County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249

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

Road I	No./County:	Warren and	Tippecanoe County	, State Road (SR) 2	26			
Design	Five Designation (Des) Numbers (1400249, 1601105, 1700114, 1600867 and 1800130) (Appendix B, page 19) are bundled for this project under Lead Des. Number 1400249.							
 Des 1400249 - SR 26 Road Rehabilitation (3R/4R Standards) from US 41 East Junction to 55 West Junction Des 1601105 - SR 26 Road Rehabilitation/HMA Overlay Minor Structural, from SR 55 V Junction, to 0.33 Mile East of SR 55 East Junction Des 1700114 - SR 26 Road Rehabilitation/HMA Overlay Minor Structural, from 0.33 M East of SR 55 East Junction, to 8.57 Miles East of SR 55 (Warren/Tippecanoe County Line Des 1600867 - SR 26 Small Structure Replacement, 1.45 Miles West of SR 55 North Junct Des 1800130 - SR 26 Small Structure Replacement, 8.70 miles East of SR 55 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): 								
			2 – The proposed ac Required Signatories				n Manual Level 2 -	
X			3 – The proposed ac Required Signatories				n Manual Level 3 -	
		Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA						
			A) – EAs require a st on the environme				nentation is	
loca	te: For documents preparated to release for public proval	involvement or s	ign for approval.		for the ESM of th		the project is	
	ESM Signat	ure	Date	ES Signature		Date		
Re N/	lease for Public Invo	vement	FHWA Signature	Date		5/20/2021		
ES	M Initials		nte	ES Initials	REB	5/20/2021 Date	-	
No INI	rtification of Public I te: Do not approve un DOT ES/District v. Reviewer	(Office of Public Involv		- onmental requir	ements have bee	n satisfied.	
	nature:			Dat	te:			
	me and Organization of C	•		io – Little River Co		 Date:	May 19, 2021	

		maiana Bepa	intilicine or irrar	15portation	
County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249
		Part I - PU	BLIC INVOL	<u>VEMENT</u>	
				or early and continuous op nmensurate with the prop	oportunities throughout the oosed action.
If No	es the project have a histo o, then:		under the Historic B		No X
C	opportunity for a Public H	earing Required?		X	
	aring is required for all his O, and the ACHP.	storic bridges process	sed under the Histor	ic Bridges Programmatic A	greement between INDOT,
meetings, sp	ecial purpose meetings, i	newspaper articles, et	c.) have occurred fo	r this project.	dents (i.e. notice of entry),
Remarks:	November 4, 2018 not field activities may be since a significant peri	fying them about the seen in the area. A so od of time had elapse 1601105 as all of the	project and that ind econd round of Noti d since the first lette field work to the ea	erty owners near the project ividuals responsible for lan- ce of Entry Letters were seeds. They were reissued onless had already been comple- ages 1-2.	nd surveying and nt on June 3, 2020 ly for Des. No.
	Adverse Effect" was p opportunity to submit of period closed 30 days. The letter was received "there will be No Histo	ublished in the <i>Revie</i> nce comment pursuant to ater on April 25, 202 I from the Pokagon Boric Properties in Area ppendix D, page 72).	w Republican on Ma 36 CFR 800.2(d), 80 1. One letter was re and of Potawatomi a of Potential Effect	legal notice of FHWA's fir arch 25, 2021 offering the p 00.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4). The received during the public co- Indians on April 12, 2021. Is (APE) significant to the Public notice and the affidavi	nublic an ne public comment omment period. They stated that Pokagon Band of
	Transportation (INDO an opportunity to subm	T) Public Involvement it comment and/or rengent upon the release	t Manual which request a public hearie of this document f	ne current <i>Indiana Departm</i> uires the project sponsor to ng. Therefore, a legal notion public involvement. This	offer the public ce will appear in a
	ntroversy on Environme ject involve substantial co		community and/or r	natural resource impacts?	Yes No
Remarks:	At this time, there is r resources.	o substantial public o	controversy concern	ing impacts to the commun	ity or to natural
<u>Part</u>	<u>II - General Pro</u>	<u>ject Identific</u>	ation, Descr	<u>iption, and Desi</u> g	<u>gn Information</u>
Sponsor of Local Name		INDOT SR 26		INDOT Distric	ct: <u>Crawfordsville</u>
Funding So	urce (<i>mark all that apply</i>)	: Federal X	State X Local	Other*	
*If other is s	selected, please identify t	ne funding source:			
This is բ	page 2 of 31 Project na	me: S	R 26 Road Rehabilitat	ion Project Date	e:May 19, 2021_

							
County	Warren and T	Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. N	o. <u>1400</u> 2	249
PURPOS	E AND NEE	D:					
				dress. The solution to urpose and Need)	the traffic problem sh	ould NOT l	pe discussed
structures Warren/Ti shoulders, seasons, a being able safety for out of 9 (p The purpo structures Warren/Ti life of the pull off an	at stream crossippecanoe Couthe pavement large amount to pull off to motorists. Adoor condition at stream crossippecanoe Couroadway by 1 d so that the life	sings along the lanty Line. The control edge is deterior of agricultural enditionally, two solutions along the lanty Line. The profine of site is sufficiently along the lanty Line. The profine of site is sufficiently Line is sufficiently Line in the profine of site is sufficiently Line.	15.7-mile segment atted from runoff quipment utilizes otorists. They altructures (CV 02 talls, heavy scaling the deteriorated 15.7-mile segment project will improject will add should be the segment of the deteriorated the deter	has transverse crack is and use by large eq is SR 26. Insufficient so lead to a poor line 6-086-14.19 and CV ing. and wide cracks (pavement, insufficient of SR 26 between ove the current paven alders along the road	ders, and deteriorated US 41 and 0.15 mile eding, rutting, and fatiguting plants shoulders prevent fare of sight for passing very compact of 26-079-24.58) are compacted and 0.15 mile edinent of the roadway way so that there is road harvesting seasons.	east of the u.e. In areas atting and harming equippedicles that turrently rate 0-78). riorated or east of the which will income for equippedic equippedic in a control of the control of	s that lack arvesting oment from t reduces ted as a 4 insufficient acrease the aipment to
PROJEC	T DESCRIPT	ΓΙΟΝ (PREFER	RRED ALTERN	ATIVE):			
County: _	Warren and Ti	ppecanoe	Municip	ality: Town of Pine	Village		
Limits of P	roposed Work	: SR 26 from U	IS 41 to 0.15 miles	east of Warren and Tip	ppecanoe County Line		
Total Work	k Length:	15.7 M	lile(s)	Total Work A	rea: <u>107.5</u> A	Acre(s)	
			terchange Justific tional approval fo	cation Study (IMS/IJS r this project?) required?	Yes ¹ Date:	No X
pproval of roject, incl	the IMS/IJS. In uding the prefe	n the remarks bo erred alternative.	x below, describe Include a discus	e existing conditions,	submitted to the FHWA provide in detail the s ni. Discuss any major es.	cope of wo	rk for the
with roady West and S along SR 2 23 North,	vay and infras Section 7 of To 26 in Sections Range 6 West	tructure improve ownship 23 Nor 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 ar on the Chatterto	ements along SR th, Range 7 West and 12 in Townsh on, IN Quadrangl	26 in Sections 7, 8, 9 on the Pine Village, ip 23 North, Range 7	Administration (FHV), 10 and 11 in Towns. IN Quadrangle. Important West and Sections 7, on, U.S. Geological Spages 1-14.	hip 23 Nort rovements 8 and 9 in	th, Range 8 are also Township
junction of junction w total project pavement,	f SR 26 and SI with SR 55, and ct length is apport insufficient sh	R 26, then running the street of the street	ng south, concurring east on SR 267 miles. The exist teriorated or insu	ent with SR 55 (labe to 0.15 mile east of ting deficiencies alon fficient structures at	continuing 0.33 miles of led as SR 55 on graph the Warren/Tippecand g the project include of stream crossings. With and obstructive parki	ics) to the ope County I deteriorated thin the tow	east Line. The
Five DES	numbers are in	ncluded in this e	nvironmental do	cument for the projec	et.		
This is	nogo 2 of 24	Droinet news	-	D 24 Dand Data Liller	om Duoisest	Data	M 10
11115 15	page 3 of 31	Project name:		R 26 Road Rehabilitati	on r roject	Date:	May 19,

County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249	1400242
---	---------

- SR 26 Road Rehabilitation from the east junction with US 41 to the north junction with SR 55 (Des. No. 1400249),
- SR 26 Road Rehabilitation from the north junction with SR 55 to 0.33 miles east of the south junction with SR 55 (Des. No. 1601105),
- SR 26 Road Rehabilitation from 0.33 miles east of the south junction with SR 55 to the Warren/Tippecanoe County Line (Des. No. 1700114),
- SR 26 Small Structure Replacement located 1.45 miles west of the north junction with SR 55 (Des. No. 1600867), and
- SR 26 Road Rehabilitation and Small Structure Replacement from the Warren/Tippecanoe County Line to 0.15 mile east of the County Line (Des. No. 1800130).

West of Pine Village, SR 26 is a two-lane facility with roadway widths that vary from 22 feet to 36 feet wide. This roadway primarily contains 12-foot lanes with 6-foot paved shoulder (8-foot usable) in both directions, with the exception of two sections that were not previously widened. Those areas have 11-foot lanes and no usable shoulders, which is deteriorated from runoffs and use by large equipment. The pavement is deteriorated throughout the section of the area west of Pine Village. Deteriorated pavement includes transverse cracking, rutting, and pavement fatigue. This section of SR 26 is a rural collector. Land use along this section is primarily agriculture with some forested and residential areas.

East of Pine Village, SR 26 is a two-lane facility with roadway widths of 22 feet with 11-foot lanes in both directions, no usable shoulder, and deteriorated pavement. The pavement edge is deteriorated from runoffs and use by large equipment. Deteriorated pavement includes transverse cracking, rutting, and pavement fatigue. This section of SR 26 is a rural collector. Land use along this section is primarily agriculture with some forested and residential areas.

Through Pine Village, SR 26 and SR 55 are two-lane facilities with roadway widths that vary from 22 feet to 48 feet wide. North of Church Street and west of Jefferson Street, the roadway consists of 12-foot travel lanes in each direction and no paved shoulders. Between Church Street and Jefferson Street, travel lanes are also 12-foot wide in each direction, with pavement continuing beyond the travel lanes as undefined shoulders and parking. The south junction of SR 26 and SR 55 includes difficult turning radii for large trucks, due to buildings restricting the road width and electrical poles that are often sideswiped by semi-trucks. Additionally, some curbs and sidewalks through town were constructed at the same grade as the pavement and provide no separation from traffic. This section of SR 26 is a major collector. Land use within Pine Village is primarily residential with small businesses.

There are four bridges, 16 culverts, and 38 small pipes identified within the project limits. Two culverts (CV 026-086-14.19 and CV 026-079-24.58) will be replaced due to deterioration. Both culverts are currently rated as a 4 out of 9 (poor condition), due to large spalls, heavy scaling, and wide cracks (Appendix C, pages 50-78). Additionally, 25 small pipes will be replaced and an additional two will be lengthened in conjunction with road widening. No work will occur on the remaining structures. The project plans and photos are included (Appendix B, pages 15-78).

The preferred alternative will provide a structural overlay to address the observed transverse cracking, rutting, and fatigue at the edge of pavement. The overlay will be applied to SR 26 over the entire project length, and SR 55 from north of Pine Village. Road widening to 12-foot lanes in both directions will take place on all existing 11-foot travel lanes within the project corridor. In addition, 5-foot shoulders (2-foot paved and 3-foot gravel) are proposed in areas where none currently exists along portions west of Pine Village, and along the length of the project east of Pine Village, where the edge of pavement is deteriorated from runoffs and use by large equipment.

Improved access and turning radii for trucks at the intersection of SR 26 and SR 55 will be accomplished by pavement markings that will shift traffic at the intersection to accommodate the wide turning movements of semi-trucks. While the roadway is not being widened through town, the parking along SR 26 will be configured from angled to parallel parking to create more space. Parking will be reduced from fourteen to ten parking spaces; however, the parallel parking will be more clearly defined with pavement markings. The town has indicated that they want as many spaces as possible, but prefer the new layout, and understand that this will reduce the number of available spaces. Additionally, a local business owner indicated concern about the updated parking on March 18, 2021 (Appendix D, page 81). Coordination occurred

This is page 4 of 31 Project name:		SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	_ Date:	May 19, 2021
		Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2		

County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249	
---	--

about the updated parking plan and the safety issues with the current parking. The business owner was understanding about the need for the updated plan. The new parking configuration can be seen in Appendix B, page 45.

Additionally, while the existing sidewalk is being maintained throughout the town of Pine Village where feasible, one exception to this is along the south side of SR 26 from SR 55 to Jefferson St where the existing sidewalk is at the same grade as the payement. Curb lines will be constructed on either side of the new sidewalk in order to raise the sidewalk up and delineate vehicular traffic from pedestrians. The new sidewalks will be 6ft. wide, but all other sidewalks will remain 4ft. wide. Curbs are being added on either side of SR 26 from Jefferson St to the west driveway that leads to Pine Village Elementary School. Select curb ramps will be replaced in the project area in the town of Pine Village to meet ADA standards. Refer to the discussion in the Cultural Resources section of this document for further information.

In addition to widening the pavement, the adjacent ditches will be regraded with appropriate side slopes. There are four bridges located within the project limits. No work will take place on any of the bridges. However, in addition to the bridges, there are 16 culverts and 38 small pipes identified within the project limits. Structure CV 026-086-14.19 is a 14' x 9' x 24' box culvert carrying UNT5 to Big Pine Creek, located 1.45 miles west of the north junction of SR 26 and SR 55 (Appendix B, page 2). This structure was already scheduled for replacement with a 13' x 8' x 60' box culvert under Des. No. 1600867, and has now been included with this project. Structure CV 026-079-24.58 is a 6' x 5' x 24' box culvert carrying UNT1 to Little Pine Creek, located 0.1 mile east of the Warren/Tippecanoe County Line (Appendix B, page 2). This structure was scheduled for replacement with a 14' x 6' x 50' box culvert due to deterioration under Des. No. 1800130, and has now also been included with this project. 25 small pipes will be replaced and an additional two will be lengthened in conjunction with road widening. No work will occur on the remaining structures. Measures have been taken to minimize project impacts by limiting culvert work to only what is necessary based on the project need.

Maintenance of traffic (MOT) during the project will be maintained using a combination of lane closures and local detours. East and west of Pine Village, SR 26 will be closed during construction with a detour route provided. Work on the Pine Village segment will be performed maintaining a single lane of traffic utilizing flaggers during work hours. Traffic will be restored to two lanes of traffic when contractor is not present. Please refer to the MOT section of this document for details of the detour.

This alternative meets the purpose and need for this project by addressing the deficiencies along the 15.7-mile segment of SR 26 in the most cost-efficient manner. This alternative will improve the deteriorated pavement, insufficient shoulders, and deteriorated or insufficient structures at stream crossings. The project will address transverse cracking, rutting, and pavement fatigue, while increasing the life of the roadway by 15 years.

SR 26 and US 41 is the western termini of the project, and the eastern termini is located on SR 26, 0.15 miles east of the Warren/Tippecanoe County Line. The project termini were chosen based on where the current roadway deficiencies exist. The termini were determined based on those endpoints to correct the existing deteriorations. As such, the proposed project limits represent logical termini. This project has independent utility as the project can function on its own, without further construction.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

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

Full Depth Reclamation and Road Widening Where Necessary

This alternative would consist of a Full Depth Reclamation along the entire length of the project with the exception of within Pine Village which would consist of a two-lift structural HMA overlay. In addition, widening of the travel lanes and shoulders would be recommended in areas where the lane width is less than 12' and shoulders are not present. This alternative would also address drainage deficiencies when necessary due to road widening. Improvements to the storm sewer system, turning movements, curbs, sidewalks, and parking throughout the town of pine village south of Church St and west of Pine Village Elementary School are also included in the alternative. This alternative meets the purpose and need of the project, however, based on cost, the full depth reclamation alternative was not chosen.

D	3. T	1		
Do	- N	∩t	h 1 1	າດ

-Nothing				
s alternative would al	llow the existing roadwa	y and structures to remain in place with no in	provements. Th	is will
This is page 5 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021
		Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2		

County Warren and Tippe	ecanoe Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249			
result in the roadway deficiencies along the 15.7-mile segment of SR 26 continuing to deteriorate and eventually lead to more expensive replacement contracts and/or cause unsafe traveling conditions for the public. This alternative was not selected as it does not meet the purpose and need for this project.							
The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable because (Mark all that apply): It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies; It would not correct existing safety hazards; It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies; It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems; or It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy. Other (Describe)							
ROADWAY CHARACTER	₹:						
Functional Classification: Current ADT: Design Hour Volume (DHV): Designed Speed (mph):	SR 26 – West to Pine Vill 996 VPD (20 189 Truck Perce 55 Legal Spee	Design Year ADT: entage (%) 13	1215 V	/PD (2042)			
	Existing	Proposed					
Number of Lanes: Type of Lanes:	2 Through	2 Through					
Pavement Width:	11-12 ft.	12 ft.					
Shoulder Width:	0-6 ft.	5-6 ft.					
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.					
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.					
Setting: Topography: Functional Classification: Current ADT: Paging Hour Values (DHV):	X Level Rol SR 26 - Pine Village to early 1871 VPD (20	astern termini - Rural Collector 017) Design Year ADT:	2238 V	/PD (2042)			
Design Hour Volume (DHV): Designed Speed (mph):	25-55 Truck Perce Legal Spee						
Dooigned Opeod (inpin).		<u> </u>					
	Existing	Proposed					
Number of Lanes:	2	2					
Type of Lanes: Pavement Width:	Through 11 ft.	Through 12 ft.					
Shoulder Width:	0-6 ft.	5-6 ft.					
Median Width:	N/A ft.	$\frac{3}{N/A}$ ft.					
Sidewalk Width:	0-6 ft.	0-6 ft.					
Setting: Topography:	Urban Sub X Level Rol	ourban X Rural ling Hilly					
Functional Classification:	SR 55 - Rural Collector						
Current ADT:	1630 VPD (20		1989 V	/PD (2042)			
Design Hour Volume (DHV):	Truck Perce						
Designed Speed (mph):	30-40 Legal Spee	d (mph): 30-40					
	Existing	Proposed					
Number of Lanes:	2	2					
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through					
This is page 6 of 31 Pr	oject name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	et Dat	te: May 19, 2021			

County	Warman and Tinn		Douto	CD 26	•	Dog No	1400240
County	Warren and Tipp	ecanoe	Route	SR 26		Des. No	1400249
Pavement	t Width:	12 ft.		12	ft.		
Shoulder \		0 ft.		5	ft.		
Median W		N/A ft.		N/A	ft.		
Sidewalk \		4 ft.		4-6	ft.		
Sidewalk	WIGHT.	1 4 II.		4-0	J 11.		
.			_				
Setting:		Urban	Subu		Rural		
Topograph	hy:	X Level	Rollin	ng	Hilly		
		ultiple roadways, this	section s	hould be filled o	out for each roa	dway.	
DESIGN C	CRITERIA FOR	BRIDGES:					
Structure/I	NBI Number(s):	026-86-01572A – no	impact	Suffic	iency Rating:		eport, 1/6/2020 ource of Information)
		Existing		Propose	ed	(Italing, 5)	ource of information)
Bridge Typ	pe:	Reinforced Concret Bridge	e Slab	Reinforceo Bridge	Concrete Slab		
Number of	f Spans:	2			2		
Weight Re		N/A ton		N/A	ton		
Height Re		N/A ft.		N/A	ft.		
Curb to Cu		23.7 ft.		23.7	ft.		
	Outside Width:	25.0 ft.		25.0	ft.		
Shoulder \		0 ft.		0	ft.		
	Channel Work:	0		0	ft.		
Structure/l	NBI Number(s):	026-86-08172 – no i	mpact	Suffic	iency Rating:		eport, 1/6/2020 ource of Information)
		Existing		•			
Bridge Typ	pe:	Reinforced Concret	e Slab		Concrete Slab		
		Bridge		Bridge			
Number of		2			2		
Weight Re		N/A ton		N/A	ton		
Height Re		N/A ft.		N/A	ft.		
Curb to Cu		36.0 ft.		36.0	ft.		
	Outside Width:	84.0 ft.		84.0	ft.		
Shoulder \		0 ft.		0	ft.		
Length of	Channel Work:	0		0	ft.		
Structure/I	NBI Number(s):	(26)55-86-05834B —	no impact	Suffic	iency Rating:		port, 1/6/2020 ource of Information)
		Existing		Propose	ed	(3)	,
Bridge Typ	pe:	Reinforced Concret Bridge	e Slab	Reinforced Bridge	l Concrete Slab		
Number of	f Spans:	2			2		
Weight Re		N/A ton		N/A	ton		
Height Re		N/A ft.		N/A	ft.		
Curb to Cu		31.0 ft.		31.0	ft.		
	Outside Width:	34.0 ft.		34.0	ft.		
Shoulder \		0 ft.		0	ft.		
		-			•		

Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project

Date: ____

May 19, 2021

This is page 7 of 31 Project name:

Indiana Department of Transportation							
County	Warren and Tipp	ecanoe	Route	SR 26		Des. No. <u>1400249</u>	
Length of C	hannel Work:	0		0	ft.		
Structure/N	BI Number(s):	026-86-05817B – r	no impact	Suff	iciency Rating:	6, BIAS Report, 1/13/2020 (Rating, Source of Information)	
		Existing		Propos	sed		
Bridge Type	e:	Reinforced Concr Bridge	ete Slab	Reinforc Bridge	ed Concrete Slab		
Number of		2			2		
Weight Res		N/A ton		N/A	ton		
Height Res		N/A ft.		N/A	ft.		
Curb to Cur	Dutside Width:	30.0 ft. 33.0 ft.		30.0	ft. ft.		
Shoulder W		33.0 ft. 0 ft.		0	It. ft.		
	hannel Work:	0		0	ft.		
Longarore	TIGHTIOI WORK.	O .		U			
Rema MAINTEN	located in 026-079-2 and an add the remain	Appendix F, pages (4.58) will be repla	s 100-101. ced due to de lengthenede project de	In summary, deterioration. I in conjunction for f	two box culvert: Additionally, 2 on with road wic urther detail.	A culvert information table is s (CV 026-086-14.19 and CV 5 small pipes will be replaced dening. No work will occur on	
Is a tempor Will the pro Provision Provision Provision Will the pro	ns will be made to ns will be made to ns will be made to posed MOT sub- stantial controve	posed? use of a detour or references for access by local for through-traffic deto accommodate are ustantially change the ersy associated with	traffic and s ependent bi ny local spe e environm n the propos	so posted. usinesses. cial events or ental consequ sed method fo	festivals. lences of the ac r MOT?	X X X	
romans.	west of Pine V termini). Traff and then south 1601105) will will be restore for Des. No. 11400249. Des Village (Des. 11400249 turns south and termini of the The closures a school buses a	fillage (Des. No. 14 fic will be routed n at SR 55 back to S be performed maind to two lanes of tr 601105 until the co. No. 1601105 and No. 1700114), will 5 to SR 352. At SF d eventually meets project. Des. No. 1 and lane restrictions and emergency servential servers.	400249), wi orth on US SR 26 at Pin ntaining a si affic when a mpletion and 1400249 we be detoured a 352 traffic with SR 26 1700114 with similar will pose a cices); howe	Il be detoured 41 to SR 352 he Village. We ingle lane of to contractor is a nd removal of vill be construed at the junction will move each. Traffic will Il be construct a temporary in ever, no signification.	at the junction. Traffic will the ork on the Pine raffic utilizing foot present. No detour for all worded in 2022. To on of SR 26 and lest to US 52. Traffic then be detoured in 2023.	of SR 26 and US 41 (western en follow SR 352 east to SR 55, Village segment (Des. No. laggers during work hours. Traffic traffic restrictions will be permitted work associated with Des. No. he area of SR 26 east of Pine ISR 55. Traffic will be routed raffic will stay on US 52 until it ed west onto SR 26 to the eastern traveling motorists (including anticipated and all inconveniences n but will cease with project	

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project

May 19, 2021

Date:

This is page 8 of 31 Project name:

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route SR 26	Des. No.	1400249					
ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:									
		Right-of-Way: \$ <u>120,</u> 1400249, 1600867, and 1	000 Construction: 800130 and are highlighted indivi	\$ 2,713,935 (2021) dually in					
Anticipate	ed Start Date of Construction:	Spring 2022							
Date proje	ect incorporated into STIP	ıly 2, 2019	_						
Is the pro	yes ject in an MPO Area? X	No							
If yes,									
Name of	f MPO Area Plan Commissi	on of Tippecanoe County	<u></u>						
Location	of Project in TIP Page 266		<u></u>						
Date of i	incorporation by reference into t	he STIP July 2, 2019							

RIGHT OF WAY:

	Amount (acres)			
Land Use Impacts	Permanent	Temporary		
Residential	11.62	0.13		
Commercial	-	-		
Agricultural	52.75	0.15		
Forest	1.29	-		
Wetlands	-	-		
Other:	-	-		
TOTAL	65.66	0.28		

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 there impacts on the environmental analysis should be discussed.

Remarks:

The project requires approximately 65.66 acres of permanent right-of-way along SR 26 which is located within either residential, agricultural or forested land use. The project also requires approximately 0.28 acres of temporary right-of-way within residential and agricultural land use. On average there will be 90'-100' of right of way throughout most of the corridor. Maximum right-of-way width is 175', however this is only at one location. Minimum right-of-way width is 22'. The project purchased at-risk advanced acquisition however, no construction has begun. Most of the new right-of-way has been previously disturbed, acquired, or modified by the existing roadway.

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

This is page 9 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date: _	May 19, 2021
		Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2		

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249

<u>Part III – Identification and Evaluation of Impacts of the Proposed</u> <u>Action</u>

SECTION A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
	Presence	Impa	acts	
		Yes	No	
Streams, Rivers, Watercourses & Jurisdictional Ditches	X	X		
Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers				
State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers	X		X	
Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed				
Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana	X		X	
Navigable Waterways				

Remarks:

Based on a desktop review, site visits on July 16, 2019, July 24, 2019, July 26, 2019, August 07, 2019, August 08, 2019, August 14, 2019, August 19, 2019, September 04, 2019, September 05, 2019, September 10, 2019, September 11, 2019, November 05, 2019, November 06, 2019, May 01, 2020, May 04, 2020, May 07, 2020 and September 01, 2020 by Little River Consultants, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix F, pages 75-79), and the water resources maps in the three RFI reports prepared to encompass the project area (Appendix E, pages 9, 10, 23, 34 and 35), there are 30 streams, watercourses, or jurisdictional ditches located within the 0.5 mile search radius. According to the desktop review, there are 16 streams, watercourses, or jurisdictional ditches present within or adjacent to the project area. No Federal, Wild and Scenic Rivers; navigable waterways or National Rivers Inventory waterways are present in the project area. Big Pine Creek is listed as a State Natural Scenic River. The Department of Environmental Management has designated a segment of Big Pine Creek and some of its headwaters "for exceptional use" due to outstanding quality. Additionally, Big Pine Creek is on the Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana. No work is being done on either of the bridges associated with Big Pine Creek or Mud Pine Creek. Proper erosion control will be put in place in order to prevent impacts.

Nineteen (19) IDEM 303d Listed Stream segments are located within a 0.5 mile search radius of the project area.

- Mud Pine Creek is located within the project area and listed as impaired for PCBs in fish tissue. No work is planned for the bridge over Mud Pine Creek so no impact is expected.
- Ten additional (10) segments identified as unnamed tributaries to Mud Pine Creek cross SR 26, six (6) of the 10 segments cross SR 26, and are also listed as impaired for PCBs.

Mud Pine Creek, Big Pine Creek and six (6) stream segments identified as unnamed tributaries to Mud Pine Creek, are listed for E. coli. All impaired tributaries cross SR 26.

Workers who are working in or near water with E. coli should take care to wear appropriate PPE, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure.

A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was completed for the project on September 18, 2020 and INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office approved on October 29, 2020. Please refer to Appendix F, pages 2-42, for the Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report.

Following the desktop review, which identified 16 potentially jurisdictional watercourses, Little River Staff investigated and identified 18 potentially jurisdictional streams with an OHWM and bed and bank, totaling 3800 linear feet within the investigated area. Of those 18 streams, 3 appeared to be perennial and 15 appeared

		estigated area. Of those 18 streams, 3 appeared to be		, ,
This is page 10 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021
		Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2		

			int or manapor		
ounty	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route SR 2	6	Des. No.	1400249
	investigated area, and ide	River staff also investigate entified 21.5 miles of road padside ditches are jurisdic	lside ditches within t		
	jurisdictional. Two juris linear feet, totaling 0.017 104). UNT5 to Big Pine the stream is only slightly	nation was received from dictional streams will be it acres, of UNT 5 to Big P Creek is an intermittent s y incised. The stream has assions at the ordinary high	mpacted due to culvine Creek will be im tream. The channel a good overhanging vo	ert replacement. Appacted (Appendix I and banks are mode egetation on the nor	opproximately 150 B, pages 35 and rately stable and th and south sides
	B, pages 78 and 133). U incised, and the banks ap sediment laden runoff fro complexes. Channel dim	feet, totaling 0.011 acres, NT1 to Little Pine Creek spear moderately stable. Tom adjacent fields. The strensions at the OHWM we ical as the two culverts red	is an intermittent stre he stream has high to ream has no overhan are estimated at 4'10'	eam. The channel is urbidity due to in ch ging vegetation and	moderately nannel erosion and no riffle/run
	General Permit, with no	on 404 Permit will be req stream mitigation anticipa s that will be replaced and	ited, but will be deter	rmined during perm	itting. The
	Wildlife (IDNR-DFW), t (USFWS) on February 1' recommendations to avoing purposes of maintaining recommended rather than stabilization under the structure comparespond to the early coor Environmental Management	s were sent to the Indiana the U.S. Army Corps of E 7, 2020 and March 12, 20 id or minimize impacts to fish and wildlife passage to box or pipe culverts. The ructure, should not create the ared to the current conditional condition letter. An automatical interest in the English website on Figure 1.	ngineers (USACE), a 20. The IDNR-DFW fish, wildlife, and bothrough a structure, be the new, replacement, conditions that are letters (Appendix C, pa ated letter was general bebruary 17, 2020 (A)	and the U.S. Fish ar V responded on Mar otanical resources. oridges and bottoml or rehabbed structuress favorable for with ages 8-11). The USA ated from the Indian ppendix C, pages 12	nd Wildlife Service rch 17, 2020 with It states that, for ess culverts are are, and any bank Idlife passage ACE did not na Department of 2-18). All
			Presence	<u>Impacts</u>	
eservoirs akes arm Pond etention E				Yes No	
Remarks:	August 08, 2019, August 10, 2019, September 11, 07, 2020 and September pages 75-79), and the wa (Appendix E, pages 9, 10	ew, site visits on July 16, 2 t 14, 2019, August 19, 201 2019, November 05, 2019 01, 2020 by Little River Outer resources maps in the 10, 23, 34 and 35), there are there are no other surface we	19, September 04, 20 9, November 06, 201 Consultants, the aeria three RFI reports pro e 30 lakes located wi	119, September 05, 29, May 01, 2020, Nal map of the project epared to encompasthin the 0.5 mile sea	2019, September May 04, 2020, May t area (Appendix F, s the project area arch radius. Based

County _	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249		
	A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was completed for the project on September 18, 2020 and INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office approved on October 29, 2020. Please refer to Appendix F, pages 2-42, for the Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report. No surface waters were identified within the project area during the wetland delineation; therefore no impacts are expected. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction. Early coordination letters were sent to the IDNR-DFW, the USACE, and the USFWS on February 17, 2020						
	and March 12, 2020. No recomm	nendations	received pertained to of	iner surface waters.			
Wetlands			<u>Presence</u>	Yes X	ots No		
Total wetla	nd area: 1.912 acre(s)	Total	wetland area impacted	l: 0.312 acre	e(s)		
(If a determi	nation has not been made for non-	isolated/iso	ated wetlands, fill in the	e total wetland area im	pacted above.)		
Wetlende //	Mark all that apply)	<u>D</u>	<u>ocumentation</u>	ES App	proval Dates		
Wetland Det	ermination ineation ated Waters Determination		X X	10/29/20 1/19/21			
would resul Substar Substar Unique Substar The pro	nts that will not result in any wellt in (Mark all that apply and explaintial adverse impacts to adjacent hotially increased project costs; engineering, traffic, maintenance, ontial adverse social, economic, or eject not meeting the identified need	n): pmes, busir pr safety pro nvironment ds.	bblems; al impacts, or	properties;	ance x x		
,	avoid, minimize, and mitigate wet	and impact	s need to be discussed	in the remarks box.			
Remarks:	Based on a review of the Nationa July 24, 2019, July 26, 2019, Aug September 04, 2019, September 06, 2019, May 01, 200 Consultants, the aerial map of the three RFI reports prepared to are 63 wetlands located within the wetlands present within or adjace.	gust 07, 201 05, 2019, Se 20, May, 04 e project are encompass e 0.5 mile s	9, August 08, 2019, A eptember 10, 2019, Sept., 2020, May 07, 2020 at (Appendix F, pages of the project area (Appendix According to the project area).	ugust 14, 2019, Augus otember 11, 2019, Nov and September 01, 202 75-79), and the water r ndix E, pages 9, 10, 23	t 19, 2019, ember 05, 2019, 00 by Little River resources maps in 3, 34 and 35), there		
	A Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report was completed for the project on September 18, 2020 and INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office approved on October 29, 2020. Please refer to Appendix F, pages 2-42, for the Waters of the U.S. Determination / Wetland Delineation Report.						
	Little River staff investigated and boundaries, for a total of 1.912 and 3 are classified as palustrine, below). A Jurisdictional Determ	eres. Of tho scrub-shru	se 40 wetlands, 37 are b (PSS). A total of 16	classified as palustrine wetlands will be impa	e, emergent (PEM), eted (see Table		
This is n	age 12 of 31 Project name:	S	R 26 Road Rehabilitation	Project Da	te: May 19, 2021		

County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249

wetlands as jurisdictional. Of those wetlands to be impacted, only Wetlands 19, 32 and 35 are Waters of the U.S. Impacts to Waters of the U.S. is 0.041 acres. A state determination was also received from IDEM (Appendix F, page 102). Impacts to State regulated wetlands (Class I and Class II wetlands) will be 0.271 acres. Incidental features are not regulated. Avoidance alternatives are not practical due to wetland areas being located immediately adjacent to the roadway embankment or within roadside ditches, in areas where widening is necessary to meet current safety standards. Wetland mitigation is anticipated and will be determined during permitting. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

Impacted Wetlands

Remarks:

Wetland No.	Classification	Total Size (Acres)	Impacted Acres	Comments
2	PEM	0.34	0.045	State - Class II
3	PEM	0.21	0.084	State - Class I
4	PEM	0.025	0.018	State - Class I
7	PEM	0.024	0.023	State - Class I
8	PEM	0.003	0.0008	Incidental Feature
19	PEM	0.005	0.0052	Waters of the U.S.
20	PEM	0.088	0.009	Incidental Feature
24	PEM	0.022	0.017	State - Class I
25	PEM	0.147	0.15	Incidental Feature
26	PEM	0.03	0.03	Incidental Feature
27	PEM	0.022	0.02	Incidental Feature
28	PEM	0.012	0.022	State - Class I
30	PEM	0.043	0.051	State - Class I
31	PEM	0.066	0.011	State - Class I
32	PEM	0.056	0.03	Waters of the U.S.
35	PEM	0.010	0.0063	Waters of the U.S.

Early coordination letters were sent to the IDNR-DFW, the USACE, and the USFWS on February 17, 2020 and March 12, 2020. The IDNR-DFW responded on March 17, 2020 with recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts to fish, wildlife, and botanical resources (Appendix C, pages 8-11). The USFWS responded on April 6, 2020, recommending a wetland delineation (Appendix C, pages 21-22). The USACE did not respond to the early coordination letter. An automated letter was generated from the IDEM website on February 17, 2020 (Appendix C, pages 12-18). All applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments section of this CE document.

	<u>Presence</u>	<u>Impacts</u>		
		Yes	No	
Terrestrial Habitat	X	X		
Unique or High Quality Habitat				

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

Based on a desktop review, site visits on July 16, 2019, July 24, 2019, July 26, 2019, August 07, 2019, August 08, 2019, August 14, 2019, August 19, 2019, September 04, 2019, September 05, 2019, September 10, 2019, September 11, 2019, November 05, 2019, November 06, 2019, May 01, 2020, May 04, 2020, May 07, 2020 and September 01, 2020 by Little River Consultants, and the aerial map of the project area (Appendix F, pages 75-79), the project area consists primarily of roadway, agricultural fields, residences, and upland forest. Forested areas are dominated by eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), tulip poplar

This is page 13 of 31 Pro	piect name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021

Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26		Des. No.	1400249
rubra), and black walnut (Jungla require approximately 0.7 acres acres of agriculture and 47.21 ac necessary to meet current safety Early coordination letters were s and March 12, 2020. The IDNR minimize impacts to wildlife and Long-eared bat, do no cut any trhanging bark, or cracks, crevices less that one acres of non-wetlan based on area (Appendix C, page Section 7 consultation (Appendi letter. An automated letter was g	ans nigra). of tree clean res of lawn standards. tent to the II a-DFW respect botanical nees suitable s, or cavities and forest is res 8-12). The x C, pages 2 generated from the control of the control	The widenting in uplar will be distributed in the distributed on M. The sources. The for roosting is from April 1998 (21-22). The form the IDEN	ng of travel lanes and d forested areas. Adurbed. Avoidance is not anticipated. the USACE, and the arch 17, 2020 with forminimize impacts (greater than 5" db 11 – September 30. Trural setting, replaces are sponded on March USACE did not residue website on February areas are sponded on February are sponded on Februar	the USFWS on Frecommendations to the Indianally cement should h 12, 2020 recopond to the ear ary 17, 2020 (A	houlders will broximately 10.27 as widening is February 17, 2020 ons to avoid or a Bat or Northern d, with loose , they state that if be at a 1:1 ration ommending a dly coordination Appendix C, pages
			or if bridges and other	areas appear to l	be the sole corridor for
				Yes	No X X
If yes, will the project impact any	of these ka	rst features	?		
Based on a desktop review, the passed on a desktop review, the passed on a desktop review, the passed on the October 13, 1993 Memorand (Appendix B, pages 3-14) and the within or adjacent to the project. In the early coordination response exist in the project area (Appendix bedrock and sand or gravel resonantive or abandoned mineral resonantive or abandoned mine	project is loo lum of Undo ne RFI report area. se, the India lix C, pages urces along ources extra because bo edrock. The replaced wil	cated outsiderstanding (lefts (Appending Seologic 5-7). IGS awith a 1% action sites arings were to majority of l meet the h	e the designated kar MOU). According to x E, pages 1-44), the ral Survey (IGS) did also indicated that the nnual flood hazard are documented in the aken to a depth of a soils encountered to ydraulic requirement	rst region of Inc to the topo map here are no kars d not indicate there was a high and high liquid he area (Appenda approximately 2 were silty or clants set forth by	diana as outlined in of the project area at features identified that karst features a potential for lation potential. No dix C, pages 5-7). 25' throughout the ay loam. INDOT. The
cal habitat identified within project a species found in project area (base ecies found in project area (based	area ed upon info upon consu	Itation with I	ration)		Yes No
	(Liriodendron tulipifera), red ma rubra), and black walnut (Jungla require approximately 0.7 acres acres of agriculture and 47.21 ac necessary to meet current safety Early coordination letters were sand March 12, 2020. The IDNR minimize impacts to wildlife and Long-eared bat, do no cut any trhanging bark, or cracks, crevices less that one acres of non-wetlar based on area (Appendix C, pag Section 7 consultation (Appendiletter. An automated letter was gastern 12-18). All applicable recommend document. In incidences of animal movements obsent, consideration of utilizing wildlife consideration of uti	(Liriodendron tulipifera), red maple (Acer r rubra), and black walnut (Junglans nigra). require approximately 0.7 acres of tree clear acres of agriculture and 47.21 acres of lawn necessary to meet current safety standards. Early coordination letters were sent to the II and March 12, 2020. The IDNR-DFW respminimize impacts to wildlife and botanical 1 Long-eared bat, do no cut any trees suitable hanging bark, or cracks, crevices, or cavities less that one acres of non-wetland forest is r based on area (Appendix C, pages 8-12). The Section 7 consultation (Appendix C, pages 2 letter. An automated letter was generated from 12-18). All applicable recommendations are document. In incidences of animal movements observed in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended in the pent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be recommended by the pent of the pent	(Liriodendron tulipifera), red maple (Acer rubrum), sug rubra), and black walnut (Junglans nigra). The widenin require approximately 0.7 acres of tree clearing in uplan acres of agriculture and 47.21 acres of lawn will be distincessary to meet current safety standards. Mitigation i Early coordination letters were sent to the IDNR-DFW, and March 12, 2020. The IDNR-DFW responded on M minimize impacts to wildlife and botanical resources. The Long-eared bat, do no cut any trees suitable for roosting hanging bark, or cracks, crevices, or cavities) from Apriless that one acres of non-wetland forest is removed in a based on area (Appendix C, pages 8-12). The USFWS is Section 7 consultation (Appendix C, pages 21-22). The letter. An automated letter was generated from the IDEN 12-18). All applicable recommendations are included in document. In incidences of animal movements observed in the project area, cent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be taken. Toposed project located within or adjacent to the potential ast features located within or adjacent to the footprint of the lifyes, will the project impact any of these karst features? Takes box to identify any karst features within the project area (Cotober 13, 1993) Based on a desktop review, the project is located outside the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (I (Appendix B, pages 3-14) and the RFI reports (Appendix Within or adjacent to the project area. In the early coordination response, the Indiana Geologic exist in the project area (Appendix C, pages 5-7). IGS a bedrock and sand or gravel resources along with a 1% a active or abandoned mineral resources extraction sites a The features will not be affected because borings were to project area did not encounter bedrock. The majority of Additionally, any culvert being replaced will meet the horesponse from IGS has been communicated with the deserbected.	(Liriodendron tulipifera), red maple (Acer rubrum), sugar maple (Acer sacr rubra), and black walnut (Junglans nigra). The widening of travel lanes are require approximately 0.7 acres of tree clearing in upland forested areas. A acres of agriculture and 47.21 acres of lawn will be disturbed. Avoidance in necessary to meet current safety standards. Mitigation is not anticipated. Early coordination letters were sent to the IDNR-DFW, the USACE, and the and March 12, 2020. The IDNR-DFW responded on March 17, 2020 with minimize impacts to wildlife and botanical resources. To minimize impact Long-eared bat, do no cut any trees suitable for roosting (greater than 5" dthanging bark, or cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 – September 30 less that one acres of non-wetland forest is removed in a rural setting, repla based on area (Appendix C, pages 8-12). The USFWS responded on Marci Section 7 consultation (Appendix C, pages 21-22). The USACE did not res letter. An automated letter was generated from the IDEM website on Febru 12-18). All applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental document. In incidences of animal movements observed in the project area, or if bridges and other ent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be taken. Toposed project located within or adjacent to the potential Karst Area of Indians of features located within or adjacent to the footprint of the proposed project? If yes, will the project impact any of these karst features? Arks box to identify any karst features within the project area. (Karst investigat October 13, 1993) Based on a desktop review, the project is located outside the designated kat the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). According (Appendix B, pages 3-14) and the RFI reports (Appendix E, pages 1-44), the within or adjacent to the project area (Appendix C, pages 5-7). IGS also indicated that the bedrock and sand or gravel resources along with a 1% annual flood hazard active or abandoned mineral resources extraction sites	(Liriodendron tulipifera), red maple (Acer rubrum), sugar maple (Acer saccharum), slipperubra), and black walnut (Junglans nigra). The widening of travel lanes and addition of require approximately 0.7 acres of tree clearing in upland forested areas. Additionally, appacres of agriculture and 47.21 acres of lawn will be disturbed. Avoidance is not practical: necessary to meet current safety standards. Mitigation is not anticipated. Early coordination letters were sent to the IDNR-DFW, the USACE, and the USFWS on It and March 12, 2020. The IDNR-DFW responded on March 17, 2020 with recommendatic minimize impacts to wildlife and botanical resources. To minimize impacts to the Indiana Long-cared bat, do no cut any trees suitable for roosting (greater than 5" dbh living or dea hanging bark, or cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 – September 30. Additionally less that one acres of non-wetland forest is removed in a rural setting, replacement should based on area (Appendix C, pages 8-12). The USFWS responded on March 12, 2020 rece Section 7 consultation (Appendix C, pages 21-22). The USACE did not respond to the ear letter. An automated letter was generated from the IDEM website on February 17, 2020 (A 12-18). All applicable recommendations are included in the Environmental Commitments document. In incidences of animal movements observed in the project area, or if bridges and other areas appear to ent, consideration of utilizing wildlife crossings should be taken. Toposed project located within or adjacent to the potential Karst Area of Indiana? If yes, will the project impact any of these karst features? If yes, will the project impact any of these karst features? In the carly coordination response, the Indiana Geological Survey (IGS) did not indicate the October 13, 1993 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). According to the topo may (Appendix B, pages 3-14) and the RFI reports (Appendix E, pages 1-44), there are no kars within or adjacent to the project area. In the early coordination response, the India

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project

Date: ___

May 19, 2021

This is page 14 of 31 Project name:

	County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route SR 26	Des. No. 1400249
--	--------	-----------------------	-------------	------------------

Remarks:

Based on a desktop review and the RFI reports (Appendix E, pages 1-44), completed by Little River Consultants on March 20, 2020, the IDNR Warren and Tippecanoe County Endangered, Threatened and Rare (ETR) Species List has been checked and is included (Appendix E, pages 12-14, 25-27, and 38-44). The highlighted species on the list reflect the federal and state identified ETR species located within the counties. According to the IDNR-DFW early coordination response letter dated March 17, 2020 (Appendix C, pages 8-11), the Natural Heritage Program's Database has been checked and the Wavyrayed Lampmussel (*Lampsilis fasciola*), a state species of special concern, has been documented in Mud Pine Creek within ½ mile of the project area. Also, the species below have been documented within ½ mile of the project area near Pine Village.

- 1. Indiana Bat (Mytois sodalist); federal and state endangered
- 2. Northern Long-Eared Bat (Myotis sepentrionalis); federal threatened and state endangered
- 3. Eastern Red Bat (Lasiurus borealis); state special concern
- 4. Salamander Mussel (Simpsonaias ambigua); in Big Pine Creek, state special concern
- 5. Kidneyshell (Ptychobranchus fasciolaris); in Big Pine Creek, state special concern
- 6. Purple Lilliput (Toxolasma lividum); in Big Pine Creek, state special concern

Additionally, IDNR-DFW recommended that impacts to the Indiana Bat, Northern Long-eared bat, and Eastern Red Bat be minimized by not cutting any trees suitable for roosting (greater than 5" dbh living or dead, with loose hanging bark, or cracks, crevices, or cavities) from April 1 – September 30.

The project qualifies for the Range-wide Programmatic Informal Consultation for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat, 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 April 20, 2021, and based on the responses provided, the project was found to "Not Likely to Adversely Affect" the Indiana bat and/or the northern long-eared bat (Appendix C, pages 29-41). INDOT reviewed and verified the effect finding and requested USFWS's review of the finding. No response was received from USFWS within the 14-day review period; therefore, it was concluded they concur with the finding. Avoidance and Mitigation Measures (AMMs) are included as firm commitments in the Environmental Commitments section of this document.

The official species list generated from IPaC did not indicate any additional federally listed species present within the project area, therefore, no additional coordination was required with USFWS.

Structure CV 026 86 14.19, which carries SR 26 over UNT5 to Big Pine Creek has shown evidence of use (nests) by a bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) during the 5/4/20 inspection. Additionally, structure CLV 026 079 24.58 that carries SR 26 over UNT1 to Little Pine Creek has shown evidence of use (nests) by a bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) during the 9/11/19 inspection. Both are in the project area and scheduled for replacement. Avoidance and minimization measures must be implemented prior to the start of and during the nesting season. Nests without eggs or young should be removed prior to construction during the non-nesting season (September 8 – April 30) and during the nesting season if no eggs or young are present. Nests with eggs or young cannot be removed or disturbed during the nesting season (May 1 – September 7). Nests with eggs or young should be screened or buffered from active construction. Details of the required procedures are outlined in the "Potential Migratory Bird on Structure Unique Special Provision". This firm commitment is included in the *Environmental Commitments* of this document.

Structure inspections were completed on September 1, 2020. USFWS Bridge/Structure Assessment shall take place no earlier than two (2) years prior to the start of construction. If construction will begin after September 1, 2022, an inspection of the structure by a qualified individual, must be performed. Inspection of the structure should check for presence of bats/bat indicators and/or presence of birds. The results of the inspection must indicate no signs of bats or birds. If signs of bats or birds are documented during this

This is page 15 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021
			•	

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26		Des. No.	1400249		
	inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. This firm commitment is included in the <i>Environmental Commitments</i> of this document. Additionally, structure (26)55-86-05834 B, which carries SR 26 over Big Pine Creek has shown evidence of use (nests) by a bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) during the 11/5/19 inspection. However, this structure will not be impacted. Coordination with INDOT, Ecology and Waterway Permitting occurred. INDOT, Ecology and Waterway							
Permitting stated that no further coordination with DNR was necessary, and that the Unique Special Provision for Eastern Phoebes should be followed (Appendix C, page 48). This precludes the need consultation on this project as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended information on endangered species at the site becomes available, or if project plans are changed, U will be contacted for consultation.								
SECTION	B – OTHER RESOURCES)						
				<u>Presence</u>	Impa	<u>cts</u>		
Wellhea Public \ Resider Source	Water Resources ad Protection Area Water System(s) ntial Well(s) Water Protection Area(s) ource Aquifer (SSA)			X	Yes	No x		
ls Is Ini	A is present, answer the following the Project in the St. Joseph Acthe FHWA/EPA SSA MOU Applitial Groundwater Assessment Fetailed Groundwater Assessme	quifer System? blicable? Required?		Yes	No			
Remarks:	The project is located in Wa Joseph Sole Source Aquifer FHWA/EPA Sole Source A Therefore, a detailed ground	, the only legally quifer Memoran	designated dum of Und	sole source aquifer erstanding (MOU)	in the state. The is not applicable	erefore, the		
	In an early coordination lett wellhead area (Appendix C				oject is not loca	ted within a		
The IDNR Water Well Record Database website (https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm) was accessed on March 18, 2020 by Little River Consultants. Eighty-seven (87) wells were found to be in the proximity of the project area. The features will not be affected because all wells will be avoided, and this project will not affect groundwater levels or quality. Most are located well outside project limits. Therefore, no impacts are expected. Should it be determined during the right-of-way phase that these wells are affected, a cost to cure will likely be included in the appraisal to restore the wells.						the proximity of is project will not re, no impacts are		
	Consultants on March 18, 2	Based on a desktop review of the INDOT MS4 website (https://entapps.indot.in.gov/MS4/) by Little River Consultants on March 18, 2020, and the RFI reports; this project is not located in an Urban Area Boundary location. No impacts are expected.						
	Based on a desktop review, August 08, 2019, August 14 10, 2019, September 11, 20	l, 2019, August 1	9, 2019, Se _l	otember 04, 2019,	September 05, 2	2019, September		
This is	page 16 of 31 Project name.	: Si	R 26 Road Re	habilitation Project	Date	e: May 19, 202		

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des	s. No1	400249
	07, 2020 and September 01, (Appendix F, pages 75-79), 1					
Transvei Project le	s inal Encroachment rse Encroachment ocated within a regulated flood ocated in floodplain within 1000				Impacts es	No .
Discuss impa Remarks:	Based on a desktop review of (http://dnrmaps.dnr.in.gov/apreport; this project is located (Appendix F, pages 44-55). The responded by phone that he larea. One is associated with Mud Pine Creek and Big Pin widening outside of the bridg located outside of the floodw which states: This project will not involve addition of any new drainage limits. This project will not emergency services or emergency services or emergency substantial.	of the IDNR Inceptship/fdms/) in a regulatory. The local flood had no concern. Mud Pine Create Creek, the brige areas, fill with a replacement of the replacement of	diana Floodway Ir by Little River Co floodplain as dete plain administrato is with the project. ek and the second idges are within a ll be placed within that qualifies as a Ca at or modification is a result, this projects	nformation Portal web nsultants on Novembermined from approve or was contacted on Fe Two floodplains are is associated with Big paving exception, ho in the floodplain at this ategory 2 per the current of any existing draina ect will not affect flood and it will not adversel	esite er 24, 202 ed IDNR f ebruary 4, located wi g Pine Cre wever, due s location. ent INDOT	0 and the RFI loodplain maps 2021, he thin the project ek. At both e to road All fill will be T CE Manual, res or the or floodplain kisting
•	oral Lands armland (per NRCS)		Presence x x	Yes x x	acts No	
Total Poir	nts (from Section VII of CPA-10	06/AD-1006* (C	es. No. 1400249)			126
Total Poir	nts (from Section VII of CPA-10	06/AD-1006* (C	es. No. 1600867)			120
Total Poir	nts (from Section VII of CPA-10	06/AD-1006* (D	es. No. 1601105)			N/A
Total Poir	nts (from Section VII of CPA-10	06/AD-1006* (C	es. No. 1700114)			141
Total Poir	nts (from Section VII of CPA-10	06/AD-1006* (C	es. No. 1800130)			134
See CE Man Remarks:	Based on a desktop review, s August 08, 2019, August 14, 10, 2019, September 11, 201 07, 2020 and September 01, (Appendix F, pages 75-79), s Protection Policy Act. An ex	site visits on Ju, 2019, August 9, November 0 2020 by Little the project will	y 16, 2019, July 2 19, 2019, Septemb 5, 2019, Novembo River Consultants convert 52.75 acr	24, 2019, July 26, 201 per 04, 2019, September 06, 2019, May 01, 2, and the aerial map of the serial m	per 05, 202 2020, May of the projection of the p	19, September of 04, 2020, May ect area e Farmland
This is p	page 17 of 31 Project name:	S	R 26 Road Rehabili	itation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249
	Conservation Services (NR and explaining that the proj 24).				
SECTION	Coordination with NRCS w 1400249, 120 for Des. No 1 CPA-106 Form (Appendix results in the consideration significant loss of prime, ur Additionally, Little River s result in an issue with prime the scores should not be add be investigated without rees	600867, 141 fo C, pages 25-28) of alternatives i nique, statewide poke with NRC e farmland. NR ded. No alterna valuating impac	r Des. No 1700114, and . NRCS's threshold sec s 160. Since this projec , or local important farn S on April 19, 2021. NI CS also expressed that the tives other than those properties.	1 134 for Des. No 18001; ore for significant impact traces are less than the aland will result from this RCS stated that the projects were not cur	30 on the NRCS- ts to farmland that threshold, no s project. ct would not nulative and that
inor Proje	cts PA Clearance	ategory Ty _l	pe INDOT Appr	oval Dates	N/A X
,		Eligible and/o			
esults of	Research	Resource F	<u>Present</u>		
rchaeolog RHP Build RHP Distr RHP Brido	dings/Site(s) rict(s)	X			
roject Effe	ect				
o Historic	Properties Affected	No Adverse	Effect X Adv	erse Effect	
	<u> </u>	Ocumentation Prepared			
ocumenta	ation (mark all that apply)	ricparca	ES/FHWA	SHPO	
istoric Pro	perties Short Report		Approval Date(s)	Approval Date	(s)
	perty Report	X	10/5/2020	11/4/2020	
	ical Records Check/ Review	X	3/15/2021	4/15/2021	
rchaeologi	ical Phase la Survey Report	X	3/15/2021	4/15/2021	
rchaeologi	cal Phase Ic Survey Report				
	ical Phase II Investigation Repo	ort			
	ical Phase III Data Recovery				
	lity and Effect Determination	X	3/15/2021	4/15/2021	
00.11 Doc	umentation	X	3/15/2021	4/15/2021	
			MOA Signature Dates	(List all signatories)	
	im of Agreement (MOA)				
	l efforts to document cultural				
n local nev	outlined in the remarks box. The spapers. Please indicate the	publication dat	e, name of paper(s) ar	nd the comment period	deadline. Likewise
iclude any	further Section 106 work which	n must be compl	eted at a later date, suc	n as mitigation or deep ti	renching.

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project

Date: ___

May 19, 2021

This is page 18 of 31 Project name:

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249	
--------	-----------------------	-------	-------	----------	---------	--

Remarks:

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

Area of Potential Effect (APE): According to 36 CFR 800.16(d), the APE is defined as "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking..."

The APE for this project includes all properties adjacent to the project and those with a proximate viewshed of the project. Urban development limited the APE within the Town of Pine Village while the curvature of the road and tree growth limited the APE outside the town. The APE is approximately 16 miles long and is approximately 0.13 mile at its widest point.

Coordination with Consulting Parties: Early coordination letter were sent on September 25, 2019 inviting the consulting parties to participate in the Section 106 process.

On September 27, 2019, the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians sent a letter accepting the invitation to serve as a consulting party for the proposed project. They offered no objection to the project and made a determination that there would be "No Historic Properties in Area of Potential Effects (APE) significant to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians." On April 12, 2021, in response to the 800.11(e) Document and Effects Finding, the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians sent a follow up letter stating that "after reviewing the details for the project referenced above, I have made the determination that there will be No Historic Properties in Area of Potential Effects (APE) significant to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians (Appendix D, page 78)."

On October 15, 2019, the SHPO responded to the early coordination letter, stating that they were "not aware of any parties who should be invited to participate in the Section 106 consultation on this project, beyond those whom INDOT already has invited."

A copy of the draft historic property report (HPR) and invitations to become Consulting Parties were sent October 26, 2020 (see Appendix D, pages 53-55). The parties are listed below.

Consulting Party	Response to Invitation	
Indiana Landmarks, Western Office	No	
Warren County Historian	No	
Warren County Historical Society	No	
Tippecanoe County Historian	No	
Tippecanoe County Historical Association	No	
Wabash Valley Trust for Historic Preservation	No	
Area Plan Commission of Tippecanoe County	No	
Warren County Commissioners	No	
Warren County Council	No	
Warren County Highway Department	No	
Tippecanoe County Commissioners	No	
Tippecanoe County Council	No	
Tippecanoe Highway Department	No	
Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma	No	
Miami Tribe of Oklahoma	No	·
Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma	No	·
Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians	Yes	

This is page 19 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021

County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249

Forest County Potawatomi Community	No
Lon and Linda Akers (property owners)	No
Trustees of the Methodist Church (property owners)	Yes
J. Leonard Spodek, DBA, Nationwide Postal Management	No
(property owner)	
Theodore and Darlene Schutter, (property owners)	No
The Windy Mill LLC (property owner)	No
Dennis Brummett (property owner)	No

Note: The IDNR State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is an automatic Consulting Party. INDOT is acting on behalf of FHWA.

Archaeology: SJCA prepared the Archaeological Literature Review and Phase 1a Reconnaissance (Jackson, March 2021), which was approved by INDOT CRO on March 16, 2021 (Appendix D, pages 3-6). Three sites were identified within the project area (12-Wa299,12-Wa-300, and 12-T-1244). These sites consisted of two isolated finds and one small lithic scatter within the project area. As a result of these efforts, none of these sites were recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP and no further work was recommended (Appendix D, Page 83).

The approved report was sent to the participating tribes and SHPO for review and concurrence on March 16, 2021 (Appendix D, pages 1-6). The SHPO letter dated April 15, 2021, concurred with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Phase Ia archaeological literature review and reconnaissance survey report (Jackson, 03/10/2021), that archaeological sites 12-Wa-0299, 12-Wa-0300, and 12-T-1244 (all of which were identified during the archaeological investigations) do not appear to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at these areas. The letter also stated that there was insufficient information regarding two sites (12-Wa-0259 and 12-Wa-0258) to determine whether it is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. SHPO recommended the sites be clearly marked and avoided by the project. If avoidance is not possible, then additional archaeological investigations may be necessary (Appendix D, Pages 83-84). The SHPO's recommendations are included as firm commitments in the Environmental Commitment section of this CE document.

Historic Properties: SJCA prepared the HPR for this project (October 2021), it contains one resource listed or previously determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP): INDOT Bridge No. 26-86-1572 (IHSSI#171-513-10008; HB-1758; NBI No. 6620), was previously determined eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C as part of the INDOT-sponsored *HBI*. It is a riveted Warren pony truss bridge, constructed in 1933. The bridge consists of two panels composing a single span of 95.8 feet with a deck width of 23.9 feet. Connecting the beams to the main truss are metal rivets. The bridge underwent minor alterations in 2000 to fix some issues with its siding. According to the *HBI*, this bridge is eligible under Criterion C. The project will have "No Adverse Effect" on the INDOT Bridge No. 26-86-1572. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired at the bridge. Further, there is a proposed paving exception at the bridge. Work surrounding the bridge will involve only widening and resurfacing of the roadway on either side of the bridge.

A historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards identified and evaluated aboveground resources within the APE for potential eligibility for the NRHP. As a result of the historic property identification and evaluation efforts, for above-ground resources are recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP:

1. Builta-Rhode Farm (IHSSI No. 171-513-05008), 9500 SR 55; is a Craftsman-style house, built c. 1920. A barn and a Folk Victorian-style gable front house are also associated with the property. The property is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C for its embodiment of significant characteristics of the Craftsman architectural style. The project will have "No Adverse Effect" on the Builta-Rhode Farm. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired from this property.

This is page 20 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route SR 26	Des. No. 1400249
--------	-----------------------	-------------	------------------

The proposed project will involve roadway resurfacing and the widening of the road's shoulders adjacent to the southwest corner of the property.

- 2. Knights of Pythias Building (IHSII No. 171-513-06005), 110 E. Lafayette St; is an Italianate-style commercial structure, built c. 1900. It is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the Knights of Pythias fraternal order and under Criterion C for its embodiment of significant characteristics of the Italianate architectural style. The project will have "No Adverse Effect" on the Knights of Pythias Building. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired from this property. All work will occur on the curb face in front of the building. The project involves the installation of one new inlet in the curb and sidewalk that will be notched out and replaced. The existing modern sidewalk will be replaced. The existing roadway will be resurfaced; parking will be modified from angled pull-in spots to parallel parking spots on both sides of the street; and there will be updates to the pavement markings. None of these project elements will alter historic features of the Knights of Pythias Building.
- 3. Pine Village Methodist Church (IHSSI No. 171-513-06007), 106 E. Church St; is a church, built in 1885, styled with Gothic Revival and Italianate elements and a sanctuary addition constructed in 1903. It is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C for its embodiment of significant characteristics of the Gothic Revival and Italianate architectural styles. The project will have "No Adverse Effect" on the Pine Village Methodist Church. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired from the proposed historic boundary of the church, which is located approximately 130 feet east of the project limits. However, right of-way will be taken on the northeast corner of Church St. and SR 26, which is property that the church recently acquired. There will be resurfacing of the roadway on SR 26 and shoulder widening north of Church St. To the south of Church St., the placement of new curbs has been proposed and the curb ramp on the southeast corner of the intersection of SR 26 and Church St. is being replaced. No historic elements of the church will be affected by any of this work.
- 4. Pine Village Post Office (IHSSI No. 171-513-06004), 101 N. Jefferson St; is a U.S. Post Office, built in 1969. It was constructed with elements of the Colonial Revival style dictated by the post office construction style guide. It is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A due to its significance in Community Planning and Development. The project will have "No Adverse Effect" on the Pine Village Post Office. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired from this resource. The project involves roadway resurfacing with the addition of new curbs. The existing modern driveway to the post office will be replaced and a new storm sewer inlet will be installed. Because there are no existing curb ramps located at the intersection of SR 26 and Jefferson St., new curb ramps will be installed at all four corners of the intersection. The existing pull-off from the roadway on SR 26 in front of the U.S. Postal Service mailbox will be maintained. The mailbox will remain in place.

INDOT CRO approved the HPR for distribution to SHPO and Consulting Parties on October 5, 2020. The HPR was forwarded to SHPO and Consulting Parties on October 6, 2020 (Appendix D, page 68-71). One email was received from Ethan Foxworthy, the chairman of the administrative council for the Pine Village United Church, concerning a limestone block retaining wall. Coordination occurred with Infrastructure Engineering (Appendix D, page 18).

The SHPO concurred with the findings of the HPR in their letter dated November 4, 2020 (Appendix D, page 5). In the letter, SHPO concurred with SJCA's assessment that they agreed with the conclusions of the HPR that the Builta-Rhode Farm, Pine Village Methodist Church, Pine Village Post Office and INDOT Bridge No. 26-86-1572 were eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. However, SHPO disagreed with the conclusions in the HPR (Appendix D, page 83), regarding the Knights of Pythias Building. They stated that "the Knights of Pythias Building located in Pine Village (IHSSI No. 171-513-06005) retains enough integrity warranting its eligibility for inclusion in the NRHP."

Documentation, Findings: A finding of "No Adverse Effect" for this project was approved by INDOT CRO for distribution to Consulting Parties and SHPO on March 15, 2021 (Appendix D, pages 1-6).

This is page 21 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021

	Indiana Department of Transportation					
County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No. <u>1400249</u>		
	Consulting Parties on March 16, Effect" finding in their letter date Consulting Parties were received	2021 (Apped April 15,	endix D, pages 3 , 2021 (Appendi	16, 2021 (Appendix D, pages 1-2) and 3-6). SHPO concurred with the "No Adverse x D, pages 83-84). No other responses from		
	Public Involvement: A notice informing the public of the finding and opportunity to comment on the "No Adverse Effect" finding was published in the <i>Review Republican</i> on March 25, 2021, offering the public an opportunity to submit comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4). One letter was received during the public comment period, which was published in the public notice to end on April 25, 2021. The letter was received from the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians on April 12, 2021, stating that "after reviewing the details for the project referenced above, I have made the determination that there will be No Historic Properties in Area of Potential Effects (APE) significant to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians (Appendix D, page 78)." The text of the public notice and the affidavit of publication appear in Appendix D, pages 79-80.					
	This completes the Section 106 process and the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 have been fulfilled.					
SECTION	D – SECTION 4(f) RESOURCE	S/ SECTI	ON 6(f) RESO	URCES		
) Involvement (mark all that apply)		Presence	Use		
Publicly Publicly	her Recreational Land y owned park y owned recreation area school, state/national forest, bikewa	ay, etc.)	X	Yes No		
	ogrammatic Section 4(f)*			FHWA Approval date		
Wildlife & Waterfowl Refuges National Wildlife Refuge National Natural Landmark State Wildlife Area State Nature Preserve		Presence	Yes No			
"De	ogrammatic Section 4(f)* e minimis" Impact* ividual Section 4(f)		Evaluations Prepared	FHWA Approval date		
Historic Pro	operties ligible and/or listed on the NRHP		<u>Presence</u>	Yes No		
			Evaluations			

This is page 22 of 31 Project name:

Prepared

<u>FHWA</u>

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project Date: May 19, 2021

	In	diana Depa	artment of	ransportation	
County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249
"D	ogrammatic Section 4(f)* le minimis" Impact* dividual Section 4(f)			Approval date	
	proval of the environmental docu s) discussed below.	ıment also serv	ves as approval	of any Section 4f Programmat	tic and/or De minimis
cumentat dividual S	historic lands for federally fu The law applies to significan NRHP eligible or listed histo	d Final docum refer to the "F e requirements artment of Tran anded transport t publicly own	nents. For further forcedural Man sof Section 4(f). Insportation Act cation facilities used parks, recrea	er discussions on Programmatual for the Preparation of Env	tic, "de minimis" and vironmental Studies". tain public and rudent alternative. refuges, and
	August 08, 2019, August 14, 10, 2019, September 11, 201 07, 2020 and September 01, pages 75-79), the March 202 SJCA (Appendix D, page 7-5	2019, August 9, November 0 2020 by Little 1 800.11 (e) Do 53), and the thr	19, 2019, Septe 15, 2019, Noven River Consultar ocumentation are RFI reports of	y 24, 2019, July 26, 2019, Aug mber 04, 2019, September 05, aber 06, 2019, May 01, 2020, Nats, the aerial map of the projected Effects Finding prepared by completed to encompass the entertial 4(f) resources located with	2019, September May 04, 2020, May t area (Appendix F, Green 3 LLC, now tire project area
	of permanent right-of-way veast drive. Bus routes will playground and athletic field the playground and athletic evaluation was not complet Village Elementary School of playground and athletic fie	vill be required likely be affects in town, which fields will no red. Additions on April 15, 20 lds a 4(f) res	d along the fronted by road clock could be contour be impacted ally, Little Riv 21. The Principource, and that	mits of Pine Village along SR 2 stage to SR 26 along with tempsures and detours. The school sidered a Section 4(f) resource, and access will not be restricted er Consultants spoke with the bal expressed that the school dot they were very excited for lementary School is not a 4(f)	porary ROW at the oll contains the only However, because eted, a Section 4(f) a Principal of Pine pes not consider the other the project to be

Additionally, five resources in the APE are recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places:

- The Builta-Rhode Farm (#171-513-05008) is a Craftsman-style house, built c. 1920. A barn and a Folk Victorian-style gable front house are also associated with the property. The property is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C for its embodiment of significant characteristics of the Craftsman architectural style. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired from this property. The proposed project will involve roadway resurfacing and the widening of the road's shoulders adjacent to the southwest corner of the property.
- Knights of Pythias Building (IHSII No. 171-513-06005) is an Italianate-style commercial structure, built c. 1900. It is recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the Knights of Pythias fraternal order and under Criterion C for its embodiment of significant characteristics of the Italianate architectural style. No right-of-way is anticipated to be acquired from this property. All work will occur on the curb face in front of the building. The project involves the installation of one new inlet in the curb and sidewalk that will be notched out and replaced. The existing modern sidewalk will be replaced. The existing roadway will be resurfaced; parking will be modified from angled pull-in spots to parallel parking spots on both sides of the street; and there will be updates to the pavement markings. None of these project elements will alter historic features of the Knights of Pythias Building.

This is page 23 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	Date:	May 19, 2021
			_	

		•		•		
County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249	
	Revival and Italian eligible for listing of the Gothic Revi acquired from the feet east of the prost. and SR 26, who of that property, the There will be result the south of Church southeast corner of representatives of St. from the church project is completed. The Pine Village Foothic constructed with eligible. It is recommendered in Community Plates ourse. The project modern driveway Because there are curb ramps will be roadway on SR 26 remain in place. 5. The Mud Pine Creeligible for the Nath constructed in 193 Places (NRHP) unconstruction and regist-of-way is and	in the NRHP undival and Italianate proposed historic ival and Italianate proposed historic ich is property there was a house rfacing of the roach St., the placem of the intersection the church have he to the northeast e. No historic electory of the Control of t	d a sanctuary der Criterion e architectura c boundary of ever, right-off at the church located on it; adway on SR and of SR 26 an planned to cot corner of the ments of the I #171-513-0 olonial Revivor listing in the opment. No dway resurface will be replaramps located our corners of J.S. Postal Section of the since the bridge integrity need to the counding the brounding the brounding the brounding the section of the counding the brounding the section of the same and the counding the brounding the section of the same and the counding the section of the same and the counding the section of the same and the same architectural of the same and the same architectural of the same architectura	addition constructed in 1903. It of for its embodiment of significal styles. No right-of-way is antical the church, which is located appropriated acquired. Prior to the chowever, that house has since be 26 and shoulder widening north of the church of the share been proposed and the condition of the church of the share been proposed and the condition of the church of the share of the share of the church of the share of the church of the share of the church of the share	is recommended ant characteristics cipated to be proximately 130 ast corner of Church hurch's acquisition een demolished. of Church St. To urb ramp on the naddition, rth side of Church ch St. after the f this work. in 1969. It was be construction style to its significance acquired from this bs. The existing will be installed. If Jefferson St., new bull-off from the fl. The mailbox will by recommended truss bridge, for of Historic cons in bridge grignificance. No seed paving	
	None of the above-mention	ed resources will	l be impacted	. Therefore, no 4(f) use is expec	eted.	
Section 6(f) Involvement Presence Use						
Section 6(f) Property Yes No						
Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 6(f). Discuss any Section 6(f) involvement.						
Remarks:	The U.S. Land and Water C Fund (LWCF), which was o	Conservation Fun created to preserv	nd Act of 1965 we, develop, a	5 established the Land and Wate nd assure accessibility to outdoor flands purchased with LWCF m	r Conservation or recreation	
	eighteen (18) properties in	Tippecanoe Cour	nty and none	//www.in.gov/indot/2523.htm, roin Warren County (Appendix I, pect area. Therefore, there will be	page 1). None of	

resources as a result of this project.

County _	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. N	lo. 1400	249
SECTION	E – Air Quality					
<u>Air C</u>	<u>tuality</u>					
ls th If YI	nformity Status of the Pro- ne project in an air quality r ES, then: Is the project in the most of Is the project exempt from If the project is NOT exem Is the project in the Tra- Is a hot spot analysis r	non-attainment or nurrent MPO TIP? conformity? pt from conformity, ansportation Plan (then:	Yes No		
Lev	el of MSAT Analysis requir	red?				
Lev	el 1a 🗶 Level 1b	Level 2 L	Level 3 Level 4	Level 5		
Remarks:	Program (STIP) (Appe Tippecanoe County Tr This project is located	ndix H, pages 1-3) ansportation Impro in Warren and Tipp IDEM (https://ww	r (FY) 2020-2024 States. The project is also incoverent Program (TIP). pecanoe Counties, which with the control of the control	cluded in the Area : th are currently in a	Plan Comm	or all criteria
		n Air Act conformi	ategorical exclusion (Gr ity rule under 40 CFR 9			
SECTION	F - NOISE					
ocorron i	- NOIGE					
Noise					Yes	No
Is a noise ar	nalysis required in accorda	nce with FHWA reg	gulations and INDOT's t	raffic noise policy?		X
		No Yes/ Dat	te	<u></u>		
ES Review	of Noise Analysis	Х				
Remarks:	The project is a Type III Transportation Traffic N					
SECTION	G – COMMUNITY IMPA	CTS				
Will the prop	community & Neighborho cosed action comply with the cosed action result in substances	ne local/regional de antial impacts to co	ommunity cohesion?		Yes X	No X X
This is p	age 25 of 31 Project nar	ne: S	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation	Project	Date: _	May 19, 2021

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26	Des. No.	1400249
Does the c	uction activities impact comm ommunity have an approved ire steps being made to adval roject comply with the transiti	transition plan? nce the community	y's transition plan?		X X X X
Remarks:	Pine Village held the first Committee for Community event that will be held with August 14, 2021. Moving August. The Town of Pine project primarily maintain community to comply with officials to minimize disru	y Enhancement co hin the project are forward the festive e Village is a smal s existing infrastru- n local developme	onfirmed that the footba a. The festival did not val is planned to be held to community and does acture. Additionally, c nt. The designer has b	all festival is the only p take place in 2020 but d annually on the secon not have a transition p oordination has been on	lanned community will be held on ad Saturday in lan; however, this ngoing with the
	nd Cumulative Impacts oposed action result in substa	ntial indirect or cu	mulative impacts?		Yes No X
Remarks:	Indirect impacts are effect but are still reasonably for related to induced changes affect the environment wh present, and reasonably fo actions.	eseeable. Indirects in the pattern of lich result from the	t effects may include grand use, population de incremental impact of	rowth inducing effects a nsity, or growth rate. Of the action when added	and other effects Cumulative impacts I to other past,
	This project will not perm bus or emergency vehicle construction due to road c addition of shoulders will improved access and turni sidewalks through town for	routes, though a to losures and detour result in increased ng radii for trucks	emporary disruption of rs. However, the struct I safety to motorists and in Pine Village will in	these services may occural overlay, road wided equipment operators.	eur during ning, and the Additionally,
Will the pro	cilities & Services oposed action result in substaties, emergency services, relies facilities? Discuss how the less facilities?	gious institutions,	airports, public transpo	rtation or pedestrian	Yes No X
Remarks:	Based on a desktop review August 08, 2019, August 10, 2019, September 11, 2 07, 2020 and September 0 B, pages 14-18), and the there is one (1) school in a There are also four (4) reli radius. The school, recreat the project area.	14, 2019, August 1 019, November 0: 1, 2020 by Little I aree RFI reports p combination with a gious facilities, fo	19, 2019, September 04 5, 2019, November 06, River Consultants, the a repared to encompass tone (1) recreational fac- our (4) cemeteries, and	I, 2019, September 05, 2019, May 01, 2020, Maerial map of the project the project area (Appen ility within the 0.5 mile one (1) pipeline within	2019, September May 04, 2020, May et area (Appendix dix E, pages 1-44), e search radius. the 0.5 mile search
	Pine Village Elementary S of permanent right-of-way affected by road closures a town. Recreational portion Metropolitan School Distr	will likely be requand detours. The sense of the property	uired along the frontag school also contains the will not be affected. A	e to SR 26. Bus routes conly playground and a an early coordination le	will likely be athletic fields in tters was sent to the
This is	page 26 of 31 Project name	e: S	R 26 Road Rehabilitation	Project Da	te: May 19, 202

	County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route SR 26	Des. No. 1400249
--	--------	-----------------------	-------------	------------------

respond to the early coordination letter; however, Little River Consultants spoke with the Principal of Pine Village Elementary School on April 15, 2021. The Principal expressed that the school was very excited for the project to be implemented.

Access to the school, recreational facility, cemeteries and religious facilities will be maintained during construction. There will be no impacts to the religious facilities or cemeteries. No cemeteries are located within 100 feet of the project area; therefore, no cemetery plan is required.

According to the RFI reports, an Indiana Gas pipeline is located 0.05 miles north of the eastern leg of the project. However, an 811 ticket and desktop investigation were performed early on in the utility coordination process to identify any and all utilities located within the project limits. No records or indications of this pipeline were identified throughout this process.

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.

Environmental Justice (EJ) (Presidential EO 12898)	Yes	No
During the development of the project were EJ issues identified?		X
Does the project require an EJ analysis?	X	
If YES, then:		
Are any EJ populations located within the project area?		X

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

Remarks:

Under FHWA Order 6640.23A, FHWA and the project sponsor, as a recipient of funding from FHWA, are responsible to ensure that their programs, policies, and activities do not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. Per the current INDOT Categorical Exclusion Manual, an EJ Analysis is required for any project that has two or more relocations or 0.5 acres of additional permanent right-of-way. The project will require 65.66 acres of new permanent right-of-way. Therefore, an EJ Analysis is required.

Potential EJ impacts are detected by locating minority and low-income populations relative to a reference population to determine if populations of EJ concern exists and whether there could be disproportionately high and adverse impacts to them. The reference population may be a county, city or town and is called the community of comparison (COC). In this project, the COC is Warren and Tippecanoe Counties. The community that overlaps the project area is called the affected community (AC). In this project, there are four AC's as the project falls within four townships. AC-1 is Shelby Township in Tippecanoe County. AC-2 is Adams Township, AC-3 is Medina Township and AC-4 is Pine Township, all in Warren County. An AC has a population of concern for EJ if the population is more than 50% minority or low-income or if the low-income or minority population is 125% of the COC. Data from the 2018 US Census Bureau was obtained from the US Census Bureau Website https://factfinder.census.gov/ on December 21, 2020 by Little River Consultants. Data sheets can be found in Appendix J. The data collected for minority and low-income populations within the AC are summarized in the below table.

Table: Minority and Low-Income Data (US Census Bureau, 2019)						
	COC	AC-1	AC-2	AC-3	AC-4	
	Tippecanoe	Shelby	Adams	Medina	Pine	
	and Warren	Township,	Township,	Township,	Township,	
	County	Tippecanoe	Warren	Warren	Warren	
		County, IN	County, IN	County, IN	County, IN	
Percent Minority	17.9%	9.2%	0.9%	9.7%	1.8%	
125% of COC	22.4%	9.2%	0.9%	9.7%	1.8%	
EJ Population of Concern		No	No	No	No	

This is page 27 of 31 Project name: SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project Date: May 19, 2021

County	Warren aı	nd Tippecanoe	Rou	te SR 26		Des. No	o. <u>1400249</u>
				<u> </u>			
		Percent Low- Income	18.4%	7.3%	6.3%	2.9%	0.0%
		125% of COC	23%	7.3% < 23%	6.3% < 23%	2.9% < 23%	0% < 23%
		EJ Population of Concern		No	No	No	No
	threshold 125% C below the	d. AC-2, Adams COC threshold. A he 125% COC threlow the 125% COC threlow the 125% COC	Township has C-3, Medina T eshold. AC-4	a percent minor fownship has a p Pine Township	rity of 0.9% whi percent minority has a percent m	ch is below 50% of 9.7% which ninority of 1.8%	ow the 125% COC of and is below 50% and is which is below 50% and is owhich is below 50% minority populations
	threshold 125% C is below 50% and	d. AC-2, Adams OC threshold. A	Township has C-3, Medina Threshold. AC COC thresh	a percent low-i Township has a p -4, Pine Townsh	ncome of 6.3% percent low-incomip has a percent	which is below ome of 2.9% what low-income of	below the 125% COC 50% and is below the ich is below 50% and 60% which is below the not low-income
	bus or e	mergency vehicle ction due to road	routes, though closures and de roadway while	h a temporary di etours. Addition e enhancing adja	sruption of thes nally, the project	e services may of will ultimately	erm impacts to school occur during increase road safety e. The project will not
Relocatior	n of Peopl	e, Businesses or	Farms				Yes No
Will the pro	posed act	ion result in the re	location of peo	pple, businesses	or farms?		X
s a Busine	ess Informa	ation Survey (BIS)	required?				X
	-	e Relocation Stud					X
las utility r	relocation (coordination been	initiated for thi	is project?			X
Number of				Businesses: _	0 Farms:	Ot	her:0
a BIS or C Remarks:	No relo utilities	quired, discuss the cations of people, will be relocated Gas, and Nipsco	businesses or to accommoda	farms will take			However, four ty REMC, AT&T,
05051011		ADDOLLO MAT	EDIAL O 9 DI	FOUL ATER O	UDOTANOSO		
SECTION	H – HAZ	ARDOUS MAT	ERIALS & RI	EGULATEDS	UBSTANCES		
		s & Regulated Su	ı bstances (Ma	ark all that apply		cumentation	
		T I				X	
Red Flag Ir	-		nt (Phase LES	A)			
Red Flag Ir Phase I En Phase II Er	vironment nvironmen	 al Site Assessmer tal Site Assessme s for Remediation	nt (Phase II E				

May 19, 2021

This is page 28 of 31 Project name:

County	Warren and Tippecanoe	Route	SR 26		Des. No.	1400249
		No Yes/ D	ate			
ES Reviev	v of Investigations	April 2	9 and 30, 2020			
Inc	lude a summary of findings	for each investiga	tion.	-		
Remarks:	Based on a review of GINDOT Site Assessmen Tank Sites), one (1) CFE Elimination System) Fa area; however, no hazm project. Further investig	t and Management O (Confined Feedi cilities, and one (1) at sites were identi	(Appendix E, l ng Operation), to NPDES Pipe I fied in or within	Page 1-44). Four (4 wo (2) NPDES (Na Location are located to 0.5 mile of the pro-) UST (Unde tional Polluti within 0.5 m oject area that	rground Storage on Discharge nile of the project
SECTION	II – PERMITS CHECKL	IST				
Permits (n	nark all that apply)		Likely Requ	ired		
Army Cor	ps of Engineers (404/Sect	ion10 Permit)				
Na Re Pr	dividual Permit (IP) ationwide Permit (NWP) egional General Permit (RG e-Construction Notification		X			
_	her etland Mitigation required					
	ream Mitigation required					
Iso Ru Ot Wo Str	ection 401 WQC blated Wetlands determinat lle 5 her etland Mitigation required ream Mitigation required	ion	X X X			
IDNR Co	onstruction in a Floodway			1		
Na La Ot	avigable Waterway Permit ke Preservation Permit her tigation Required					
US Coast	Guard Section 9 Bridge P					
Others (P Remarks:	A USACE Section 404 be required for this proj	permit and an IDE	M Section 401	Water Quality Certi	fication and	Rule 5 are likely to
	Applicable recommendate permits are found to be would supersede these reall required permits.	necessary, the con-	ditions of the pe	rmit would be requ	irements of tl	ne project and
	While two floodplains a impacted. However, du floodplain, but outside of	e to road widening	outside of the l	oridge areas, fill wil	l be placed w	ithin the
This is	page 29 of 31 Project na	me:	SR 26 Road Reh	abilitation Project	Dat	ə: May 19, 2

County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249

SECTION J- ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

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

Remarks:

Firm:

- 1. If the scope of work or permanent or temporary right-of-way amounts change, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately. (INDOT ESD and INDOT District)
- 2. It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to notify school corporations and emergency services at least two weeks prior to any construction that would block or limit access. (INDOT ESD)
- 3. Workers who are working in or near water with E. coli or that are impaired for PCBs in fish tissue should take care to wear appropriate PPE, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure. (INDOT SAM)
- 4. Lighting AMM1: Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during the active season. (USFWS)
- 5. Tree Removal AMM1: Modify all phase/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) to avoid tree removal.
- 6. Tree Removal AMM2: Apply time of year restrictions (April 1 September 30) for tree removal when bats are not likely to be present, or limit tree removal to 10 or fewer trees per project at any time of year within 100 feet of existing road/rail surface and outside of documented roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors; visual emergence survey must be conducted with no bats observed. (USFWS, IDNR-DFW)
- 7. Tree Removal AMM3: Ensure tree removal is limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits). (USFWS)
- 8. Tree Removal AMM4: Do not remove documented Indiana bat or NLEB roosts that are still suitable for roosting, or trees within 0.25 miles of roosts, or documented foraging habitat any time of year. (USFWS)
- 9. General AMM1: Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs. (USFWS)
- 10. Structures CV 026-086-14.19 and CV 026-079-24.58 have shown evidence of use (i.e. nests) by a bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) during the September 1, 2020 inspection. Avoidance and minimization measures must be implemented prior to the start of and during the nesting season. Nests without eggs or young should be removed prior to construction during the non-nesting season (September 8 April 30) and during the nesting season if no eggs or young are present. Nests with eggs or young cannot be removed or disturbed during the nesting season (May 1 September 7). Nests with eggs or young should be screened or buffered from active construction. Details of the required procedures are outlined in the "Potential Migratory Bird on Structure USP" (INDOT)
- 11. SHPO stated there was insufficient information regarding two sites (12-Wa-0259 and 12-Wa-0258) to determine whether it is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. SHPO recommended the sites be clearly marked and avoided by the project. If avoidance is not possible, then additional archaeological investigations may be necessary. Sites should be marked as "Sensitive Areas-do not disturb" on the plan sheets. (SHPO)
- 12. The existing pull-off from the roadway on SR 26 in front of the U.S. Postal Service mailbox will be maintained. The mailbox will remain in place. The mailbox will be marked as "Do Not Disturb" on the plan sheets. (SHPO)
- 13. No traffic restrictions will be permitted for Des. No. 1601105 until the completion and removal of detour for all work associated with Des. No. 1400249 (INDOT).
- 14. USFWS Bridge/Structure Assessment shall take place no earlier than two (2) years prior to the start of construction. If construction will begin after September 1 2022, an inspection of the structure by

010	construction. If con	istruction will begin after September 1 2022, an inspe	ction of the	e structure by
This is page 30 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project	_ Date:	May 19, 2021
		Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2		

County Warren and Tippecanoe Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400249

a qualified individual, must be performed. Inspection of the structure should check for presence of bats/bat indicators and/or presence of birds. The results of the inspection must indicate no signs of bats or birds. If signs of bats or birds are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately (INDOT).

For Further Consideration:

- 1. Revegetate all bare and disturbed areas that are not currently mowed and maintained with a mixture of grasses, sedges, and wildflowers native to Central Indiana and specifically for stream bank/floodway stabilization purposes as soon as possible upon completion; turf-type grasses (including low-endophyte, friendly endophyte, and endophyte free tall fescue but excluding all other varieties of tall fescue) may be used in currently mowed areas only. (IDNR-DFW)
- 2. Use minimum average 6-inch graded riprap stone extended below the normal water level to provide habitat for aquatic organisms in the voids. (IDNR-DFW)
- 3. The new, replacement, or rehabbed structure, and any bank stabilization under the structure, should not create conditions that are less favorable for wildlife passage under the structure compared to the current conditions. (IDNR-DFW)

SECTION K-EARLY COORDINATION

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

Remarks:

- 1. Indiana Geological Survey Automated response generated February 17, 2020
- 2. Environmental Coordinator, IDNR, Division of Fish & Wildlife Sent February 17, 2020 Response received March 17, 2020
- 3. Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Roadway Automated letter generated February 17, 2020 signed March 12, 2020
- 4. Indiana Department of Environmental Management, Proximity to WPA Automated response February 21, 2020
- 5. US Department of Housing & Urban Development Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 6. US Fish & Wildlife Service Sent March 12, 2020 Response received April 6, 2020
- 7. Regional Environmental Coordinator, Midwest Regional Office, National Park Service Sent February 17, 2020 No Response
- 8. State Conservationist, NRCS Sent February 17, 2020 Coordination occurred February 18, 2020, response received March 4, 2020
- 9. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 10. Warren County Commissioners Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 11. Warren County Highway Department Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 12. Warren County Surveyor Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 13. Warren County Floodplain Administrator Sent February 4, 2021 Phone conversation, February 4, 2021
- 14. Tippecanoe County Surveyor Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 15. Tippecanoe County Commissioners Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 16. Tippecanoe Highway Department Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 17. Pine Village Fire Department Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 18. Pine Village Street Commissioner Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 19. Pine Village Clerk Sent February 17, 2020 No response
- 20. Metropolitan School District of Warren County Board Sent February 17, 2020 No response

20. Met	tropolitan School I	District of warren County Board – Sent February 17	, 2020 - No re	esponse
This is page 31 of 31	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Project Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2	Date: _	May 19, 2021