the hearing date, will be evaluated, considered and addressed in subsequent environmental documentation. Written comments in regard to the project may be submitted prior to the public hearing and within the comment period to: INDOT Public Hearings, ICSN Room 2642, 100 North Senate Ave., Indianapolis, IN 46204. With advance notice, INDOT can provide special accommodation for persons with disabilities and/or limited English speaking ability and persons needing auxiliary aids or services such as interpreters. Should special accommodation be needed please contact Ricky Clark, Office of Public Involvement at (317) 232-6601, or email rclark@indot.in.gov. This notice is published in compliance with Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Section 771 (CPR 771.111O)(X)(Z) states: "Each State must have procedures approved by the FHWA to carry out a public involvement/public hearing program." 23 CFR 230.212(a)(7) states: "Public involvement procedures shall provide for periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all and revision of the process as necessary," approved by the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation on August 16, 2012. INDOT Public Hearings Manager, Ricky Clark, Phone Number: (317) 232-6601, email: rclark@indot.in.gov

Date: Thursday, August 11, 2016

[Signature]

Title: Legals Advertising
LEGAL NOTICE
OF
PLANNED IMPROVEMENT

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) is developing plans for a proposed SR 37 intersection improvement at Strawtown Avenue, 6.34 miles north of SR 32/SR 38 (Conner Street), located in Hamilton County. The project proposes a single lane roundabout with a central island featuring a mountable curb. A paved truck apron will allow larger vehicles, such as WB-65 tractor-trailers or more commonly referred to as an interstate semi-truck to maneuver through the roundabout. Curb and gutter will also be constructed throughout the roundabout limits. Construction of the project will require approximately 0.06 acre of new permanent right-of-way. A building is proposed to be removed in the southwest quadrant as part of the project currently occupied as a two story residence and the project will include relocation of those residents. The project will construct one half of the roundabout at a time, allowing traffic on SR 37 to remain open via the use of a temporary signal. Through movements along Strawtown Avenue will be restricted during construction. It is anticipated that each half of the project will take 45 days to construct, therefore impacting traffic for approximately 90 days. School corporations and emergency services will be notified prior to any construction that would block or limit access. All residential and commercial properties near the project site will have driveway access during construction.

The Federal Highway Administration and the INDOT have agreed that this project falls within the guidelines of a Categorical Exclusion Level 4 with no impacts to wetlands. At present, both state and federal funds are anticipated for construction of the project with the total cost estimated at $1,250,000. Preliminary design plans, along with the environmental document and other information, are being made available for review at the following locations:

1. Hamilton East Public Library, 1 Library Plaza, Noblesville, IN 46060,
   Phone # (317) 773-1384
2. Planning Department, Indiana Department of Transportation Greenfield District at
   32 South Broadway, Greenfield, IN 46140, Phone # (855) 463-6848
3. Hearings Examiner, Room N642 of the Indiana Government Center North,
   100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2216, Phone # (317) 234-0796

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you have a disability for which
INDOT needs to provide accessibility to the documents, please contact the Office of Public
Involvement at 317-232-6601 or reclark@indot.in.gov .

All interested persons may request a public hearing or express their concerns by submitting
comments to the attention of Mary Wright, Public Hearing Examiner at INDOT, Room N642, 100
North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2216 on or by Monday, July 25, 2016.
If a hearing is determined to be in the best interest of the public, the community will be notified. Otherwise, any comments or materials received as a result of this publication will be considered in the decision-making process.

This notice is published in compliance with: 1) Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Section 771 (CFR 771.111(h)(1)) stating, "Each State must have procedures approved by the FHWA to carry out a public involvement/public hearing program."; 2) 23 CFR 450.210(a)(1)(ix) stating, "Provide for the periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all interested parties and revise the process, as appropriate."; and 3) The INDOT Public Involvement Policies and Procedures approved by the Federal Highway Administration on August 16, 2012. Mary Wright, Public Hearing Examiner, Phone # (317) 234-0796, E-Mail: mwright@indot.IN.gov
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
(Governmental Unit)

Hamilton County, Indiana

To: The Times
641 Westfield Rd.
Noblesville, IN 46060

PUBLISHER'S CLAIM

LINE COUNT
Display Master (Must not exceed two actual lines, neither of which shall
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Personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for said county and state, the undersigned Tim Timmons who, being duly sworn, says that he is Publisher of The Times newspaper of general circulation printed and published in the English language in the city of Noblesville in state and county afore-said, and that the printed matter attached hereto is a true copy, which was duly published in said paper for 2 time(s), the date(s) of publication being as follows:
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Jennifer Louise May  
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LEGAL NOTICE OF PLANNED IMPROVEMENT

The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) is developing plans for a proposed SR 37 intersection improvement at Stratwown Avenue, 0.34 miles north of SR 32/SR 38 (Conner Street), located in Hamilton County. The project proposes a single lane roundabout with a central island featuring a mountable curb. A paved truck apron will allow larger vehicles, such as WB-65 tractors-trailers or more commonly referred to as an interstate semi-truck, to maneuver through the roundabout. Curbs and gutters will also be constructed throughout the roundabout limits. Construction of the project will require approximately 0.06 acre of new permanent right-of-way. A building is likely to be removed in the southeast quadrant as part of the project currently occupied as a two-story residence and the project will include relocation of those residents. The project will construct one half of the roundabout at a time, allowing traffic on SR 37 to remain open via the use of a temporary signal. Through movements along Stratwown Avenue will not be allowed. It is anticipated that each half of the project will take 45 days to construct, therefore impacting traffic for approximately 90 days. School corporations and emergency services will be notified prior to any construction that would block or limit access. All residential and commercial properties near the project site will have driveway access during construction. The Federal Highway Administration and the INDOT have agreed that this project falls within the guidelines of a Categorical Exclusion Level 4 with no impacts to wetlands. At present, both state and federal funds are anticipated for construction of the project with the total cost estimated at $1,230,000. Preliminary design plans, along with the environmental document and other information, are being made available for review at the following locations:

1. Hamilton East Public Library, 1 Library Plaza, Noblesville, IN 46060, Phone # (317) 773-1384
2. Planning Department, Indiana Department of Transportation Greenfield District at 32 South Broadway, Greenfield, IN 46140, Phone # (317) 463-6012
3. Hearings Examiner, Room N642 of the Indiana Government Center North, 100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204 2216, Phone # (317) 234-0796

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you have a disability for which INDOT needs to provide accessibility to the documents, please contact the Office of Public Involvement at 317-232-6601 or rdoink@indot.in.gov.

All interested persons may request a public hearing or express their concerns by submitting comments to the attention of Mary Wright, Public Hearing Examiner at INDOT, Room N642, 100 North Senate Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2216 on or by Monday, July 25, 2016. If a hearing is determined to be in the best interest of the public, the community will be notified. Otherwise, no comments or materials received as a result of this publication will be considered in the decision-making process. This notice is published in compliance with: 1) Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Section 771 (CFR 771.111(i)(1)) stating, “Each State must have procedures approved by the FHWA to carry out a public involvement/public hearing program.”; 2) 23 CFR 450.210(n)(1) (ii) stating, “Provide for the periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all interested parties and revise the process, as appropriate.”; and 3) The INDOT Public Involvement Policies and Procedures approved by the Federal Highway Administration on August 16, 2012. Mary Wright, Public Hearing Examiner, Phone # (317) 234-0796, E-Mail: mwright@indot.IN.gov
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Appendix H: Air Quality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>DES</th>
<th>STIP NAME</th>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>WORK TYPE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>MILES</th>
<th>FEDERAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>Estimated Cost left to Complete Project*</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>MATCH</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1298685</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>Added Travel Lanes</td>
<td>169th to 203rd Street</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$10,913,762.40</td>
<td>Major New - Construction</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$10,913,762.40</td>
<td>$7,726,440.00</td>
<td>$13,642,203.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1298685</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>ITS Traffic Management Systems</td>
<td>169th to 203rd</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Major New - Construction</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1298685</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>New Bridge, Bridge</td>
<td>169th to 203rd</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Major New - Construction</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton County</td>
<td>1296105</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>New Interchange, Construction</td>
<td>I-108 at 108 Street</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>Major New - - Consulting</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$900,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1296470</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>SR 32</td>
<td>Small Structure Replacement</td>
<td>5.52 mi. E. of E. jct. SR 38</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Bridge ROW</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1296470</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>SR 13</td>
<td>Small Structure Replacement</td>
<td>SR 13 at 4.647 mile north of SR 32 (55-13-29-15-16)</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Bridge ROW</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1296470</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>SR 37</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement, Roundabout</td>
<td>SR 37; at Strawtown Ave; 6.34 mile north SR 32 / SR 38 Corner Streets RP 181+38</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Safety ROW</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$320,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1383334</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>Added Travel Lanes</td>
<td>From 96th St to 216th Street (ALL phases cashflow) Traditional Option</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Major New - Construction</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton County</td>
<td>1403334</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction (GR4R Standards)</td>
<td>276th St from US 31 to Garden Road</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Group K Program</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$417,400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$417,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton County</td>
<td>1403334</td>
<td>Init.</td>
<td>US 31</td>
<td>Road Reconstruction (GR4R Standards)</td>
<td>276th St from US 31 to Garden Road</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>Group K Program</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>$417,400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$417,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated Costs left to Complete Project column is for costs that may extend beyond the four years of a STIP. This column is not fiscally constrained and is for information purposes.
## County List: All Regulated Criteria Pollutants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Name</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Date Designated Nonattainment</th>
<th>Effective Date of Nonattainment Designation</th>
<th>Nonattainment Classification Type (if applicable)</th>
<th>State Implementation Plan Due (if applicable)</th>
<th>Attainment Date (5 Yrs. from Effective Date of Designation) (if applicable)</th>
<th>Date Reclassified to Attainment w/Maintenance Plan (if applicable)</th>
<th>Date Maintenance Plan is to be Revised (8 Yrs. after being Redesignated) (if applicable)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix I: Additional Studies
### Detailed Listing of Grants Grouped by County

**INDIANA - 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID &amp; Element</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grant Element Title</th>
<th>Grant Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Exp. Date</th>
<th>Cong. District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 - XXX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>MORSE PARK</td>
<td>HAMILTON COUNTY PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$142,332.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>12/6/1972</td>
<td>6/30/1975</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 - XXX</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>FOREST PARK POOL</td>
<td>HAMILTON COUNTY PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2/3/1976</td>
<td>6/30/1978</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 - XXX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FLOWING WELL PARK</td>
<td>CARMEL/CLAY TWP PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/23/1993</td>
<td>6/30/1998</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502 - XXX</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>COOL CREEK PARK NATURE CENTER</td>
<td>HAMILTON COUNTY PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5/20/1994</td>
<td>6/30/1999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 - XXX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>KOTEEWI PARK ACQUISITION &amp; DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>HAMILTON COUNTY PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9/6/2000</td>
<td>12/31/2005</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551 - XXX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D/MACGREGOR PARK</td>
<td>WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3/9/2005</td>
<td>12/31/2007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HANCOCK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant ID &amp; Element</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Grant Element Title</th>
<th>Grant Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Exp. Date</th>
<th>Cong. District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350 - XXX</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>RILEY PARK AND POOL RENOVATION</td>
<td>GREENFIELD PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1/30/1979</td>
<td>12/31/1983</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552 - XXX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>BECKENHOLDT PARK</td>
<td>GREENFIELD PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/19/2005</td>
<td>12/31/2009</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 - XXX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SUGAR CREEK TOWNSHIP PARK</td>
<td>SUGAR CREEK PARK BOARD</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9/7/2006</td>
<td>12/31/2009</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575 - XXX</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>BECKENHOLDT PARK PHASE II</td>
<td>GREENFIELD PARK &amp; RECREATION BOARD</td>
<td>$1,564,466.00</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4/15/2011</td>
<td>12/31/2015</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Totals**

- **Hamilton County Total:** $905,783.19
- **County Count:** 9

- **Hancock County Total:** $776,466.00
- **County Count:** 4
### Summary of crash severity and type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Total Number of Crashes</th>
<th>Crash Types</th>
<th>Crash Severity (Number-Type)</th>
<th>Number of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>Off Road</td>
<td>Right Angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007  7</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008  2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009  4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010  5</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011  6</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012  4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013  3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals 31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Rear end collision a few hundred feet from intersection that may be attributed to a combination of speed and inattentiveness.
2. Rear end collision involving a vehicle stopped behind a northbound SR 37 driver turning left onto Strawtown Avenue.
3. Crash of southbound SR 37 vehicle may have resulted from driver avoiding a vehicle crossing from Strawtown Avenue.