

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION LEVEL 1 FORM

Date: October 7, 2019

Initial Version

Additional Information to CE Level 1 Dated: _____

Purpose of this document:

CE Level 1 documentation for exempted projects

State-funded categorical exemption documentation

Approval CE Level 1 or State-Funded CE:

Environmental Scoping Manager or
Environmental Policy Manager

Date

Release for Public Involvement

DGD

2019.11.21 10:41:36
-05'00'

ESM/ES Initials

Date

Certification of Public Involvement

Office of Public Involvement

Date

PROJECT INFORMATION			
County, Route	Washington County, State Road (SR) 60 and Salem Bypass	Des Number	1702225
Purpose and Need:	<p>The need for this project is based on safety concerns due to a high incidence of crashes at the intersection of SR 60 and Salem Bypass in Washington County. The intersection is configured as a two-way stop on the Salem Bypass. Since the intersection opened for use in 2012, a high frequency of serious crashes has occurred. Of the 34 total accidents at this intersection between 2012 and 2017, nine (27 percent) have been fatal or incapacitating. Of the 34 total crashes, 19 (56 percent) were right-angle or left-turn crashes. Crashes due to these contributing circumstances can be attributed to the current intersection configuration. The crash data is provided in Appendix I, pages I-1 to I-5.</p> <p>The purpose of this project is to improve the safety of the intersection thereby reducing the frequency and/or severity of collisions.</p>		
Project Description:	<p><u>Location</u> This project is located at the intersection of SR 60 and Salem Bypass in Washington Township which is within the east-central portion of Washington County, Indiana (Appendix B, page B-1). Specifically, the project is located in Sections 21, 22, 27, and 28, Township 2 North, Range 4 East of the Salem, Indiana 7.5-minute United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangle (Appendix B, page B-2).</p> <p><u>Existing Conditions</u> The existing intersection consists of a two-way stop control of Salem Bypass at SR 60. SR 60 is functionally classified as a Principal Arterial and has a posted speed limit of 45 miles (mi.) per hour (mph). Salem Bypass is classified as a Principal Arterial on the northeast leg and a Minor Arterial on the southwest leg of the intersection and has a posted speed limit of 55 mph. Both roadways currently have one 12-foot (ft.)-wide through lane in each direction, one 12 ft. wide right turn lane, and one 12 ft. wide left turn lane adjoined by 10-ft.-wide paved (11 ft. wide usable) shoulders. There are no curbs or sidewalks present within the project area; however, there are guardrails present in all quadrants of the intersection except the southwest quadrant.</p>		

	<p>Land uses within the project area include transportation (pavement and roadside drainage ditches), roadside grass, streams, and wetlands (Appendix B, pages B-5 to B-24). Land uses adjacent to the project area include agricultural fields, residences, forests, and a mitigation site. Utilities within the project area include underground drinking water, sanitary sewer, gas, and communication lines and overhead telephone and electrical lines.</p> <p><u>Preferred Alternative</u> The preferred alternative is to reconfigure the intersection into a single-lane roundabout utilizing the 3R design standard. The design plans are provided in Appendix B, pages B-25 to B-36. The roundabout will have an inscribed circle diameter of 154 ft. and will provide a 12 ft.-wide truck apron, an 18 ft. circulating roadway width, and entry widths ranging from 19.67 ft. to 23.08 ft. Pavement will be replaced to full-depth, as needed, to build the new approach legs. Existing guardrail along the south side of the intersection and a portion of the existing guardrail along the north side of SR 60 to the east of Salem Bypass will be removed and not replaced. New guardrail end treatments with MGS W-beam guardrail height transitions will be installed. Existing guardrail will be removed. Approximately 17 luminaires will be installed throughout the intersection to provide adequate lighting.</p> <p>Approximately 18 6-ft.-wide, variable length combined concrete curb-and-gutter turnouts with revetment riprap turnouts will be installed to provide drainage through the project area. Six new drainage inlets, Types B-15 and C-15, will be installed. The two existing culvert structures within the project area will be avoided during construction.</p> <p>Construction of this project is anticipated to begin in Spring 2021 and will last approximately seven months. The roundabout will be constructed utilizing phased construction; furthermore, Salem Bypass will be closed for construction while SR 60 remains open to through-traffic and vice versa. Maintenance of traffic plans are provided in Appendix B, pages B-28 to B-30. The official Salem Bypass detour will utilize SR 135 through the Town of Salem, SR 56, and US 150, requiring approximately 43.1 mi. and 51 minutes of drive time. SR 60 will remain open as long as possible through construction but will be closed to complete curb work. The official SR 60 detour will utilize SR 56 and I-65, requiring approximately 38.6 mi. and 38 minutes of drive time.</p> <p>The project termini given below are logical because they include only the intersection area required to install the roundabout, which is the preferred alternative.</p> <p>The vertical and horizontal limits of construction were minimized as much as possible as a design measure to avoid and minimize impacts for this project, which resulted in no stream or wetland impacts and no tree removal. No environmental mitigation is anticipated to be required.</p> <p>The preferred alternative is anticipated to satisfy the purpose and need of the project by improving the safety of the intersection thereby reducing the frequency and/or severity of collisions.</p>						
<p>Other Alternatives Considered:</p>	<p><u>Alternative 1, No Build</u> The No Build alternative would allow the existing intersection to remain as currently configured. Crashes would be expected to continue at the current rate, as described in the Purpose and Need section of this Categorical Exclusion document. This alternative would not address the safety concerns at the intersection, so it would not meet the stated purpose and need of the project. Therefore, this alternative was discarded from further consideration.</p>						
<p>Project Termini:</p>	<p>The project will extend along SR 60 from approximately 0.10 mi. northwest to approximately 0.12 mi. southeast of the center of the existing intersection, for a total of 0.22 mi., and along Salem Bypass from approximately 0.15 mi. southwest to approximately 0.11 mi. northeast of the center of the existing intersection, for a total of 0.26 mi.</p>						
<p>Funding Source(s):</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Local</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other</td> <td>Estimated Cost:</td> <td>\$1,624,789 (2021)</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State	<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Estimated Cost:	\$1,624,789 (2021)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State	<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Estimated Cost:	\$1,624,789 (2021)		
<p>Project Sponsor:</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>INDOT Seymour District</td> <td>Project Length:</td> <td>0.48 mi.</td> </tr> </table>	INDOT Seymour District	Project Length:	0.48 mi.			
INDOT Seymour District	Project Length:	0.48 mi.					

Name and organization of CE Level 1 Preparer: Jessica Peterson, MS; Metric Environmental, LLC

INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: _____ Date: _____

SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION			
Public Involvement*		No:	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible:
Comments:	<p>Notice of entry letters were mailed to potentially affected property owners near the project area on April 5, 2018 notifying them about the project and that individuals responsible for land surveying and field activities may be seen in the area. A sample copy of the Notice of entry letter and is included in Appendix G, page G-1.</p> <p>To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" was published in the <i>Salem Leader</i> on June 11, 2019 offering the public an opportunity to submit comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4). The public comment period closed 30 days later on July 11, 2019. The text of the public notice and the affidavit of publication appear in Appendix D, pages D-28 to D-29. No comments were received.</p> <p>The project will meet the minimum requirements described in the current <i>INDOT Public Involvement Manual</i> which requires the project sponsor to offer the public an opportunity to submit comment and/or request a public hearing. Therefore, a legal notice will appear in a local publication contingent upon the release of this document for public involvement. This document will be revised after the public involvement requirements are fulfilled.</p> <p>Although a public meeting was suggested during early coordination, the public will be offered an opportunity to request a public hearing. Even if not requested, a public hearing or public information meeting may be offered at INDOT's discretion since the project involves a roundabout.</p>		
Right-of-way (permanent and temporary, in acres)		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: Possible:
Comments:	<p>The existing right-of-way (ROW) along SR 60 is approximately 85 to 190 ft. from the centerline of roadway, and the existing ROW along Salem Bypass is approximately 100 to 140 ft. from the centerline of the roadway (Appendix B, pages B-31 to B-35).</p> <p>This project will occur within existing ROW. No permanent or temporary ROW will be required for this project.</p> <p>If the scope of work or permanent or temporary ROW is required, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately.</p>		
Disruption to public facilities/services (such as schools, emergency service)		No:	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible:
Comments:	<p>Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 27, 2018 by Metric Environmental, LLC (Metric), the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-3), and the Red Flag Investigation (RFI) report (Appendix E, page E-2 and E-7) there are no public facilities within or adjacent to the project area. Access to all properties will be maintained during construction. Therefore, no impacts are expected.</p> <p>Early coordination letters were sent to INDOT Office of Aviation and the Washington County Surveyor, Highway Department, and Commissioners on November 5, 2018 and to the City of Salem Mayor's Office, City Council, Fire Department, and Police Department and the Washington County Sheriff's Department and Emergency Management on May 6, 2019 (Appendix C, pages C-1 to C-3). INDOT Office of Aviation; the Washington County Highway Department, Commissioners, Sheriff's Department, and Emergency Management; and the City of Salem Mayor's Office, City Council, Fire Department did not respond.</p>		

SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION			
	<p>The Washington County Surveyor responded on November 14, 2018 with design suggestions but did not provide any recommendations; furthermore, the designer responded to the Surveyor on December 3, 2018 informing that a public information meeting would occur (Appendix C, pages C-17 to C-18).</p> <p>The Washington County Highway Department (WCHD) responded on May 9, 2019 expressing design related concerns but did not provide any recommendations; furthermore, the designer responded to the WCHD on May 20, 2019 informing that a public information meeting would occur (Appendix C, pages C-21 to C-22).</p> <p>The roundabout will be constructed utilizing phased construction along SR 60, with a temporary closure of Salem Bypass to build the southwest and northeast intersection legs; thus, Salem Bypass will be closed for construction while SR 60 remains open to through-traffic. The official Salem Bypass detour will utilize SR 135 through the Town of Salem, SR 56, and US 150, requiring approximately 43.1 mi. and 51 minutes of drive time. SR 60 will remain open as long as possible through construction but will be closed to complete curb work. The official SR 60 detour will utilize SR 56 and I-65, requiring approximately 38.6 mi. and 38 minutes of drive time. It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to notify school corporations and emergency services at least two weeks prior to any construction that would block or limit access.</p>		
Involvement with existing bridge(s) (Include structure number(s))		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
		Possible: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Comments:	<p>Two bridges are located within the project limits, including Bridge Number (No.) 060-88-09275/National Bridge Inventory (NBI) No. 021456, a 24-ft. span by 8-ft. rise precast three-sided structure under the northeast leg of Salem Bypass, and Bridge No. 060-88-03726 A/NBI No. 021450, a 30-ft. span by 17-ft. rise arch structure under the southeast leg of SR 60. The bridges will remain in place for the duration of construction and will not be impacted. No other bridges or structures are present within the project area.</p>		

** Limited public involvement, CE-1 level projects will typically have no public hearing opportunity offered.*

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES			
Streams, Rivers, and Watercourses Impacted (linear feet)		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
		Possible: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Comments:	<p>Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 26, 2018 by Metric, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-3), and the water resources map in the RFI report (Appendix E, page E-8), there are 20 rivers and streams located within the 0.5 mi. search radius. The nearest stream, Hoggart Branch, intersects the project area. However, no permanent or temporary excavation or fill will occur/be placed within the stream. A firm commitment has been included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document for the contractor to install silt fence or other erosion control measures around the perimeter waterbodies to remain undisturbed at the project site. Therefore, no impacts are expected.</p> <p>A <i>Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report</i> was INDOT-ESD-Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office (EWPO) approved on February 20, 2019. Please refer to Appendix F, pages F-1 to F-14 for the <i>Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report</i>. It was determined that three streams, UNT 1, UNT 2, and UNT 3, totaling 1722.1 linear ft. are within the project study limits (Appendix F, page F-17). The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.</p> <p>Early coordination letters were sent to the USACE and Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR)-Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) on November 5, 2018 and to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on May 6, 2019 (Appendix C, pages C-1 to C-3). USACE did not respond to the early coordination letter.</p> <p>On November 5, 2018, Metric generated an automatic Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) Proposed Roadway Construction Projects letter, in which IDEM recommended obtaining Section 401/404 of the Clean Water Act permits, if necessary (Appendix C, pages C-6 to C-13).</p>		

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES			
	<p>IDNR-DFW responded on December 15, 2018 with recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts to nearby streams (Appendix C, pages C-19 to C-20). IDNR-DFW recommended avoiding impacts to the Hoggatt Branch mitigation planting area and implementing appropriately design erosion and sediment control measures.</p> <p>USFWS responded on May 7, 2019 with recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts to nearby streams (Appendix C, pages C-23 to C-24). USFWS recommended implementing temporary erosion and sediment control methods.</p> <p>All applicable IDEM, IDNR-DFW, and USFWS recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p>		
Wetlands (acres)	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes:	Possible:
Comments:	<p>Based on a review of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) online mapper (https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html), the USGS topographic map (Appendix B, page B-2), and the RFI report (Appendix E, page E-8), there are 11 NWI wetlands located within the 0.5 mi. search radius and none are found within the project area. A site visit was conducted on September 26, 2018 by Metric and three wetlands were identified. The delineated Wetlands are depicted in an exhibit provided in Appendix F, page F-17. Wetland A is a 0.053-acre (ac.) Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Temporarily Flooded (PEM1A) wetland located on the west side of the intersection. Wetland B is a 0.008-ac. PEM1A wetland located on the north side of Salem Bypass. Wetland C is a Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Seasonally Flooded (PEM1C) wetland located east of the intersection. All three wetlands are classified as poor quality due to receiving polluted run-off and exhibiting low plant species diversity. All three wetlands are outside of construction limits and, therefore, will not be impacted (Appendix B, page B-35).</p> <p>A <i>Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report</i> was INDOT-ESD-EWPO-approved on February 20, 2019. Please refer to Appendix F, pages F-1 to F-14 for the <i>Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report</i>. It was determined that two PEM1A wetlands and one PEM1C wetland are present within the project study limits. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.</p> <p>Early coordination letters were sent to the USACE and IDNR-DFW on November 5, 2018 and to the USFWS on May 6, 2019 (Appendix C, pages C-1 to C-3). USACE did not respond to the early coordination letter.</p> <p>On November 5, 2018, Metric generated an automatic IDEM Proposed Roadway Construction Projects letter, in which IDEM recommended obtaining Section 401/404 of the Clean Water Act permits, if necessary (Appendix C, pages C-6 to C-13).</p> <p>IDNR-DFW responded on December 5, 2018 with recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts to nearby wetlands (Appendix C, pages C-19 to C-20). IDNR-DFW recommended implementing appropriately design erosion and sediment control measures.</p> <p>USFWS responded on May 7, 2019 but did not provide recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts to nearby wetlands (Appendix C, pages C-23 to C-24).</p> <p>All applicable IDEM, IDNR-DFW, and USFWS recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p>		
Disturbance of Terrestrial Habitat (acres)	No:	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Possible:
Comments:	<p>Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 26, 2018 by Metric, and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-3), there are grass and tree habitats surrounding the project area. The dominant vegetation includes narrow-leaf cattail (<i>Typha angustifolia</i>), reed canary grass (<i>Schedonorus arundinaceus</i>), red clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>), large barnyard grass (<i>Echinochloa crus-galli</i>), oldfield American aster (<i>Symphyotrichum pilosum</i>), black medic (<i>Medicago lupulina</i>), spotted lady's-thumb</p>		

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES			
	<p>(<i>Persicaria maculosa</i>), hop sedge (<i>Carex lupulina</i>), Johnson grass (<i>Sorghum halepense</i>), Canadian goldenrod (<i>Solidago canadensis</i>), Queen Anne's-lace (<i>Daucus carota</i>), and common reed (<i>Phragmites australis</i>) in the herb stratum and Japanese honeysuckle (<i>Lonicera japonica</i>) in the woody vine stratum. Approximately 1.21 ac. of grass will be disturbed for construction of the roundabout. No trees or shrubs will be removed.</p> <p>Early coordination letters were sent to IDNR-DFW on November 5, 2018 and to USFWS on May 6, 2019 (Appendix C, pages C-1 to C-3).</p> <p>IDNR-DFW responded on December 5, 2018 with recommendations to revegetate bare and disturbed areas, post "do not mow or spray" signs along the ROW, and seed and protect 3:1 and steeper slopes (Appendix C, pages C-19 to C-20).</p> <p>USFWS responded on May 7, 2019 with a recommendation to implement temporary erosion and sediment control methods within areas of disturbed soil (Appendix C, pages C-23 to C-24).</p> <p>All applicable IDNR-DFW and USFWS recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p>		
Karst Features		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p>Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 26, 2018 by Metric, the topographic map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-2), and the RFI report (Appendix E), the proposed project is located inside the designated karst region of Indiana as outlined in the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). There are no karst features identified within the project area. In the early coordination response dated November 5, 2018, the Indiana Geological Survey (IGS) did not indicate that karst features may exist in the project area (Appendix C, pages C-4 to C-5). There is a high potential for bedrock resources within the project area; however, deep excavation (i.e., 10 ft. below ground surface) will not occur. Response from IGS has been communicated with the designer on August 15, 2019. No impacts are expected.</p>		
Threatened and Endangered Species		No: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p>Based on a desktop review and the RFI, completed by Metric on January 29, 2019, the IDNR Washington County Endangered, Threatened and Rare (ETR) Species List has been checked and is included in Appendix E, pages E-11 to E-14. The highlighted species on the list reflect the federal and state identified ETR species located within the county. According to the IDNR-DFW early coordination response letter dated December 5, 2018 (Appendix C, pages C-19 to C-20), the Natural Heritage Program's Database has been checked and no plant or animal species listed as state or federally ETR have been reported to occur in the project vicinity. IDNR-DFW recommends utilizing light fixtures that minimize the harmful effects of lighting on humans and wildlife. All applicable IDNR-DFW recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p> <p>Project information was submitted through the USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) portal, and an official species list was generated (Appendix C, pages C-26 to C-31). The project is within range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>) and the federally threatened Northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>). No additional species were found within the project area other than the Indiana bat and NLEB.</p> <p>The project qualifies for the <i>Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat (NLEB)</i>, dated May 2016 (revised February 2018), between FHWA, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and USFWS. An effect determination key was completed on June 5, 2019, and based on the responses provided, the project was found to "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" the Indiana bat and/or the NLEB. INDOT reviewed and verified the effect finding on June 11, 2019, and requested USFWS's review of the finding (Appendix C, pages C-32 to C-41). No response was received from USFWS within the 14-day review period;</p>		

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES			
	<p>therefore, it was concluded they concur with the finding. Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) are included as firm commitments in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p> <p>In the early coordination response dated May 7, 2019, USFWS stated they have no objections to the project as proposed and provided recommendations regarding clearing vegetation and implementing erosion control devices (Appendix C, pages C-23 to C-24). All applicable USFWS recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p> <p>This precludes the need for further consultation on this project as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended. If new information on endangered species at the site becomes available, or if project plans are changed, USFWS will be contacted for consultation.</p>		
Drinking Water Resources		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p>The project is located in Washington County, which is not located within the area of the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state of Indiana. Therefore, the FHWA/Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Sole Source Aquifer Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not applicable to this project. No impacts are expected.</p> <p>The IDEM's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (http://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/pages/wellhead/) was accessed on November 5, 2018 by Metric. This project is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area.</p> <p>The IDNR Water Well Record Database website (https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm) was accessed on July 9, 2019 by Metric. No wells are located near this project. Therefore, no impacts are expected.</p> <p>Based on a desktop review of the INDOT MS4 website (https://entapps.indot.in.gov/MS4/) by Metric on July 9, 2019, and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages E-3 and E-9); this project is located in an Urban Area Boundary (UAB) location; however, no coordination is needed.</p> <p>Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 26, 2018 by Metric, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-3), and the design plans (Appendix B, pages B-31 to B-35), this project is located where there is a public water system. The public water system will not be affected because the facilities are outside of construction limits and are not anticipated to be in conflict with the proposed project. The designer is conducting utility coordination and will continue to coordinate, as necessary, until project completion to ensure to conflicts occur.</p>		
Flood Plains (note transverse or longitudinal impact)		No: <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p>Based on a desktop review of the IDNR Indiana Floodplain Information Portal website (http://dnrmmaps.dnr.in.gov/appsphp/fdms/) by Metric on May 6, 2019, this project is located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from approved IDNR floodplain maps (Appendix F, page F-45). An early coordination letter was sent on May 6, 2019 to the local Floodplain Administrator. The floodplain administrator did not respond within the 30-day time frame. This project qualifies as a Category 1 per the current INDOT CE Manual, which states, "Although this project involves work within the horizontal limits of the 100-year floodplain, no work is being performed below the 100-year flood elevation and as a result this project does not encroach upon the base floodplain."</p> <p>In the early coordination response dated December 5, 2018, IDNR-DFW stated that the proposal will require the formal approval for construction in a floodway under the Flood Control Act (Appendix C, pages C-19 to C-20). Therefore, a Construction in a Floodway permit will be required.</p>		
Farmland (acres)		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES																																																						
Comments:	Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 26, 2018 by Metric, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-3), there is no land that meets the definition of farmland under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) within or adjacent to the project area. The requirements of the FPPA do not apply to this project; therefore, no impacts are expected. In the early coordination response dated November 28, 2018, NRCS stated that this project will not cause a conversion of prime farmland (Appendix C, page C-14).																																																					
Cultural Resources		No: X	Yes:																																																			
		Possible:																																																				
Comments:	<p><u>Area of Potential Effect</u> Qualified professionals working for Metric and meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards defined an Area of Potential Effect (APE). The APE is the geographical area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist, as defined by 36 CFR Section 800.16 (d). The APE for this project includes all properties within a 1,300 ft. radius of the intersection of SR 60 and Salem Bypass (Appendix D, Pages D-2 and D-5).</p> <p><u>Coordination with Consulting Parties</u> Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires federal agencies or their representatives to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.2(c) and the INDOT <i>Cultural Resources Manual</i>, the consulting parties were invited to participate in efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by this project, assess the project’s effects, and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties. On April 4, 2019, the potential consulting parties tabulated below and in Appendix D, page D-27 were invited via e-mail (Appendix D, pages D-7 to D-10) to view Section 106 documentation, including the consulting party coordination letter dated March 28, 2019 (Appendix D, pages D-11 to D-12), on the Indiana Section 106 Consultation and Outreach Portal Enterprise (IN SCOPE). The INDOT CRO, on behalf of FHWA, and the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) were automatic consulting parties.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin: 10px 0;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Invited Consulting Party</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Reply Received</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Response</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Indiana Landmarks – Southern Office</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Historical Society</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Historian</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Commissioner – District 1</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Commissioner – District 2</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Commissioner – District 3</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Council – District 1</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Mayor – City of Salem</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Washington County Highway Supervisor</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Delaware Nation of Oklahoma</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Miami Tribe of Oklahoma</td><td>April 29, 2019</td><td>Yes</td></tr> <tr><td>Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> <tr><td>Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians</td><td>None received</td><td>N/A</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>On April 29, 2019, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma agreed to be a consulting party and stated, “If any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery (Appendix D, Page D-13). The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma requirement has been included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.</p>			Invited Consulting Party	Reply Received	Response	Indiana Landmarks – Southern Office	None received	N/A	Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development	None received	N/A	Washington County Historical Society	None received	N/A	Washington County Historian	None received	N/A	Washington County Commissioner – District 1	None received	N/A	Washington County Commissioner – District 2	None received	N/A	Washington County Commissioner – District 3	None received	N/A	Washington County Council – District 1	None received	N/A	Mayor – City of Salem	None received	N/A	Washington County Highway Supervisor	None received	N/A	Delaware Nation of Oklahoma	None received	N/A	Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma	None received	N/A	Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	None received	N/A	Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	April 29, 2019	Yes	Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	None received	N/A	Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians	None received	N/A
Invited Consulting Party	Reply Received	Response																																																				
Indiana Landmarks – Southern Office	None received	N/A																																																				
Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Historical Society	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Historian	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Commissioner – District 1	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Commissioner – District 2	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Commissioner – District 3	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Council – District 1	None received	N/A																																																				
Mayor – City of Salem	None received	N/A																																																				
Washington County Highway Supervisor	None received	N/A																																																				
Delaware Nation of Oklahoma	None received	N/A																																																				
Delaware Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma	None received	N/A																																																				
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	None received	N/A																																																				
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	April 29, 2019	Yes																																																				
Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	None received	N/A																																																				
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians	None received	N/A																																																				

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES

On May 8, 2019, the Indiana SHPO responded to the consulting party coordination letter and did not provide recommendations for consulting parties beyond those whom were invited (Appendix D, pages D-14 to D-15).

Archaeology

Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(b), a Qualified Professional Archaeologist with Metric conducted a Phase Ia records check on August 29, 2018, which involved review the State Historical Architectural and Archaeological Research Database (SHAARD), site maps on file with the IDNR-Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, cultural resource management reports, cemetery records, and historical data. The project area was found to have been previously surveyed for the construction of the Salem Bypass. As noted in the consulting party coordination letter (Appendix D, pages D-11 to D-12) and the Section 106 effect finding (Appendix D, pages D-2 to D-3), "the project will also be only taking place in the existing ROW that has been disturbed by the construction of the Salem Bypass and the existing intersection with SR 60. According to SHAARD, there are two ineligible archaeological sites mapped within the project area; however, they were destroyed by the construction of the Salem Bypass. The potential for any impacts to intact portions of those sites or other such sites to be present within the project area is considered extremely low". Therefore, Metric recommended that no further archaeological work was needed.

On April 4, 2019 and May 31, 2019, INDOT CRO agreed with these archaeological findings and recommendations through concurrence with the consulting party coordination letter and the Section 106 effect finding, respectively. On May 8, 2019 and June 20, 2019, the Indiana SHPO also agreed with these archaeological findings and recommendations through concurrence with the consulting party coordination letter and the Section 106 effect finding, respectively (Appendix D, pages D-14 to D-17).

Historic Properties:

Metric reviewed the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures, SHAARD, SHAARD Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and several other primary and secondary sources containing information about Washington Township and Washington County. No NRHP-listed or -eligible properties were identified within the APE. Metric completed the HPSR on April 3, 2019 (Appendix D, Pages D-19 to D-20).

On April 4, 2019, INDOT CRO concurrence with the findings and recommendations in the HPSR was received. On April 4, 2019, Indiana SHPO and other potential consulting parties were invited via e-mail to view the HPSR on IN SCOPE (Appendix D, pages D-7 to D-11) and a hard copy of the report was submitted by mail to the Indiana SHPO. On May 8, 2019, the Indiana SHPO indicated concurrence with the findings and recommendations of the HPR (Appendix D, Pages D-14 to D-15).

Documentation, Findings

On May 31, 2019, the INDOT CRO, on behalf of the FHWA, approved the APE and issued a "No Historic Properties Affected" finding for this project (Appendix D, Page D-1). Following this finding, the effect documentation was provided to the Indiana SHPO for a 30-day review and comment period. On June 20, 2019, the Indiana SHPO responded with their concurrence regarding the "No Historic Properties Affected" finding (Appendix D, Page D-16 to D-17).

Public Involvement

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4), the views of the public were sought regarding the effect of the proposed project. An announcement was published in the *Salem Leader* on June 11, 2019 (Appendix D, pages D-28 to D-29). A deadline date of July 11, 2019 was established to provide comments on the "No Historic Properties Affected" finding. As no comments were received regarding the "No Historic Properties Affected" finding during the 30-day public comment period, the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 were fulfilled.

Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes:	Possible:
---	---	------	-----------

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES			
Comments:	<p>Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 prohibits the use of certain public and historic lands for federally funded transportation facilities unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. The law applies to significant publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife / waterfowl refuges, and NRHP eligible or listed historic properties regardless of ownership. Lands subject to this law are considered Section 4(f) resources.</p> <p>Based on a desktop review, a site visit on September 26, 2018 by Metric, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, page B-3), and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages E-2 and E-7), there are no Section 4(f) resources within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, no impacts are expected.</p> <p>The U.S. Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 established the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which was created to preserve, develop, and assure accessibility to outdoor recreation resources. Section 6(f) of this Act prohibits conversion of lands purchased with LWCF monies to a non-recreation use.</p> <p>A review of 6(f) properties on the LWCF Coalition website at https://www.lwcfcoalition.com/tools revealed a total of four properties in Washington County (Appendix I, page I-6). None of these properties are located within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, there will be no impacts to 6(f) resources as a result of this project.</p>		
Air Quality Impacts		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p>This project is included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-2021 and 2020-2024 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIPs) (Appendix H, pages H-1 to H-2).</p> <p>This project is located in Washington County, which is currently in attainment for all criteria pollutants according to the IDEM County Nonattainment List, accessed by Metric on July 1, 2019 (https://www.in.gov/idem/airquality/files/nonattainment_county_list.pdf). Therefore, the conformity procedures of 40 CFR Part 93 do not apply.</p> <p>This project is of a type qualifying as a categorical exclusion (Group 1) under 23 CFR 771.117(c), or exempt under the Clean Air Act conformity rule under 40 CFR 93.126, and as such, a Mobile Source Air Toxics analysis is not required.</p>		
Community/Economic Impacts		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p><u>Indirect Effects and Cumulative Impacts</u> Indirect impacts are effects which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate. Cumulative impacts affect the environment which result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such actions.</p> <p>Based on the scope of work, no indirect effects or cumulative impacts have been identified.</p> <p><u>Environmental Justice (EJ)</u> Under FHWA Order 6640.23A, FHWA and the project sponsor, as a recipient of funding from FHWA, are responsible to ensure that their programs, policies, and activities do not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. This project will have no relocations and will require no ROW, which is less than 0.5 ac. of additional permanent ROW; therefore, an EJ analysis is not required per the current INDOT Categorical Exclusion Manual.</p>		
Hazardous Materials		No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>

INVOLVEMENT WITH RESOURCES			
Comments:	Based on a review of GIS and available public records, an RFI was completed on January 29, 2019 by Metric (Appendix E). One National Pollution Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) Facility is located within 0.5 mi. of the project area, and the NPDES Facility is located within the project area; however, no hazmat sites were identified in or within 0.5 mi. of the project area that will impact the project. The NPDES Facility is within the project area. No impacts are expected because of distance or a No Further Action determination by IDEM. Further investigation for hazardous material concerns is not required at this time.		
Permits		No:	Yes: X
Possible:			
Comments:	<p>No permanent or temporary impact to streams or wetlands is anticipated; therefore, permits to comply with Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act will not be required.</p> <p>Based on consultation with IDNR-DFW this project will require the formal approval from IDNR Division of Water for construction in a floodway.</p> <p>Since greater than one acre of land will be disturbed, a Construction/Land Disturbance Storm Water (e.g., Rule 5) Permit will be required.</p> <p>Applicable recommendations provided by IDNR-DFW and IDEM are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this document. If a construction in a floodway permit is found to be necessary, the conditions of the permit will be requirements of the project and will supersede these recommendations.</p> <p>It will be the responsibility of the project sponsor to identify and obtain all required permits.</p>		

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS:

Firm

1. If the scope of work or permanent or temporary right-of-way is required, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately. (INDOT ESD and INDOT Seymour District)
2. The contractor will be responsible for contacting school districts and emergency services at least 14 days prior to construction. (INDOT ESD)
3. If a spill occurs or contaminated soils or ground water are encountered during construction, appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) will be utilized. Contaminated materials will need to be properly handled and disposed of in accordance with current regulations. IDEM should be notified through the spill line at (888) 233-7745 within 24 hours of discovery of contamination from an Underground Storage Tank system and within 2 hours of discovery of a spill. (INDOT)
4. If any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery. (Miami Tribe of Oklahoma)
5. 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 Indiana Code 14-21-1-29) 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 Indiana Code 14-21-1-29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations, including but not limited to 36 CFR 800. (INDOT CRO)
6. General AAM 1: Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat area aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs. (USFWS)
7. Hibernacula AMM 1: For projects located within karst areas, on-site personnel will use best management practices, secondary containment measures, or other standard spill prevention and countermeasures to avoid impacts to possible hibernacula. Where practicable, a 300 foot buffer will be employed to separate fueling areas and other major containment risk activities from caves, sinkholes, losing streams, and springs in karst

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS:

- topography. (USFWS)
8. Lighting AMM 2: When installing new or replacing existing permanent lights, use downward-facing, full cut-off lens lights (with same intensity or less for replacement lighting); or for those transportation agencies using the BUG system developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society, be as close to 0 for all three ratings with a priority of "uplight" of 0 and "backlight" as low as practicable. (USFWS)

For Further Consideration

9. The use of cutback asphalt emulsion containing more than seven percent (7%) oil distillate is prohibited during the months of April through October. (IDEM)
10. Install silt fence or other erosion control measures around the perimeter of any wetlands and /or other waterbodies to remain undisturbed at the project site. (IDEM)
11. Stabilize all disturbed areas upon completion of land disturbing activities. (IDEM)
12. Sediment-laden water which otherwise would flow from the project site shall be treated by erosion and sediment control measures appropriate to minimize sedimentation. (IDEM)
13. Wastes and unused building materials shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. (IDEM)
14. 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. (IDEM)
15. 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)
16. 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)
17. A stable construction site access shall be provided at all points of construction traffic ingress and egress to the project site. (IDEM)
18. Public or private roadways shall be kept cleared of accumulated sediment that is a result of run-off or tracking. (IDEM)
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. Minimize and contain within the project limits in-channel disturbance and the clearing of trees and brush. (IDNR-DFW)
21. Plant native hardwood trees along the top of the bank and right-of-way to replace the vegetation destroyed during construction. (IDNR-DFW)
22. Post "Do Not Mow or Spray" signs along the right-of-way. (IDNR-DFW)
23. 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)
24. Seed and protect all disturbed streambanks and slopes not protected by other methods that are 3:1 or steeper with erosion control blankets that are heavy-duty, biodegradable, and net free or that use loose-woven / Leno-woven netting to minimize the entrapment and snaring of small-bodied wildlife such as snakes and turtles (follow manufacturer's recommendations for selection and installation); seed and apply mulch on all other disturbed areas. (IDNR-DFW)
25. 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.) (IDNR-DFW)
26. Minimize the extent of hard armor (riprap) in bank stabilization by using bioengineering techniques whenever possible. If riprap is utilized for bank stabilization, extend it below low-water elevation to provide aquatic habitat. (IDNR-DFW)
27. 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. (IDNR-DFW)

THE CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION CANNOT BE PROCESSED AS A LEVEL ONE IF YES IS SELECTED FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS*:		
Formal noise analysis required?	No: X	Yes:
Environmental Justice analysis required?	No: X	Yes:
Right-of-Way acquisition greater than 0.5 acre?	No: X	Yes:
Relocation of residences/businesses/etc.?	No: X	Yes:
Added through-traffic lanes?	No: X	Yes:
Facility on new location or realignment?	No: X	Yes:
Permanent alteration of local traffic pattern?	No: X	Yes:
Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resource impacts?	No: X	Yes:
Sole Source Aquifer Groundwater Assessment required?	No: X	Yes:
Is the project "Likely to Adversely Affect" Threatened and Endangered Species?	No: X	Yes:
Stream impacts greater than 300 linear feet, or work beyond 75 feet from pavement?	No: X	Yes:
Wetland impacts greater than 0.1 acre?	No: X	Yes:
Does the project have historic bridge involvement, or a Section 106 finding of No Adverse Effect / Adverse Effect?	No: X	Yes:

** Please note, this table is not applicable for state funded CE's.*