

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

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

<b>Road No./County:</b>	<b>US Route 20 at State Route 2</b>
<b>Designation Number:</b>	<b>1383614 &amp; 1601711</b>
<b>Project Description/Termini:</b>	<b>New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2</b>

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):

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 2</b> – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 3</b> – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 4</b> – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA
<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Environmental Assessment (EA)</b> – EAs require a separate FONSI. Additional research and documentation is necessary to determine the effects on the environment. Required Signatories: ES, FHWA

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

**Approval** \_\_\_\_\_  
 ESM Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ ES Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 FHWA Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Release for Public Involvement**

N/A \_\_\_\_\_ REB 7-5-18  
 ESM Initials \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ ES Initials \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Certification of Public Involvement** \_\_\_\_\_  
 Office of Public Involvement \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

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

INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: C.J. Cunningham, Troyer Group

This is page 1 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018

Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

Part I - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

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

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

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

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

Remarks: Notice of Entry for Survey or Investigation - Notice of Entry for Survey or Investigation letters were mailed on October 15, 2015 to property owners located in the vicinity of the project area describing the proposed project and notifying them that project personnel may be entering their property to gather data for environmental analysis. An example of this letter is located in Appendix G-1.
Section 106 Consulting - To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice (Appendix D-44 through D-46) was published in the South Bend Tribune and LaPorte Herald Argus on February 26, 2018. The notice offered the public an opportunity to comment on the "No Historic Properties Affected" Section 106 finding. The public had a 30 day comment period to respond to the notice. The comment period expired on March 28, 2018 and no comments were received.
Public Hearing - The proposed project will meet the minimum requirements described in the current Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Manual which would require 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.

Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts? Yes No x

Remarks: Some public controversy is known to exist regarding roundabouts along state routes in rural areas. The level of controversy concerning this project is not yet known. The opportunity is needed to educate the public about roundabouts and about roundabout interchanges and the safety they provide.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

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

Sponsor of the Project: Indiana Department of Transportation INDOT District: LaPorte  
 Local Name of the Facility: Intersection of US 20 and State Road 2

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

\*If other is selected, please identify the funding source: N/A

**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 for the project stems primarily from operational safety issues that currently exist at this intersection. Between 2008 and 2017, the intersection experienced a crash rate of 2.59 accidents per million vehicles entering (MVE). INDOT's threshold for potential operating deficiency is 1.5 accidents/MVE. Moreover, the intersection sees a high rate of traffic accidents resulting in injuries to those involved. Review of recent accident data indicates that over the last ten years, there have been 238 traffic accidents, with 33% resulting in injury or fatality. This rate greatly exceeds the national average of 20%, as reported by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. A detailed breakdown of crashes occurring between 2008 and 2017 is provided below.

SEVERITY	'08	'09	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	Total
Crash with no Injury	14	12	7	7	9	14	10	12	14	17	159
Non-Incapacitating Injury	4	4	3	9	10	5	4	3	1	7	67
Incapacitating Injury	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	2	-	3	10
Fatal	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>238</b>

*Note: Data obtained from Indiana State Police*

An estimated 46 heavy vehicle trips along US 20 through downtown New Carlisle are made during the peak hour. Some of these trips may be necessary as they originate or end near New Carlisle, but it is anticipated most of these trips could be encouraged to remain on the east-west corridor, which is designated as an Extra-Heavy-Duty Highway.

The need for the project also stems from existing operational efficiency, as measured by Level of Service (LOS). LOS analyzes roadways and intersections by categorizing traffic flow and assigning quality levels of traffic based on performance measures like vehicle speed, density, congestion, etc. LOS assigns grades A through F, with A being the worst and B being the best. LOS A represents free flow traffic; LOS C represents stable flow; and LOS F represents a breakdown in flow or gridlock. The existing intersection has a LOS of C according to calculations performed according to the Highway Capacity Manual.

The purpose of the proposed project is to increase the operational safety at the intersection of US 20 and State Road 2 by achieving the following results:

- 1.) Decreasing points of conflict with highest volume of traffic, which flows east-west.
- 2.) Deterring truck traffic from utilizing US 20 through New Carlisle as a shortcut between the western leg of the intersection and US 31.
- 3.) Maintaining or improving operational efficiency.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):</b>
-----------------------------------------------------

County: LaPorte Municipality: N/A (between LaPorte and South Bend)

Limits of Proposed Work: The limits of the proposed work along extend from the center of the existing intersection in the following manner:

- US 20 western leg – approximately 2,150 feet west of the intersection
- US 20 northern leg – approximately 4,350 feet north of the intersection
- SR 2 eastern leg – approximately 1,550 feet east of the intersection
- SR 2 southern leg – approximately 1,600 feet south of the intersection

Total Work Length: 1.83 Mile(s) Total Work Area: 41.3 Acre(s)

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

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

<sup>1</sup>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.*

**Existing Conditions:**

This project is located between the towns of Rolling Prairie and New Carlisle in LaPorte County, Indiana and consists of the reconstruction and grade separation of the US Route 20 (US 20) and State Road 2 (SR 2) interchange. US 20 runs in an east-west direction approaching the intersection from the west and turns north at the intersection. SR 2 runs in an east-west direction approaching the intersection from the east and turns southwest at the intersection. The existing intersection is an at-grade signalized crossing. See Appendices B-1 through B-8 for project area maps, project illustrations, and project area photographs.

SR 2 and the west leg of US 20 are listed as minor arterials on INDOT's functional classification map. The north leg of US 20 is listed as a major collector. The posted speed limit on the east approach is 60 mph, and the posted speed on the west, north, and south approaches is 55 mph. The east-west corridor is designated as an Extra-Heavy-Duty Highway. This recognizes the predominant traffic pattern in which traffic flows eastward on US 20 transfers to SR 2 via a through movement, and vice versa for westward travelling traffic. This intersection is the only at-grade intersection of two four-lane highways in Indiana, and it has one of the highest crash rates in the state.

The four legs of the intersection US 20 and SR 2 are four lane divided highways with 20' grass medians. In each direction there are 2-12' lanes, a 4'-wide inside shoulder and a 10' outside shoulder. Near the interchange, there are dedicated left turn lanes and right-turn entrance/exit ramps. Existing right-of-way along the east-west roadway is approximately 435 feet wide, widening toward the intersection. Existing right-of-way along the north-south roadway it is approximately 355 feet wide, widening toward the intersection.

Land use surrounding the proposed interchange area (outside the existing right-of-way) is primarily agricultural. A restaurant with a driveway is located adjacent to eastbound US 20 approximately 1,500 feet west of the existing intersection.

**Proposed Project Improvement:**

The project will convert the existing signalized intersection to a new grade separated, "dog-bone" interchange. The dog-bone interchange uses roundabouts north and south of the interchange. This modification from a more typical stop-controlled interchange further reduces conflict points and is anticipated to provide safer and more efficient access from the off-ramps into mainline traffic flow. This improved access addresses the existing intersection's high westbound-to-southbound left turning movement. The increased efficiency allows for fewer approach lanes on the north-south leg than other intersection types, resulting in a reduction of required pavement and bridge width. Traffic analysis indicates that a two-lane north-south roadway section at the intersection is adequate.

The east-west corridor will remain at grade and traffic will flow uninterrupted. The north-south corridor will be elevated and a new

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

bridge will be constructed overtop the east-west corridor. Roundabouts will be constructed north and south of the bridge. Under the new intersection configuration, traffic will enter and exit the free-flowing east-west corridor by way of new on/off ramps. The on/off ramps will intersect the north-south corridor at two new roundabouts. In addition to improvements immediately surrounding the interchange, the northern leg of US 20 will be reduced from a divided 4-lane section to a multi-direction 2-lane section between the interchange and 600' northeast of US 20's intersection with C.R. N 600 E, where the road currently transitions to a 2-lane section. The roadway and bridge improvements will be constructed simultaneously, but are being designed under separate INDOT designation numbers – Des. No. 1383614 for the roadway work and Des. No. 1601711 for the bridge work.

The majority of the project's excavation will involve fill work to build up the ramp approaches for the bridge overtop the east-west route. Previously stockpiled material remains in the intersection's northwest quadrant, which will be removed to a depth of approximately 15 feet and relocated elsewhere within the construction limits. Underdrain and culverts will be installed beneath the improved roadways, which will require excavation to a depth of 4 to 5 feet.

The maintenance of traffic (MOT) will be phased. The first phase will involve lane restrictions along the east-west corridor (down to a single lane in each direction) and road closures with corresponding detours for the north-south corridor. During the first phase of construction, work will focus on the construction of the north and south roundabouts, ramps in all four quadrants of the intersection, and construction of the bridge's center pier. The state route detour will utilize SR 39 to the west and US 31 to the east. Detoured traffic will be directed between those roads by way of US 20/SR 2, through the subject intersection. A map of the detour route can be found in Appendix B-20.

The second phase of the project construction will maintain the complete closure of the north-south route and require the same detour discussed above, and will still require lane restrictions on the east-west corridor to accommodate construction of the north and south bridge piers. Additional temporary daytime closures with flaggers will also be necessary during the placement of beams or other work on the structure. Such closings are not anticipated to occur for more than two days. During the first phase of construction, work will focus on the construction of the bridge and the on/off ramp tie-ins.

MOT and detour sheets are available in Appendix B-18 through B-20.

Additional right-of-way is not anticipated to be necessary, as right-of-way was set aside for when the intersection was first constructed in the early 1960's. The current intersection of State Road 2 and US 20 did not take its current shape until after 1960. The intersection was previously located to the west at what is now the intersection of Oak Knoll Road at US 20. Oak Knoll Road previously served as the intersection's northern US 20 leg and the southern SR 2 leg. Construction plans were prepared in 1960 to shift the intersection to the east to its current location by re-aligning the intersection's southern and northern legs. The plans called for a "future interchange" and the corresponding right-of-way was acquired at that time along with that which was necessary for realigned roadway corridors.

The preferred alternative meets the project's purpose and need by:

- 1) Introducing an intersection geometry with many fewer conflicts among turning movements, both by separating the grade among the east-west and north-south corridors and by incorporated roundabouts among the interchanges, which have fewer conflict point than traditional stop-controlled or signalized intersections.
- 2) Providing a free-flowing route along the east west corridor that will encourage heavy vehicle traffic to utilize the eastern SR 2 leg rather than the northern US 20 leg as a connection between US 31 and the western US 20 leg, thereby deterring such traffic from travelling through New Carlisle.
- 3) Improving the design year operation efficiency from LOS A to LOS C (per Highway Capacity Manual calculations, which assesses average intersection delay).

See Appendices B-1 through B-8 for project illustrations and project area photographs. Refer to Appendices B-9 through B-54 for the roadway design plans, and Appendices B-55 through B-71 for the bridge design plans.

This is page 5 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

### OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

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

The following alternatives were evaluated as part of a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER), prepared for INDOT in March, 2016. The report documented the engineering assessment phase of the project, outlined alternatives considered, and identified the preferred alternative. Supplementary to the PER was a Structure Size and Type (SST) Report that assessed a wide array of variations the bridge types identified in the PER, and determined the preferred bridges/structures that would accompany each of the intersection geometric configuration alternatives. The preferred alternative then became subject to detailed environmental and engineering analyses.

Below is a summary of each of the evaluated alternatives. Additional details regarding these alternatives are available in the appended PER (Appendix J) and SST Report (Appendix K).

**1.) No-Build Alternative.**

The No-Build Alternative serves as the baseline for comparison for the build alternatives. This alternative is not preferred because it would not improve the safety of the intersection. If selected, high-speed crashes and resulting injuries will persist. The no-build alternative is not recommended as it does not meet the purpose and need of the project since it does not enhance safety for vehicular traffic.

**2.) Tight diamond interchange.**

The tight-diamond interchange is a typically-configured interchange with stop-controlled intersections and a bridge carrying the north-south leg over the east-west leg. A variant of the standard diamond interchange, this version would bring the ramp terminals closer together so that they remain within the existing right-of-way. This configuration would remove significant conflict points from the intersection and would increase safety and traffic flow. The tight-diamond alternative was removed from further consideration because it 1) does not decreasing the number of conflict points to the greatest degree 2) does not increase traffic efficiency to the greatest degree and 3) would result in a corresponding structure type that would have a higher up-front construction cost and a higher life-cycle cost, thereby making this alternative less economically viable than the preferred alternative.

**3.) Dog-bone interchange with a three-sided structure.**

The alternative would utilize the Dog-Bone interchange similarly to the preferred alternative. However, this alternative would have the east-west roadway passing over the north-south roadway by means of a three-sided structure. The dog-bone configuration would make the three-sided structure feasible due to its reduced travel speeds and fewer travel lanes, which would allow for a narrower structure width than that which would be necessary for additional turn lanes associated to a tight diamond interchange. The dog-bone/three-sided structure alternative was removed from further consideration because it 1) it would result in a corresponding structure type that would have a higher up-front construction cost and a higher life-cycle cost 2) the overall project's up-front construction cost would be higher than the preferred alternative, thereby making this alternative less economically viable than the preferred alternative.

The matrix below summarizes the key criteria metrics that were used to evaluate the improvement alternatives. Additional information concerning each criterion is located beneath the table.

Criteria:	Configuration Alternatives			
	No-Build (Existing)	Tight Diamond w/ preferred bridge	Dogbone w/ preferred bridge (preferred alternative)	Dogbone w/ 3-sided structure
Safety	Many conflict points and high potential of serious injury.	Few conflict points. However high potential for serious injury remains.	Fewest conflict points and low potential for serious injury.	Fewest conflict points and low potential for serious injury.
HCM LOS / 20-yr Growth Rate to Failure	C / 2.75%	A / 3.8%	A / 5.4%	A / 5.4%
Desired Traffic Patterns	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Est. Construction Cost (as calculated for PER)	\$0	\$9,861,600	\$7,074,900	\$12,091,100
User Cost During Construction	\$0	\$11,544,000 (10-mo. Detour)	\$5,820,000 (5-month Detour)	\$153,500 (No Detour)
Structure Life Cycle Cost	not calculated	\$2,404,000	\$1,284,000	\$1,948,000
Right-of-way Risk	N/A	May need additional right-of-way for change in grade of N-S alignment.	Additional right-of-way not likely to be required.	Additional right-of-way not likely to be required.

**Explanation of evaluation criteria:**

**Safety:**

Conflict points are counted as any time the travel path of a vehicle crosses the travel path of any other vehicle potentially utilizing the intersection.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

The potential of serious injury is a factor of what percentage of those conflict points involve head-on or 'T-bone' collisions and the potential to impact a rigid hazard such as a bridge pier or abutment.

**HCM LOS / 20-yr Growth Rate to Failure:**  
 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) Level of Service (LOS) is a measure of the intersection's ability to handle traffic and can evaluate existing and proposed traffic volumes. The 20-yr growth rate to failure is the rate at which yearly traffic volumes would need to increase in order to reach failure (LOS D) in 20 years. LOS analyzes roadways and intersections by categorizing traffic flow and assigning quality levels of traffic based on performance measures like vehicle speed, density, congestion, etc. LOS assigns grades A through F, with A being the worst and B being the best. LOS A represents free flow traffic; LOS C represents stable flow; and LOS F represents a breakdown in flow or gridlock.

**Desired Traffic Patterns:**  
 A significant priority of this project is to alter the existing traffic patterns in the area through encouraging the use of the east-west alignment by making the route free flow and to reduce the amount of truck traffic from using US 20 through New Carlisle by discouraging turning movements.

**Construction Cost:**  
 Includes all material and labor necessary to complete the construction of the project. For the purpose of the Preliminary Engineering Report (PER), the quantity and cost of all major items were calculated and a 30% contingency was included to cover the remainder. *(note: the construction costs developed as part of the PER were preliminary and were used for relative comparison among alternatives. The may be inconsistent with cost estimates presented elsewhere in this document.)*

**Life Cycle Cost:**  
 The life cycle cost is the calculated net present value of all the necessary maintenance costs for each configuration for a 100-yr time period.

**User Cost During Construction:**  
 Value that represents the cost in lost time and resources incurred by the users during construction as compared to the standard cost of traveling that route.

**Right-of-way Risk:**  
 Assessment of the likelihood that additional right-of-way will need to be purchased to complete the project. Right-of-way reacquisition is not considered as part of this risk.

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

- |                                                                                               |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies;                                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| It would not correct existing safety hazards;                                                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies;                             | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems; or            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (Describe)                                                                              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**ROADWAY CHARACTER:**

**US 20 (western leg)**

<i>Functional Classification:</i>	Minor Arterial			
<i>Current ADT:</i>	21,133	VPD (2016)	Design Year ADT:	29,096
<i>Design Hour Volume (DHV):</i>	2,649	Truck Percentage (%)	31%	VPD (2039)
<i>Designed Speed (mph):</i>	60	Legal Speed (mph):	55	

	Existing		Proposed	
Number of Lanes:	4		4	
Type of Lanes:	Vehicular – 2 EB, 2 WB		Vehicular – 2 EB, 2 WB	
Pavement Width:	38' (each direction)	ft.	38' (each direction)	ft.
Shoulder Width:	6' – outside 4' - inside	ft.	10' – outside 4' - inside	ft.
Median Width:	20' ft.		20' ft.	
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.		N/A ft.	

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

### US 20 (northern leg)

Functional Classification: Major Collector  
 Current ADT: 5,795 VPD (2016)          Design Year ADT: 6,352 VPD (2039)           
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 635 Truck Percentage (%) 11%  
 Designed Speed (mph): 60 Legal Speed (mph): 55

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	4	2
Type of Lanes:	Vehicular – 2 NB, 2 SB	Vehicular – 1 NB, 1 SB
Pavement Width:	24' ft.	24' ft.
Shoulder Width:	11' – outside 3' – inside ft.	10' – both sides ft.
Median Width:	22' ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

### SR 2 (southern leg)

Functional Classification: Minor Arterial  
 Current ADT: 8,125 VPD (2016)          Design Year ADT: 8,968 VPD (2039)           
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 807 Truck Percentage (%) 12%  
 Designed Speed (mph): 60 Legal Speed (mph): 55

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	4	4
Type of Lanes:	Vehicular – 2 NB, 2 SB	Vehicular – 2 NB, 2 SB
Pavement Width:	40' ft. (each direction)	40' ft. (each direction)
Shoulder Width:	11' – outside 3' – inside ft.	11' – outside 3' – inside ft.
Median Width:	20' ft.	20' ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

### SR 2 (eastern leg)

Functional Classification: Minor Arterial  
 Current ADT: 18,183 VPD (2016)          Design Year ADT: 26,195 VPD (2039)           
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 2,358 Truck Percentage (%) 34%  
 Designed Speed (mph): 60 Legal Speed (mph): 60

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	4	4
Type of Lanes:	Vehicular – 2 EB, 2 WB	Vehicular – 2 EB, 2 WB
Pavement Width:	40' ft. (each direction)	40' ft. (each direction)
Shoulder Width:	9' – outside 3' – inside ft.	10' – outside 5' – inside ft.
Median Width:	25' ft.	20' ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

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



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

### DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES:

Structure/NBI Number(s): 020-00-10223 (proposed structure number) Sufficiency Rating: N/A (no bridge currently exists)

	Existing	Proposed
Bridge Type:	N/A	Continuous Composite Prestressed Concrete I-Beam Type III
Number of Spans:	N/A	2 spans, (71'-0" / 71'-0")
Weight Restrictions:	N/A	None
Height Restrictions:	N/A	16'-6"
Curb to Curb Width:	N/A	32'-0"
Outside to Outside Width:	N/A	35'-0"
Shoulder Width:	N/A	4'-0"
Length of Channel Work:	N/A	N/A

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

Remarks: A Structure Size and Type (SST) was prepared in March, 2016 in which bridge options corresponding the various interchange alternatives were evaluated in order to determine which structure would be the most economically suitable alternative to ultimately become incorporated into the final interchange design. The text of the SST Report is available in Appendix K.

The SST Report determined that the preferred alternates for bridges on both interchange configurations (tight diamond and dog-bone configuration) is a prestressed concrete two-span bridge with mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls. This option minimizes the overall construction time. Because embankment heights are minimized and because the concrete I-beams can be erected without the use of a shoring tower or in-span splice, construction can be completed in a relatively short duration compared with the other alternates.

Closure and detour of the north-south roadway will be required during construction. Alternatives that avoided a road closure were considered. However, the cost of the temporary closure of the north-south road during construction is offset by the savings incurred by adding a center pier and reducing the bridge spans.

The proposed bridge will be Continuous Composite Prestressed Concrete I-Beam Type III bridge and will have two spans (71'-0" and 71'-0") with no skew.

Yes       No       N/A

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

*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:

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

This is page 9 of 26    Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2    Date: July 5, 2018

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

Remarks: The maintenance of traffic (MOT) will be phased. The first phase will involve lane restrictions along the east-west corridor (down to a single lane in each direction) and road closures with corresponding detours for the north-south corridor. During the first phase of construction, work will focus on the construction of the north and south roundabouts, ramps in all four quadrants of the intersection, and construction of the bridge's center pier. The state route detour will utilize SR 39 to the west and US 31 to the east. Detoured traffic will be directed between those roads by way of US 20/SR 2, through the subject intersection. A map of the detour route can be found in Appendix B-20.

The second phase of the project construction will maintain the complete closure of the north-south route and require the same detour discussed above, and will still require lane restrictions on the east-west corridor to accommodate construction of the north and south bridge piers. Additional temporary daytime closures with flaggers will also be necessary during the placement of beams or other work on the structure. Such closings are not anticipated to occur for more than two days. During the second phase of construction, work will focus on the construction of the bridge and the on/off ramp tie-ins.

The MOT and detour plan are available in the roadway construction plans, Appendices B-18 through B-20.

The closures/lane restrictions will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists (including school buses and emergency services); however, no significant delays are anticipated and all inconveniences will cease upon project completion. The project sponsor will be responsible for contacting school districts and emergency services at least 2 weeks prior to construction. Delays would/may occur during construction but would cease with project completion.

**ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:**

Engineering\*: \$ 1,451,410\* (2018) Right-of-Way: \$ 0 Construction\*: \$ 7,074,900 (2019)

*\*Engineering and construction costs have been updated to reflect current project estimates and are different from those reported in STIP/TIP. Amendments to the STIP/TIP will be sought prior to project letting to ensure consistency.*

Anticipated Start Date of Construction: Spring, 2019

Date project incorporated into STIP June 20, 2017 by way of NIRPC TIP. See STIP/TIP approval letters in Appendix H-4. Also listed directly in STIP – See Appendix H-1.

Is the project in an MPO Area?  Yes  No

If yes, Name of MPO Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC)

Location of Project in TIP 2018-2021 NIRPC TIP Project (Approved May 18, 2016), pages 11 and 36 (Appendix H-2 and H-3).

Date of incorporation by reference into the STIP June 20, 2017. See STIP/TIP approval letters in Appendix H-4

**RIGHT OF WAY:**

Land Use Impacts	Amount (acres)	
	Permanent	Temporary
Residential	0.0	0.0
Commercial	0.0	0.0
Agricultural	0.0	0.0
Forest	0.0	0.0
Wetlands	0.0	0.0
Other:	0.0	0.0
Other:	0.0	0.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

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 their impacts on the environmental analysis should be discussed.

Remarks: All work is within the existing right-of-way. Only existing right-of-way will be affected. The existing right-of-way is comprised of the asphalt-paved travel lanes, auxiliary turning lanes, and roadway shoulders. The areas within the right-of-way, but outside of the existing pavement include grassy center median and grassy side slope and grassy/brushy areas within the existing right-of-way. Within the right-of-way there are no agriculture, commercial, or residential land uses.

No new right-of-way (permanent or temporary) is required. No relocations of residences or businesses are anticipated with this project. The existing right-of-way varies throughout the project area, but typical right-of-way widths are as follows:

- SR 2 (north) 170 ft.
- SR 2 (south) 170 ft.
- US 20 (east) 240 ft.
- US 20 (west) 210 -240 ft.

Beyond the width of the right-of-way along the intersect legs, the right-of-way also widens in the area immediately surrounding the intersection. Construction plans were prepared in 1960 to shift the intersection to the east to its current location by re-aligning the intersection's southern and northern legs. The plans called for a "future interchange" and the corresponding right-of-way was acquired at that time along with that which was necessary for realigned roadway corridors.

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

#### SECTION A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<u>Presence</u>	<u>Impacts</u>	
		Yes	No
<b>Streams, Rivers, Watercourses &amp; Jurisdictional Ditches</b>			
Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigable Waterways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Remarks: Streams and rivers in the area were mapped while preparing the Red Flag Investigation. The Waters Resources Map can be found in Appendix E-8. Streams, rivers, and water resources were also examined on USGS topographic maps (Appendix B-2), National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps (Appendix F-17), and during field investigations. The Red Flag Investigation revealed no streams or rivers within the project's construction limits. The field investigation completed by Cardno in October, 2015 revealed no jurisdictional waterways in the project area.

A Regulated Waters Delineation Report was prepared by Cardno, Inc. and approved by INDOT on January 16, 2016. Field investigations related to the report's preparation were conducted by Cardno, Inc. on October 27, 2015. The survey of the project footprint yielded no wetlands and Waters of the US. There were no features requiring detailed investigation or delineation present on site. The project footprint consists of US 20 and SR 2 roadways and constructed roadside drainages, none of which displayed an ordinary high water mark (OHWM); therefore they would not be considered a Water of the US. Adjacent to these roads are upland grass and agricultural land use features.

Early Coordination letters were sent to environmental resource agencies on January 18, 2018 (Appendix C-1). In their response dated July 18, 2017 (Appendix C-13) the USFWS did not reference impacts to streams. The USFWS has no objections to the project as currently proposed.

IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife responded to early coordination on July 28, 2017 (Appendix C-14) and did not

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

provide any comment regarding stream impacts but recommended standard commitments to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources. IDNR stated that the recommendations within their letter were only for consideration. These recommendations have been included as commitments for consideration in Section J.

In their response dated August 1, 2018 (Appendix C-21), the US Army Corps of Engineers stated that no activities under the Corps of Engineers' regulatory jurisdiction may commence without prior Corps' authorization. No jurisdictional resources are present in the project area; therefore no authorization from the Corps of Engineers is necessary.

No impacts to streams, watercourses, or jurisdictional ditches are anticipated.

**Other Surface Waters**

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

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

**Remarks:**

Surface waters in the area were mapped while preparing the Red Flag Investigation. The Waters Resources Map can be found in Appendix E-8. Surface water resources were also examined on USGS topographic maps (Appendix B-2), on National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps (Appendix F-17), and during field investigations. The Red Flag Investigation revealed no lakes or ponds near the project's construction limits. The field investigation completed by Cardno in October, 2015 revealed no surface waters in the project area.

The existing stormwater management in the area consists of roadside drainage swales, which flow generally from the northeast to southwest, as dictated by the area topography. There are no existing stormwater detention or retention facilities in the area.

Early Coordination letters were sent to environmental resource agencies on January 18, 2018 (Appendix C-1). In their response dated July 18, 2017 (Appendix C-13) the USFWS did not reference impacts to surface waters. The USFWS has no objections to the project as currently proposed.

IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife responded to early coordination on July 28, 2017 (Appendix C-14) and did not provide any comment regarding sensitive surface waters.

No impacts to existing surface waters are anticipated. The proposed improvements will involve the construction of four detention basins within the interchange – on in each quadrant surrounding the bridge. These basins will act as “dry” ponds and will only hold water immediately after storms events as it is slowly discharged into the adjacent natural stormwater collection system.

**Wetlands**

Total wetland area: 0.0 acre(s) Total wetland area impacted: 0.0 acre(s)

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

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

Wetland No.	Classification	Total Size (Acres)	Impacted Acres	Comments
<i>(no wetlands)</i>				

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

**Wetlands (Mark all that apply)**

Documentation

ES Approval Dates

- Wetland Determination
- Wetland Delineation
- USACE Isolated Waters Determination
- Mitigation Plan

x

1/26/16

**Improvements that will not result in any wetland impacts are not practicable because such avoidance would result in (Mark all that apply and explain):**

- Substantial adverse impacts to adjacent homes, business or other improved properties;
- Substantially increased project costs;
- Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems;
- Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts, or
- The project not meeting the identified needs.


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

Remarks: A regulated Waters Delineation Report was prepared by Cardno, Inc. and approved by INDOT on January 16, 2016. Field investigations related to the report's preparation were conducted by Cardno, Inc. on October 27, 2015. The survey of the project footprint yielded no wetlands and no waters of the US. There were no features requiring detailed investigation or delineation present on site. The project footprint consists of US 20 and SR 2 roadways and constructed roadside drainages that were found but that they did not display OHWM, therefore they would not be considered a Waters of the US. Adjacent to these roads are upland grass and agricultural land use features.

No impacts to wetlands are anticipated.

**Terrestrial Habitat**

Unique or High Quality Habitat

Presence

x

Impacts

Yes	No
	x

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

Remarks: Land use within the construction limits is comprised of asphalt roadway, gravel shoulder, grassy medians/side-slope and brushy open area within the existing right-of-way. Land use near the intersection is primarily cropland with scattered wooded areas and some commercial development to the west.

Early Coordination letters were sent to environmental resource agencies on January 18, 2018 (Appendix C-1). In their response dated July 18, 2017 (Appendix C-13) the USFWS stated that the proposed project will have no effect on wetlands or other significant habitat types. The USFWS has no objections to the project as currently proposed.

IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife responded to early coordination on July 28, 2017 (Appendix C-14) and did not provide any comment regarding significant terrestrial habitat, but recommended standard commitments to avoid, minimize, or compensate for impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources. IDNR stated that the recommendations within their letter were only for consideration. These recommendations have been included as commitments for consideration in Section J.

No loss of mature trees will occur in order to accommodate the footprint of the proposed roundabout and the necessary intersection sight distances. The only habitat areas will requiring removal to accommodate the proposed intersection improvement and bridge involve grassy/scrubby areas within the right-of-way. Significant or valuable terrestrial habitat will not be affected by the project.

*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

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

**Karst**

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

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

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 the state as identified in the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between INDOT, Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), IDNR and the USFWS. No karst features are known to exist within or adjacent to the proposed project area.

The Indiana Geological Society's (IGS) was sent an early coordination letter on June 30, 2017. They responded on July 12, 2017 with a completed questionnaire that indicated the project is not located near any geographic, geological, geophysical, or topographic features; that the project has no mineral resources in the project area; and that there are no active or abandoned mineral resource extractions site nearby. No concerns regarding these resources were raised by IGS.

**Threatened or Endangered Species**

Within the known range of any federal species  
 Any critical habitat identified within project area  
 Federal species found in project area (based upon informal consultation)  
 State species found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR)

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

Is Section 7 formal consultation required for this action?

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

Remarks: According to a species list generated by the USFWS's online Informal Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool, the project is within the range of the following Federally endangered species: Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), piping clover (*Charadrius melodus*), and the Mitchell's Satyr butterfly (*Neonympha mitchellii mitchellii*). The project is within the range of the following Federally threatened species: the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) and the eastern massasauga rattlesnake (*Sistrurus catenatus*). The IPaC official species list can be found in Appendix pages C-23 through C-29. The LaPorte County listing of the Indiana Natural Heritage Data Center information on endangered, threatened, or rare (ETR) species and high quality natural communities is attached with ETR species highlighted (Appendix E-11). No concerns regarding impacts to habitat for any of these species were raised by USFWS or IDNR, and no adverse impacts are anticipated during construction activities.

Early coordination letters were sent out on June 30, 2017 to environmental resource agencies including the USFWS and IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife (Appendix C-1). In their response dated July 18, 2017 (Appendix C-13) the USFWS stated that the proposed project will have no effect on wetlands or other significant habitat types. The USFWS has no objections to the project as currently proposed and no consultation is needed as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife responded to early coordination on July 28, 2017 (Appendix C-14) and stated that the Natural Heritage Database has been checked and no plant or animal species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been report to occur in the project vicinity.

The procedures for the Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation (RPIC) for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat have been implemented as they relate to this project. A review of the USFWS database did not indicate the presence of endangered bat species in or within 0.5 mile of the project area. The project area is primarily cropland surrounding the intersection with scattered wooded areas and some commercial development to the west of the intersection. The IPaC system was used to verify the project's eligibility for review under the December 15, 2016 FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion (PBO) for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). Based on the answers to the determination key within IPaC, the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the identified bat species. This finding is the result of the proposed permanent street lighting to be installed in the vicinity of the interchange. The project is adjacent to a wooded area located immediately northeast of the proposed interchange. This area is suitable for bat habitat, therefore Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) must be implemented to keep potential impacts to a minimum. The consistency letter generated by IPaC can be found beginning in Appendix C-30. INDOT Environmental Services concurred with this determination on March 22, 2018 (see email in Appendix C-39). No response to the verification was received from USFWS within 14 days, and this concludes the Section 7 consultation for the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

The following AMMs must be incorporated into the project scope in order for the project to remain eligible for the PBO:

General AMM 1: Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs.

Lighting AMM 1: 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

These above-listed AMMs will become firm project commitments and be incorporated into the project plans and specifications.

### SECTION B – OTHER RESOURCES

#### Drinking Water Resources

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

	Presence	Impacts	
		Yes	No
Wellhead Protection Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Water System(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Residential Well(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Source Water Protection Area(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sole Source Aquifer (SSA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?

	Yes	No
Is the Project in the St. Joseph Aquifer System?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the FHWA/EPA SSA MOU Applicable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Initial Groundwater Assessment Required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Detailed Groundwater Assessment Required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Remarks:

The Indiana Department of Environmental Management's Wellhead Proximity Determinator website (<http://www.in.gov/idem/cleanwater/pages/wellhead/>) was accessed on July 5, 2017 by Troyer Group. The required project location data was provided and it was determined that this project is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area (Appendix C-9).

The Environmental Protection Agency's Sole Source Aquifer website (<https://www.epa.gov/dwssa>) was accessed on June 11, 2018 by The Troyer Group. The project is located in LaPorte County, which is not located within the area of the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state of Indiana. Therefore, the FHWA/EPA Sole Source Aquifer Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is not applicable to this project, and a detailed groundwater assessment is not required. No impacts are expected.

Groundwater wells are present in the general project area. Topographic survey, which would identify any well components, was acquired within the area of all anticipated construction activities. No direct impacts to residential wells are anticipated. IDEM guidelines regarding handling hazardous materials will be followed to prevent potential contamination of nearby groundwater wells.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

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

Discuss impacts according to classification system described in the "Procedural Manual for Preparing Environmental Studies".

Remarks: The project does not encroach upon the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Special Flood Hazard Area. The project is not located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from available Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plain maps. The area has not been mapped by FEMA, and there are no floodplains near the anticipated construction limits.

Please refer to Appendix F-18, which contains a screenshot from FEMA's Flood Map Service Center indicating that no available flood map panels are available for the project area.

Because no floodplains are present, the project does not fall within the guidelines for the implementation of 23 CFR 650, 23 CFR 771, and 44 CFR.

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

Total Points (from Section VII of CPA-106/AD-1006\* N/A  
 \*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: As is required by the Farmland Protection Policy Act, coordination with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has occurred by completing and providing to them Form NRCS-AD-1006. NRCS responded in a letter dated July 5, 2017 indicating that the project will not cause a conversion of prime farmland. Appended to NRCS's letter was the AD-1006 form, on which NRCS indicated that the project site does not contain prime farmland. The remainder of the form was therefore not completed. (see July 17, 2017 response letter and AD-1006 form in Appendices C-10 and C-11.

### SECTION C – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Category	Type	INDOT Approval Dates	N/A
Minor Projects PA Clearance			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Eligible and/or Listed  
Resource Present

**Results of Research**

Archaeology	<input type="checkbox"/>
NRHP Buildings/Site(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
NRHP District(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
NRHP Bridge(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Project Effect**

No Historic Properties Affected  No Adverse Effect  Adverse Effect

Documentation  
Prepared

Documentation (mark all that apply) \_\_\_\_\_ ES/FHWA Approval Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_ SHPO Approval Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_

This is page 16 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

Historic Properties Short Report	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Historic Property Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1/5/18	1/30/18
Archaeological Records Check/ Review	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Archaeological Phase Ia Survey Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3/31/16	5/4/16
Archaeological Phase Ic Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Archaeological Phase II Investigation Report	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Archaeological Phase III Data Recovery	<input type="checkbox"/>		
APE, Eligibility and Effect Determination	<input type="checkbox"/>		
800.11 Documentation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2/22/18	3/20/18

**MOA Signature Dates** (List all signatories)

Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

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

Remarks:

All documentation related to cultural resources can be found in Section 106, 800.11 findings documentation in Appendix D. In some instances, specific appendix page numbers are called out below.

**Area of Potential Effect (APE):**

An Area of Potential Effects (APE) was identified, inside of which all above ground resources were identified and evaluated. The APE is the "geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alteration in the character or use of historic properties. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking..." (36 CFR 800.9 a). The APE for the project area includes all areas surrounding the interchange from where the proposed interchange elements are likely to be visible. Due to the surrounding flat terrain and open fields, the APE extends as far as 0.88 miles from the center of the existing intersection. The APE also extends northeast to encompass all properties adjacent to the proposed US 20 reconfiguration to a 2-lane roadway section. The woodlot immediately northeast of the intersection and associated heavy vegetation blocks views to and from the intersection and proposed bridge, thus narrowing the APE in that direction. A map of the APE can be found in Appendix D-12.

**Coordination with Consulting Parties:**

On March 31, 2016, The Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was provided a copy of the archaeology report for their review and approval. In a letter dated May 4, 2016, SHPO concurred with the results of the archaeology report.

On January 8, 2018 and January 9, 2018 the agencies/individuals listed below were sent early coordination letters inviting them to become Section 106 consulting parties and providing access to the Historic Properties Report (HPR) and Phase Ia Archeological Report (tribes only since SHPO had already been provided the Phase Ia Archaeology Report). Those accepting an invitation as a consulting party are listed in bold. INDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are considered automatic consulting parties, and therefore are not included on the list.

1. **Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer**
2. Porter County Historian
3. Porter County Museum
4. LaPorte County Commissioners
5. LaPorte County Council, 4th District Representative
6. LaPorte County Highway Superintendent
7. **LaPorte County Historian**
8. Indiana Landmarks, Northern Regional Office
9. LaPorte County Historical Society Museum
10. Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning
11. Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
12. Forest County Potawatomi Community

This is page 17 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

13. Miami Tribe of Oklahoma
14. Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
15. Pokagan Band of Potawatomi Indians

The Miami Tribe of Oklahoma replied in a letter dated January 11, 2018 accepting the invitation to serve as a consulting party and offered no objection to the project. They also stated that this site is within the aboriginal homelands of the Miami Tribe, and 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. Fern Schultz, the LaPorte County Historian, responded via email on January 13, 2018 and offered no objection to the project.

In their letter dated January 30, 2018, the SHPO recommended that the Indiana Lincoln Highway Association be invited as a consulting party, as the original 1913 route of the Lincoln Highway was located near the subject intersection. The Indiana Lincoln Highway Association was added as a consulting party and was invited to review and comment on the Section 106 findings documentation. SHPO also offered comment on the extent of the APE, but ultimately concurred with its size. SHPO went on to state their concurrence with the findings of the HPR, and re-stated their concurrence with the findings of the Phase 1a Archaeology Report. Copies of all consulting party correspondence are located in Appendix D-30 through D-42.

#### Archaeology:

A Phase 1a Archaeological Field Reconnaissance was conducted on October 21, 22, 26, 27, and 29 and November 2 and 3, 2015 and an accompanying Archaeological Report was completed on March 11, 2016 (Arnold, 2016). The Phase 1a archaeological investigation revealed three previously unidentified archaeological sites. Based on historic background research in conjunction with the discovered artifacts, all three sites were determined to lack the necessary criteria for listing in the NRHP, and no further archaeological work was recommended.

#### Historic Properties:

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures (State Register) were checked and no properties on either list are in the APE. LaPorte County, Indiana was surveyed for the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) by the Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana most recently in 1988. An interim report was published in 1989, which identified two properties within the APE, both of which were evaluated for their eligibility for the NRHP as part of a HPR. In addition to properties surveyed within the IHSSI, all properties determined to be 50 years of age or older at the time of the project letting (2018) were subject to evaluation. Online data available from the LaPorte County Assessor was consulted to aid in determining the age of the structures within the APE.

The HPR concluded that no properties are eligible for the NRHP. The conclusions of the report are located in Appendix D-23.

#### Documentation, Findings:

A finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" was approved by INDOT's Cultural Resources Office (CRO), acting on behalf of the FHWA, on February 22, 2018 (Appendix D-4). A letter informing consulting parties of the finding, including the SHPO, was sent on February 23, 2018. The SHPO concurred with the finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" in a letter dated March 20, 2018 (Appendix D-1).

#### Public Involvement:

Legal Notices were published in the *South Bend Tribune* and *LaPorte Herald Argus* on February 26, 2018 (Appendix D-44 through D-46). The notices offered the public an opportunity to comment on the "No Historic Properties Affected" Section 106 finding. The public had a 30 day comment period to respond to the notice. The comment period expired on March 28, 2018 and no comments were received.

The Section 106 process has been completed and the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 have been fulfilled.

This is page 18 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

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

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

**Parks & Other Recreational Land**

- Publicly owned park
- Publicly owned recreation area
- Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)

Presence

x

Use

Yes	No
	x

Evaluations

Prepared

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


FHWA  
Approval date

--

**Wildlife & Waterfowl Refuges**

- National Wildlife Refuge
- National Natural Landmark
- State Wildlife Area
- State Nature Preserve

Presence


Use

Yes	No

Evaluations

Prepared

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


FHWA  
Approval date

--

**Historic Properties**

- Sites eligible and/or listed on the NRHP

Presence

--

Use

Yes	No

Evaluations

Prepared

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


FHWA  
Approval date

--

\*FHWA approval of the environmental document also serves as approval of any Section 4f 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) properties include publicly owned public parks, recreation areas, and wildlife or waterfowl refuges, or any publicly or privately owned historic site listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. No such existing facilities or properties are present adjacent to the project area, as determined through review of appropriate data layers during preparation of the Red Flag Investigation (Appendix E-7).

One planned trail corridor is located in the area. The planned, but not yet constructed trail runs east-west through the project area. According the attributes available from available geographic information systems data, the trail is titled "LaPorte/South Bend Corridor" and appeared in an undated plan prepared by the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC) (see "Infrastructure" map from the Red Flag Investigation, Appendix E-7). However, the

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

"Northwest Indiana Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan of 2010" does not identify this corridor as a priority trail corridor.

NIRPC was sent an early coordination letter on June 30, 2017, but no response was received.

<b>Section 6(f) Involvement</b>	<u>Presence</u>	<u>Use</u>	
		Yes	No
<b>Section 6(f) Property</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Remarks: There are no Section 6(f) resources located adjacent to the project area. Section 6(f) resources include properties acquired by or improved with the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). According to the LWCF, Detailed Listing of Grants Grouped by County accessed by Troyer Group on August 5, 2017, no projects within LaPorte County receiving LWCF dollars are located near the project area. (Appendix I-1).

### SECTION E – Air Quality

**Air Quality**

**Conformity Status of the Project**

	Yes	No
Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, then:		
Is the project in the most current MPO TIP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the project exempt from conformity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the project is NOT exempt from conformity, then:		
Is the project in the Transportation Plan (TP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a hot spot analysis required (CO/PM)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Level of MSAT Analysis required?

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

Remarks: LaPorte County is currently in attainment for all criteria pollutants. The project's design, concept, and scope are accurately reflected in the Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission's (NIRPC) 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and is incorporated by reference in INDOT's 2018-2021 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Therefore, the conformity requirements of 40 CFR 93 have been met. The page listing the project as part of INDOT's updated 2018-2021 STIP can be found in Appendix H-1. The pages listing the project as part of the FY 2018-2021 NIRPC TIP can be found in Appendix H-2 and H-3.

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

Recent court rulings changed the regulations regarding the air quality standards related to 24-hour ozone. The revised court ruling requires that the project be included in long-range plan that conforms to the new standards. NIRPC may, through the Interagency Consultation Group, determine that the project is exempt from conformity to the new air quality standard related to 24-hour ozone, because the intersection's new configuration will help to improve air quality, as it reduces vehicle idling and acceleration.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

### SECTION F - NOISE

**Noise**

**Yes      No**

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

**No      Yes/ Date**

<b>ES Review of Noise Analysis</b>		
------------------------------------	--	--

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

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

Remarks: 

The proposed intersection improvement will not impact development patterns in the area. There will be no negative impacts to community cohesion, the local tax base, or property values. Construction is not expected to affect planned community events.

LaPorte County has an approved ADA transition plan, which is viewable online at :  
<http://www.laportecounty.org/Resources/Highway/ADATransitionPlan.pdf>

This project will not affect any area identified as priorities for improvement.

The construction of the interchange and bridge is not anticipated to impact any community events such as festivals or fairs. The website <http://www.laportecounty.com/home/events> was consulted and none of the events listed occur near the proposed project. Access to these events will not be directly affected by the MOT plan. The posted detour routes will ensure visitors are provided an alternate route to travel to the events.

Once constructed, project will have a positive impact on the community as it will improve safety and traffic efficiency for the motoring public.

**Indirect and Cumulative Impacts**

**Yes      No**

Will the proposed action result in substantial indirect or cumulative impacts?           

Remarks: 

Indirect impacts are effects caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. They may include growth inducing effects, inducing changes in the pattern of land use, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems. Cumulative impacts are those resulting from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time

Although the project is introducing a new interchange, no new access will be created as would occur by converting an

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte Route US 20 & SR 2 Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

interstate overpass to an interchange. Traffic patterns after construction are anticipated to remain consistent with those observed currently. Therefore conversion of the nearby farmland to commercial use or any other additional development is not anticipated.

**Public Facilities & Services**

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

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

Remarks: There are none of the following facility types near the project area: health, educational, religious institution, emergency service, airports, or public transportation. No significant impacts are expected to these facility types.

Private utilities are present within the right-of-way and could conflict with the proposed improvement. Private underground utilities include a natural gas and broadband cable/phone. Utility coordination is ongoing with each utility's respective owner to ensure project impacts can be avoided or an appropriate relocation can occur.

No significant impacts are expected to emergency services. The project sponsor is responsible to notify school corporations and emergency services at least two weeks prior to any construction that would block or limit access. This is a firm commitment included in Section J.

**Environmental Justice (EJ) (Presidential EO 12898)**

During the development of the project were EJ issues identified? 

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

Does the project require an EJ analysis? 

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

If YES, then:

Are any EJ populations located within the project area? 

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

Will the project result in adversely high or disproportionate impacts to EJ populations? 

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

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

**Relocation of People, Businesses or Farms**

Will the proposed action result in the relocation of people, businesses or farms? 

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

Is a Business Information Survey (BIS) required? 

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

Is a Conceptual Stage Relocation Study (CSRS) required? 

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

Has utility relocation coordination been initiated for this project? 

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

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

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

Remarks: No relocations of people, businesses, or farms will take place as a result of this project. Utility coordination is ongoing, and utility relocations are not anticipated.

Private utilities are present within the right-of-way and could conflict with the proposed improvement. Private underground utilities include a natural gas and broadband cable/phone. Utility coordination is ongoing with each utility's respective owner to ensure project impacts can be avoided or an appropriate relocation can occur.

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

**SECTION H – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & REGULATED SUBSTANCES**

Documentation

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

Red Flag Investigation

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA)

Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA)

Design/Specifications for Remediation required?


**No    Yes/ Date**

<b>ES Review of Investigations</b>		X (5/11/18)
------------------------------------	--	-------------

*Include a summary of findings for each investigation.*

Remarks:

A Red Flag Investigation (RFI) was completed on October, 2016 by The Troyer Group in conjunction with the Preliminary Engineering Report. However the RFI was not submitted to INDOT Hazardous Materials Unit at that time. The RFI was later update to conform to updated INDOT HMU guidance and was submitted to INDOT in March, 2018, and was approved on May 11, 2018. Two potentially hazardous sites were identified in the project vicinity or in the project area (discussed below). The Red Flag Investigation is located in Appendices E-1 through E-19.

Grimm Tool and Die, 5424 E. US 20, (FID 17130), is located immediately southwest of the far western edge of the project area. The site was formerly a tool and die shop. A 1,000 gallon waste oil UST was removed from the site on August 2, 1990. A release from an on-site petroleum/hazardous substance UST was self-reported in September, 1990. Adequate soil sampling was not performed at the time of closure to determine the status of the site; however, the Initial Incident Report Log from IDEM indicated that Total Petroleum Hydrocarbon (TPH) levels were less than 100 parts per million (ppm), which is less than the closure screening level in place at the time. If excavation occurs in this area, it is possible that petroleum contamination could be encountered, in which case proper removal and disposal of soil and/or groundwater would be necessary, and petroleum contaminated soil and/or groundwater would need to be tested for RCRA metals, VOC, and PAHs before disposal at a landfill. The project limits stop northeast of this property, and therefore contaminated soils will not be involved in the project excavation. The depth of excavation in this area will be to a depth that will not reach groundwater. Therefore, special provisions regarding testing and removal/disposal of soil and groundwater will not be necessary.

Junction City Truck Stop, 5636 East US 20, Rolling Prairie (FID 2831), was located directly south of US 20, 0.23 mile west of the US 20 and SR 2 intersection. This site is located adjacent to the project area, west of the intersection, south of US 20. Three (3) regulated USTs were removed from the ground on April 13, 1999. Confirmatory soil sampling for TPH indicated that all results were less than 100 ppm, which was the closure screening limit in place at the time of UST removal. The pump island and UST excavation were south of the current on-site restaurant, over 100' south of US 20. No impact is expected. Further investigation for hazardous materials at this site is not required at this time.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

### SECTION I – PERMITS CHECKLIST

Permits (mark all that apply)

Likely Required

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

Individual Permit (IP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nationwide Permit (NWP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional General Permit (RGP)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pre-Construction Notification (PCN)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wetland Mitigation required	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stream Mitigation required	<input type="checkbox"/>

**IDEM**

Section 401 WQC	<input type="checkbox"/>
Isolated Wetlands determination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rule 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wetland Mitigation required	<input type="checkbox"/>
Stream Mitigation required	<input type="checkbox"/>

**IDNR**

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

**US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit**

**Others (Please discuss in the remarks box below)**

--

Remarks:

An IDEM Rule 5 storm water permit will be required for the project because more than 1.0 acre of land will be disturbed.  
It is the responsibility of the project sponsor or the designer/agent on behalf of the project sponsor to obtain any necessary permits and comply with their conditions.



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorteRoute US 20 & SR 2Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

<b>SECTION J- ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS</b>
---------------------------------------------

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

Remarks:

**FIRM:**

1. **IDEM** - Fugitive dust must be controlled by proper wetting, chemical stabilizers, or wind barriers. Dirt tracked onto paved roads from unpaved areas is to be minimized.
2. **IDEM** - Proper measures are to be taken to ensure that asphalt paving plants are permitted and operating properly. The use of cutback asphalt, or asphalt emulsion containing more than seven percent oil distillate is prohibited during the month of April through October. The Asphalt Paving Rule 326 IAC 8-5 should be reviewed.
3. **IDEM** - If a spill occurs or contaminated soils or water are encountered during construction, appropriate 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.
4. **INDR-SHPO** - 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.
5. **INDOT** - The project sponsor is responsible to notify school corporations and emergency services at least two weeks prior to any construction that would block or limit access.
6. **INDOT** - If the scope of work or permanent or temporary right-of-way amounts change, INDOT ES and the INDOT LaPorte District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately.
7. **INDOT** - 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 a "recommendation" or "for consideration" is superseded by any similar conditions of any permit obtained for the project. Such conditions shall be treated as mandatory commitments.
8. **USFWS** - Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs.
9. **USFWS** - 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

**FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION:**

1. **IDNR-DFW** - 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) from April 1 through September 30.
2. **IDNR-DFW** - Revegetate all bare and disturbed areas with a mixture of grasses (excluding all varieties of tall fescue) and legumes as soon as possible upon completion; low endophyte tall fescue may be used in the ditch bottom and side slopes only.
3. **IDNR-DFW** - 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.

This is page 25 of 26 Project name: New Interchange at US 20 and State Road 2 Date: July 5, 2018

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County LaPorte

Route US 20 & SR 2

Des. No. 1383614 / 1601711

<b>SECTION K- EARLY COORDINATION</b>
--------------------------------------

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:

<i>AGENCY:</i>	<i>DATE:</i>	<i>RESPONSE RECEIVED:</i>
Indiana Department of Environmental Management	6/30/17	7/31/17
Indiana Geological Survey	6/30/17	7/13/17
IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife	6/30/17	7/28/17
USFWS (Chesterton)	6/30/17	7/18/17
United States Army Corps of Engineers (Louisville District Office)	6/30/17	8/1/17
United States Department of Housing and Urban Development	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service	6/30/17	7/5/17
National Park Service	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
INDOT LaPorte District - Environmental Coordinator	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
INDOT Office of Public Involvement	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
LaPorte County Highway Superintendent	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
LaPorte County Surveyor	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>
LaPorte County Board of Commissioners	6/30/17	<i>(no response)</i>