

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

<b>Road No./County:</b>	I-64 and I-265/Floyd County
<b>Designation Number(s):</b>	1900162 (Lead), et al. (Additional Des. Nos. are listed in the Project Description (Preferred Alternative) section of this document).
<b>Project Description/Termini:</b>	Added Travel Lanes/Along I-64 from US 150 to just north of Cherry Street with additional pavement rehabilitation extending to Main Street; added lanes on I-265 from I-64 to north of State Street and improvements to the interchanges of I-64 at US 150 and I-265

	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 2</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT DE and/or INDOT ESD
	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 3</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT ESD
<b>X</b>	<b>Categorical Exclusion, Level 4</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT ESD and FHWA
	<b>Environmental Assessment (EA)</b> – Required Signatories: INDOT ESD and FHWA
	<b>Additional Investigation (AI)</b> – The proposed action included a design change from the original approved environmental document. Required Signatories must include the appropriate environmental approval authority

**Approval**

_____	_____
INDOT DE Signature and Date	INDOT ESD Signature and Date
_____	
FHWA Signature and Date	

**Release for Public Involvement**

_____	ADWP	December 4, 2023
INDOT DE Initials and Date	INDOT ESD Initials and Date	

**Certification of Public Involvement**

\_\_\_\_\_

INDOT Consultant Services Signature and Date

**INDOT DE/ESD Reviewer Signature and Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer:** \_\_\_\_\_

Kia Gillette, HNTB

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

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

### Part I – Public Involvement

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

Does the project have a historic bridge processed under the Historic Bridges PA*?	Yes	No
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If No, then:		
Opportunity for a Public Hearing Required?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

The I-64 Added Travel Lanes (Improve 64) project has included several public involvement efforts. These efforts include *Notice of Entry* letters, a project website, social media posts via the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Southeast accounts, a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), an Environmental Justice (EJ) Working Group, a public information meeting, noise barrier surveys, a noise barrier public information meeting, and a Section 106 public notice. Upon release of this environmental document for public involvement, a public hearing will be held as described below. Public involvement activities to date are summarized below and included in Appendix G.

#### Notice of Entry Letters

Notice of Entry letters were mailed to potentially affected property owners near the project area on February 12, 2021, June 10, 2021, March 31, 2022, April 7, 2022, and August 5, 2022, notifying them about the project and that individuals responsible for land surveying and field activities may be seen in the area. Sample copies of the Notice of Entry letters are included in Appendix G, pages 1-6.

#### Project Website

The website for the Improve 64 project is [Improve64.com](http://Improve64.com). The website includes project updates, presentations and videos, frequently asked questions, and project documents.

#### CAC Meetings

The Improve 64 CAC was formed to serve as a sounding board for study information and decision-making, to facilitate collaborative problem solving and discussion of specific issues, and to serve as a link to the community by sharing project information. Forty-two individuals representing government, utilities, employers, event/tourism/retail, business, user groups, and special interest groups were originally invited to participate on the CAC. Eight additional individuals were invited to be on the CAC based on feedback from the first CAC meeting (Appendix G, pages 7-8). To date, two CAC meetings have been held, as described below:

- Meeting #1 (Virtual) (August 3, 2021) – Topics included the purpose of the meeting, the role of the CAC, a project overview, the format of future meetings, and time for discussion and questions. CAC members commented on the difficulty of merging from I-265 westbound (WB) to I-64 eastbound (EB), suggested additional CAC and EJ Working Group members, and asked about potential truck detours. They also suggested underpass work be staggered and not occur at the same time (Appendix G, pages 9-16).
- Meeting #2 (In person) (August 9, 2022) – This was a combined CAC/EJ Working Group meeting held at the Scribner Middle School in New Albany. Topics included a project overview, discussion of the environmental review process, efforts made to engage communities with EJ concerns, anticipated schedule, the public comment period/upcoming public information meeting, and time for discussion and questions. CAC and EJ Working Group members commented on the potential to address traffic on I-265 outside the project limits,

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

concerns over closing Cherry Street and Captain Frank Road at the same time and effects to neighborhood access. In addition, TARC (local transit agency) was recommended as a good resource to coordinate with regarding communicating with residents. Meeting attendees also suggested considering a possible dual left turn onto State Street from the I-265 interchange ramp, possible transit routes during maintenance of traffic (MOT), and potentially including signage along the interstate about historic downtown. Historic properties within the project area and the status of the Section 106 consultation process were discussed. Meeting attendees recommended providing information about the project to stores on State Street, to local libraries, and community centers. Maps showing the census block groups with minority and low-income populations of EJ concern were reviewed and meeting attendees were asked if there were any missing areas. No additional areas were identified. Meeting attendees were also asked if public meeting information should be translated into other languages in addition to Spanish. Meeting attendees were not aware of other languages that would be helpful (Appendix G, pages 17-34).

### **EJ Working Group Meetings**

The EJ Working Group was formed to focus on EJ community concerns by identifying EJ communities, determining the best outreach methods to reach those communities, and identifying possible impacts. EJ Working Group members include government representatives, low-income advocates, minority organizations, and community representatives. Twenty-five individuals were originally invited to participate on the EJ Working Group. Fifty-two additional individuals were invited to be on the EJ Working Group based on feedback from the first CAC and EJ Working Group meetings (Appendix J, pages 32-34). To date, two EJ Working Group meetings have been held, as described below:

- Meeting #1 (Virtual) (August 3, 2021) – Topics included the purpose of the meeting, the role of the EJ Working Group, a project overview, discussion of the environmental study, and time for discussion and questions. Maps showing census block groups with minority and low-income populations of EJ concern were shared at the meeting and the Floyd County NAACP and Center for Neighborhoods representatives indicated they appeared to be accurate. They also mentioned a high minority population in the Jefferson Gardens apartments. Concerns expressed during the meeting included the temporary closure of Cherry Street and possible impacts on Scribner Middle School. Participants also suggested including more west Louisville representatives on the EJ Working Group because many residents cross the Sherman Minton bridge to shop at stores and access destinations on State Street (such as the west Louisville YMCA, Louisville Mayor’s office, community centers, schools, Louisville Urban League, TARC (regional transit agency), Housing Authority, and additional black churches such as Howard Chapel and Bethel Church). Participants indicated it is important to be transparent about closures and to be honest to build trust. The Floyd County NAACP and Center for Neighborhoods representatives stressed the importance of relying on trusted partners – community centers, churches, Urban League – for ways to engage EJ communities. Possible outreach events could include “Park Days” at Victory Park or Shelby Park, Harvest Homecoming, World Fest, KY State Fair, and job fairs. Americana Community Center, La Casita, Catholic Charities, the Mayor’s Office of Globalization, and St. Mary’s Church in New Albany are good resources to reach out to the Hispanic population. Radio was also suggested as an outreach tool. (Appendix J, pages 25-29).
- Meeting #2 (In person) (August 9, 2022) – This was a combined CAC/EJ Working Group meeting held at the Scribner Middle School in New Albany. See discussion above in **CAC Meetings** section.

### **Public Information Meeting #1**

Public information meeting #1 was held on August 17, 2022 at the Scribner Middle School. Approximately 84 people attended. Several methods were used to advertise the meeting including: emailing fliers (in both English and Spanish) to EJ Working Group and CAC members to share; a public notice in the local newspaper; social media posts; a press release; mailing over 12,000 postcards with the public meeting and project website information to adjacent zip codes (including the populations of EJ concern); and more than 1,500 hard-copy fliers were distributed to grocery stores,

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

community centers, apartment complexes, and other locations within the community. Many of these locations that received hard copies of fliers were specifically mentioned during the EJ Working Group meetings and/or were within census block groups with minority and low-income populations of EJ concern. The meeting presentation provided an overview of the project, discussed the environmental review process, and included the anticipated project schedule. A factsheet and “Frequently Asked Questions” handouts were available at the meeting for attendees to take home. Project team staff were also available at informational boards to answer questions from the public (Appendix G, pages 20-43).

A public comment period was held from August 2 to September 2, 2022. Public comments generally pertained to existing traffic and truck jake brake noise; support for noise barriers, notifying Harrison County residences of public involvement opportunities; revegetation after construction; including additional lanes in the project along US 150, I-64, and I-265; not including tolls on the Sherman Minton bridge; not adding travel lanes; welcome centers; truck traffic causing slow traffic along I-64 eastbound (EB); lengthening the US 150 westbound (WB) to I-64 EB ramp; extending the project west along I-64 to the Georgetown exit; the intersection of US 150 and Old Vincennes Road; increasing development in the Georgetown area; and rock wall treatment. Responses to comments generally included clarifying the scope and limits of the project; explaining why lanes were being added or not being added; and summarizing the noise analysis process and the noise barriers to be constructed as part of the project. Public comments during this comment period and responses to comments are included in Appendix G, pages 44-123.

### **Noise Barrier Surveys and Public Information Meeting**

In accordance with INDOT’s Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure (2022) (Noise Policy), noise barrier survey postcards were mailed to benefited receptors and businesses that could have their line-of-sight blocked for these three noise barriers (Noise Barrier (NB) 5, NB6, and NB7) on December 20, 2022, asking if they were in favor of a noise barrier near their property. The transmittal letter also included an invitation to a noise barrier public information meeting.

The noise barrier public information meeting was held on January 24, 2023, at the New Albany Schools Educational Support Center. The purpose of this public meeting was to educate neighborhood residents on INDOT’s Noise Policy and encourage benefited receptors to complete a survey on whether they were in favor of a noise barrier at that location or not. The meeting presentation provided an overview of the project, discussed INDOT’s Noise Policy, and provided information regarding possible noise barriers along I-64 and I-265. Meeting handouts were available in both English and Spanish. Project team staff were also available at informational boards to answer questions from the public. Meeting attendees could complete a noise barrier survey postcard and give to project team staff at the meeting. Approximately 58 people attended the public meeting.

INDOT’s Noise Policy requires a second noise survey mailing for each feasible and potentially reasonable noise barrier if the response rate is not 50% or greater. Less than a 50% response rate was received for the first round of surveys for Noise Barrier (NB) 5 and NB7. A second round of survey postcards was mailed to benefited receptors who did not originally respond for NB5 and NB7 on February 13, 2023. Hard copies of the survey postcard mailings were hand delivered to 18 residences on Ealy Street for NB5 because all original mailings were returned to sender as undeliverable.

The noise public comment period was from December 20, 2022 to March 3, 2023. Public comments during the noise public comment period generally pertained to truck jake brakes; supporting noise barrier construction at specific locations; existing traffic noise; keeping existing trees; and lowering the speed limit to reduce noise. Responses to comments generally included clarifying INDOT’s Noise Policy, and explaining where noise barriers are likely to be constructed and where they will not be constructed. Noise barrier survey and public meeting information, and public comments during the noise survey comment period and responses to comments are included in Appendix I, pages 82-107.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

### **Section 106**

To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice of FHWA’s finding of No Adverse Effect was published in the *News and Tribune* on April 29, 2023 offering the public an opportunity to submit comment pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e), and 800.6(a)(4). The public comment period closed 30 days later on May 30, 2023. No public comments were received. The text of the public notice and the affidavit of publication appear in Appendix D, pages 4-5.

### **Public Hearing**

The project will meet the minimum requirements described in the current *Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Project Development Public Involvement Procedures Manual* which requires the project sponsor to offer the public an opportunity to submit comments and/or request a public hearing. Therefore, a legal notice will appear in a local publication contingent upon the release of this document for public involvement. This document will be revised after the public involvement requirements are fulfilled.

### **Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds**

*Discuss public controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts, including what is being done during the project to minimize impacts.*

At this time, there is no substantial public controversy concerning impacts to the community or to natural resources.

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

Sponsor of the Project: INDOT INDOT District: Seymour

Local Name of the Facility: I-64 and I-265

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

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

### **PURPOSE AND NEED:**

*The need should describe the specific transportation problem or deficiency that the project will address. The purpose should describe the goal or objective of the project. The solution to the traffic problem should NOT be discussed in this section.*

#### **Needs**

The following needs were identified for this project:

- 1. Existing and Future Traffic Congestion:** Insufficient traffic capacity in the vicinity of the I-64 and I-265 interchange causes recurring congestion along I-64 between SR 62/SR 64 and the Indiana/Kentucky state line and along I-265 between I-64 and Grant Line Road. This results in peak period travel speeds below 20 miles per hour, intermittent queuing, and a high frequency of rear end and sideswipe crashes.

Level of Service (LOS) provides a common “grading” scale for describing traffic congestion on roadways, from LOS A (best) to LOS F (worst). LOS A represents near ideal traffic flow, while LOS F represents a breakdown of the traffic flow. Table 1 shows the 2019 peak hour LOS and the 2046 No Build peak hour LOS. Highway capacity LOS within the project corridor do not meet INDOT standards (LOS D is the minimum in urban areas) in the current conditions (2019) or the design year (2046). In 2019 there were seven freeway segments with unacceptable LOS (E or F) in either the a.m. or p.m. peak periods (bold in Table 1)

This is page 5 of 66 Project name: I-64 Added Travel Lanes (Improve 64) Date: November 29, 2023

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

(Appendix K, pages 36-40). Recurring congestion occurs on I-64 EB during typical weekday morning peak periods, beginning near the I-64 and SR 62/SR 64 interchange due to the high-volume US 150 entrance ramp downstream. On I-64 WB, congestion occurs during the typical weekday afternoon peak period. I-265 WB experiences congestion during both the typical weekday morning and afternoon peak periods.

Congestion is expected to increase in the design year (2046) with 15 freeway segments with unacceptable LOS (E or F) in either the a.m. or p.m. peak periods. Twenty segments are anticipated to result in a decreased LOS in the a.m. or p.m. peak period (gray shading in Table 1) (Appendix K, pages 59-60).

**Table 1. Freeway Segment LOS Comparison for 2019 Existing and 2026 No Build Conditions**

Segment	2019 Existing (a.m./p.m) LOS*	2046 No Build (a.m./p.m.) LOS*
<b>I-64 Eastbound</b>		
Lanesville Rd. to SR 62/64	B/A	F/B
Inside SR 62/64	B/A	F/B
SR 62/64 to US 150	F/B	F/B
Inside US 150	F/B	F/C
US 150 to I-265	E/C	E/D
System Ramp to I-265	B/C	C/D
I-265 to Spring St.	C/B	D/B
Inside Spring St.	C/A	D/B
Sherman Minton Bridge	D/B	D/C
<b>I-265 Eastbound</b>		
System Ramp from I-64	B/C	C/D
I-64 to State St. (weave)	B/C	C/D
Inside State St.	B/C	B/C
State St. to Grant Line Rd.	C/D	C/D
<b>I-265 Westbound</b>		
Grant Line Rd. to State St.	C/D	F/F
Inside State St.	B/F	F/F
State St. to I-64 (weave)	D/F	F/F
System Ramp to I-64 westbound	D/D	F/E
<b>I-64 Westbound</b>		
Sherman Minton Bridge	B/E	C/F
Inside Spring St.	A/C	B/E
Spring St. to I-265	B/D	B/F
System Ramp to I-265	C/E	C/E
Inside I-265	A/B	A/C
System Ramp from I-265	D/D	F/E
I-265 to US 150	A/D	B/E
Inside US 150	A/C	A/C
US 150 to SR 62/64	A/C	A/C
Inside SR 62/64	A/B	A/B
SR 62/64 to Lanesville Rd.	A/C	A/C

\*Note, the bold values indicate unacceptable operating conditions. The highlighted cells indicate a projected decrease in LOS.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

During the a.m. peak there is a bottleneck on I-64 EB at the US 150 interchange due to heavy entrance ramp demand, limited mainline capacity (two lanes), a short entrance ramp merge distance, and horizontal and vertical curves. This bottleneck causes upstream LOS F conditions and observed speeds of less than 20 mph. I-64 EB between US 150 and I-265 experiences LOS E conditions in the a.m. peak, a condition that worsens if the bottleneck at the US 150 entrance ramp were removed. Traffic on the single lane ramp from I-265 WB to I-64 EB also experiences LOS E conditions in the a.m. peak.

During the p.m. peak there is significant congestion and LOS F conditions on I-265 WB approaching the I-64 interchange. This is due to heavy entrance ramp demand from State Street and limited I-265 mainline capacity combined with the downstream weave to the system ramps. I-64 WB is congested with LOS E conditions from the Sherman Minton Bridge to Spring Street, and the I-64 WB to the I-265 EB ramp also operates at LOS E conditions.

Crash records for years 2017, 2018, and 2019 were analyzed within the project area of influence. Of the 656 crashes that occurred on the freeway mainline during the 3-year period, 301 (46%) were rear end crashes that are typically related to congested conditions.

The INDOT RoadHAT 4D software was used to calculate the index of crash cost (Icc) and the index of crash frequency (Icf) for each location based on the number and severity of crashes occurring during the 3-year period, traffic volumes, and facility characteristics. An Icf or Icc value greater than zero indicates that the crash rate at a specific location is higher than expected given the type of facility and traffic volumes. A positive Icf or Icc value corresponds to the standard deviation. For example, an Icf or Icc value of 1 indicates that crashes are 1 standard deviation higher than expected. Results of the RoadHAT analysis are summarized below and in Tables 2–3 and 2–4 in Appendix K, pages 33-35.

The eastbound I-64 freeway segment between SR 62 and US 150 has an Icf value of 2.26 and an Icc value of 1.29, and the adjacent segment between US 150 and I-265 has an Icf value of 1.37 and an Icc value of 1.14. There is a clear pattern of rear-end crashes occurring in congested conditions during peak hours. During the AM peak, congestion and queuing are frequently observed on eastbound I-64 upstream of the I-265 interchange. Congestion and queuing extend west of US 150 towards SR 62. Per the Final Engineers Report, review of crash narratives for the segment of eastbound I-64 between SR 62 and I-265 indicated that over half of the crashes (85 of 151) specifically identified queuing or congested conditions as contributing factors to the crash (Appendix K, page 32).

The westbound I-64 freeway segment between I-265 and US 150 has an Icf value of 1.35, indicating a possible high crash frequency. The Icc value is 0.20, indicating the severity of crashes may not be substantially higher than average.

- 2. Deteriorated Pavement:** Pavement on I-64 within the project area is deteriorating and in poor condition. It is nearing the end of its lifecycle. I-64 was constructed in the 1960's with concrete pavement and overlaid with asphalt in 1991. I-265 was constructed in 1970 with concrete pavement. US 150 was constructed in 1967 with concrete pavement, and crack and sealed in 1995 before being overlaid with hot mix asphalt. Over the next decade, pavement of I-64, I-265, and US 150 within the project area will require maintenance. Syncing rehabilitation efforts, rather than addressing each individually, will simplify asset management and reduce interruptions to motorists.

### Purpose

The purpose of the project is to reduce traffic congestion such that peak hour operating conditions are a LOS D or better, where possible, and to improve the deteriorating condition of the pavement.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):

County: Floyd Municipality: New Albany

Limits of Proposed Work: Along I-64 from US 150 to just north of Cherry Street with additional pavement rehabilitation extending to Main Street; added lanes on I-265 from I-64 to north of State Street and improvements to the interchanges of I-64 at US 150 and I-265

Total Work Length: 5.98 Mile(s) Total Work Area: 357 Acre(s)

Is an Interstate Access Document (IAD)<sup>1</sup> required?

If yes, when did the FHWA provide a Determination of Engineering and Operational Acceptability?

Yes <sup>1</sup>	No
<b>X</b>	
Date: June 6, 2022	

<sup>1</sup>If an IAD is required; a copy of the approved CE/EA document must be submitted to the FHWA with a request for final approval of the IAD.

*Describe location of project including township, range, city, county, roads, etc. Existing conditions should include current conditions, current deficiencies, roadway description, surrounding features, etc. Preferred alternative should include the scope of work, anticipated impacts, and how the project will meet the Purpose and Need. Logical termini and independent utility also need discussed.*

#### **Location**

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and INDOT Seymour District are planning to proceed with an added travel lanes project extending northwest along I-64 for approximately 4.23 miles from the I-64 bridge over Main Street in New Albany to the US 150 interchange and along I-265 for approximately 1.75 miles north-northeast to approximately the Green Valley Road overpass (Appendix B, page 1). The project is within an urban portion of New Albany in Floyd County, Indiana. The project is located in Sections 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 in Township 2 South and Range 6 East, and Sections 2 and 3 in Township 3 South and Range 6 East, and Sections 2 and 3 in Township 3 South and Range 6 East in Georgetown, Lafayette, and New Albany Townships, as shown in the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5 Minute Georgetown and New Albany, Indiana Quadrangle Maps (Appendix B, pages 2-3). Land use adjacent to the project area is primarily forested, residential and commercial (Appendix B, pages 5-12).

#### **Existing Conditions**

I-64 and I-265 are classified as Interstates and are part of the National Highway System and National Truck Network. US 150 is an Urban Minor Arterial and is on the National Truck Network.

I-64 from US 150 to I-265 consists of five 12-foot through lanes (two eastbound and three westbound), an inside shoulder that varies from four to seven feet, and an outside shoulder that varies from 10 to 12 feet. The eastbound and westbound lanes of I-64 are separated by a median that varies from 38 to 80 feet. The median in this section includes both grass on the western and eastern ends, and rock outcrops with trees in the center. From one-half mile east of US 150 to approximately 1.7 miles east of US 150, rock faces as high as 140 feet are present along the outside shoulders of the roadway and as high as 40 feet within the median. The posted speed limit is 55 miles per hour (mph). Adjacent land use along this section of I-64 is primarily forested and residential.

I-64 from I-265 to Spring Street consists of six 12-foot through lanes (three eastbound and three westbound), and inside shoulder that varies from four to seven feet, and an outside shoulder that varies from 10 to 12 feet. From Spring Street to approximately 0.4 mile north of Cherry Street, a 14-foot paved median is present. From approximately 0.4 mile north of Cherry Street to the I-64/I-265 interchange, eastbound and westbound lanes separate and follow independent alignments, and a vegetated median that varies from 14 feet to greater than 300 feet is present. The posted speed limit is 55 mph. Adjacent land use along this section of I-64 is primarily residential.



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

I-265 from I-64 to Green Valley Road consists of four 12-foot wide through lanes (two in each direction), a 60-foot grass median, a 4-foot inside shoulder, and a 10-foot outside shoulder. The posted speed limit is 65 mph for I-265 EB and 55 mph for I-265 WB. Adjacent land use along I-265 consists of forested, residential, and commercial land.

US 150 from 500 feet south of Old Vincennes Road to I-64 varies from one through lane in each direction at the bridge over I-64 to two through lanes in each direction north of I-64. The through lanes are 12 feet wide, with 4-foot inside shoulders, 10-foot outside shoulders, and a 50-foot grass median. A left turn lane to Wesley Chapel Lane is located approximately 1,800 feet north of I-64. Adjacent land use along US 150 is primarily residential, a religious facility, and forested.

According to the Final Engineer's Report (October 22, 2021), the pavement along I-64, I-265, and US 150 is deteriorating and will require rehabilitation in the near future (Appendix K, page 15). I-64 was initially constructed with concrete pavement in the 1960's and it was overlaid with asphalt in 1991. The original I-265 concrete pavement was built in 1970. US 150 was built in 1967 with concrete pavement. The original pavement was crack and sealed in 1995 before being overlaid with asphalt.

Insufficient traffic capacity near the I-64/I-265 interchange causes recurring freeway congestion along I-64 between SR 62/64 and the Indiana/Kentucky state line and along I-265 between I-64 and Grant Line Road. Several segments of I-64 and I-265 currently perform at a LOS E or F during peak periods (Appendix K, 36-40). This indicates that traffic flow is unstable at best during peak hours, with areas of unacceptable congestion. During the a.m. peak there is a bottleneck on I-64 EB at the US 150 interchange due to heavy entrance ramp demand, limited mainline capacity (two lanes), a short entrance ramp merge distance, and horizontal and vertical curves. This bottleneck causes upstream LOS F conditions and observed speeds of less than 20 mph. I-64 EB between US 150 and I-265 experiences LOS E conditions in the a.m. peak, a condition that would worsen if the bottleneck at the US 150 entrance ramp were removed. Traffic on the single lane ramp from I-265 WB to I-64 EB also experiences LOS E conditions in the a.m. peak.

During the p.m. peak there is significant congestion and LOS F conditions on I-265 WB approaching the I-64 interchange. This is due to heavy entrance ramp demand from State Street and limited I-265 mainline capacity combined with the downstream weave to the system ramps. I-64 WB is congested with LOS E conditions from the Sherman Minton Bridge to Spring Street, and the I-64 WB to the I-265 EB ramp also operates at LOS E conditions.

### **Preferred Alternative**

The project includes the addition of travel lanes along I-64 and I-265, as well as pavement replacement and rehabilitation within the project limits. It also includes reconfiguring the I-64/I-265 interchange. See Appendix B, page 4 for an overview of the proposed lane changes and Appendix B, pages 24-253, for preliminary design plans.

The project is anticipated to include the following elements:

- Addition of a travel lane in each direction on I-64 from US 150 to 2,000 feet north of Cherry Street. In most areas, the additional lanes will be added within the median. Rock excavation will be necessary to construct the travel lanes in the median.
- Addition of an auxiliary lane on eastbound I-265 from I-64 to State Street and a travel lane on eastbound I-265 from I-64 to 4,000 feet east of State Street. The auxiliary lane will be added on the outside and the travel lane added within the median.
- Addition of one lane to all I-64/I-265 interchange ramps and one lane on the I-64 WB exit ramp to US 150.
- Replacement and/or rehabilitation of pavement on I-64, I-265, and US 150.
- Relocation of the eastbound I-64 eastbound to I-265 ramp within the I-64/I-265 interchange. This ramp will be shifted slightly to the southeast so the exit will be on the right side, instead of the left side in the current

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

configuration. The I-64 eastbound to I-265 ramp will remain generally on the existing location. The I-64 eastbound mainline will be shifted north within the median to separate the two traffic movements. Construction of a new bridge on eastbound I-64 is required to accommodate the ramp relocation. Please see Appendix B, page 8 for the new interchange configuration.

- Replacement, widening, and the completion of preventive maintenance on bridges throughout the project area.
- Replacement of culverts and storm sewers, and construction of 14 new detention basins outside of the I-64 and I-265 travel lanes, within interchange infields, and within the I-64 median. Please see Appendix B, pages 5-12 for the location of the detention basins.
- Installation of guardrail and concrete barrier wall, as needed, along I-64.
- Replacement and addition of signage, lighting, and pavement markings.
- Replacing and adding Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) conduits, relocating and replacing dynamic message signs, replacing traffic counting sensors, and upgrading traffic monitoring camera equipment.
- Above-ground and underground utility relocations.
- Acquisition of new permanent and temporary right-of-way (ROW).
- Construction of retaining walls at multiple locations to minimize ROW acquisition and to accommodate new traffic lanes added within the median along I-64 between US 150 and the Captain Frank Road overpass, east of the I-265/I-64 interchange ramps.
- Construction of three noise barriers (Noise Barrier (NB) 5, NB6, and NB7) along I-64 and I-265 in accordance with INDOT's Noise Policy. NB5 will be located east of I-64 approximately 75 feet north of Cottom Street and 600 feet south of Cherry Street. NB6 will be located east of I-265 from Maevi Drive to 400 feet south of the Green Valley Road overpass (excluding a gap between Wedgewood Drive and Redwood Drive due to conflicts with overhead transmission lines). NB7 will be located west of I-265 from approximately 235 feet south of Village Pine Drive to 630 feet north of Barrington Court.

All Des. Nos. included in the Improve 64 construction contract are summarized below in Table 2. A brief description of the scope of work has also been provided in the table. Several projects included in the Improve 64 construction contract will have their respective environmental impacts documented in separate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents. Each of the projects with separate environmental documents have independent utility and logical termini. These projects could be completed with or without the Improve 64 project. They are included in the same contract because the location and timing were consistent with the added travel lanes project. Constructing during the same time period will minimize impacts to highway users in the area.

**Table 2. Summary of Des. Nos. For or Near the Improve 64 Project.**

Included in the Improve 64 Construction Contract and Impacts Included in this CE	
Des. No.	Scope of Work
<b>Road</b>	
1900162 (Lead)	I-64 Added Travel Lanes
2100019	I-64 Lighting, US 150 to I-64/I-265
<b>Bridge</b>	
1800706/1800405	Bridge Painting on US 150 EB and WB over I-64 (Str. 1 & Str. 2)
1700207	Bridge Replacement on I-64 EB over Quarry Road (Str. 3)
2200015	Bridge Replacement on I-64 WB over Quarry Road (Str. 4)
1702617	Bridge Replacement on I-64 WB over I-64 EB to I-265 EB Ramp (Str. 5a)
2200016	New Construction on I-64 EB over I-64 EB Ramp to I-265 EB (Str. 5b)
1800721	Bridge Replacement on I-64 WB over I-265 Ramp to I-64 EB (Str. 6)
2200019	Bridge Replacement on I-265 WB to I-64 EB over I-64 EB to I265 EB (Str. 7)
2200017	Bridge Replacement on I-64 EB over Captain Frank Road (Str. 8)

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Included in the Improve 64 Construction Contract and Impacts Included in this CE	
Des. No.	Scope of Work
<b>Bridge (continued)</b>	
2200018	Superstructure Replacement on I-64 WB over Captain Frank Road (Str. 9)
1702614	Bridge Deck Overlay on I-64 EB & WB over Cherry Street (Str. 10)
2000326/2000323	Bridge Deck Replacement & Widening on I-265 EB over State Street (Str. 11)
2000324	Bridge Deck Overlay on I-265 WB over State Street (Str. 12)
2200719	I-64 EB & WB over SR 62/Spring Street (Str. 20)
2200718	I-64 WB Off-ramp to Spring Street over I-64 WB On-Ramp From Spring Street (Str. 21)
<b>Large Culverts</b>	
2300056	Str. No. 022-122.14WB - Valley View Creek Liner
2300057	Str. No. 022-122.60 - Valley View Creek Liner
2300058	Str. No. 022-121.71EB - Valley View Creek - Manhole Connection and Pipe Extension
2300059	Str. No. 022-121.95EB - Valley View Creek Liner
2300060	Str. No. 022-119.83 - UNT to Little Indian Creek Liner
2301566	Str. No. 022-121.07 - Hill Brook Liner
Included in the Improve 64 Construction Contract and Impacts Included in a Separate NEPA Document	
Des. No.	Scope of Work
<b>Road</b>	
1900366	US 150 and Old Vincennes Road (East)
<b>Bridge</b>	
1700205/1700206	I-64 EB and WB over SR 62/SR 64 (Str. 13 & Str. 14)
2000144/2000145	Bridge Deck Overlay on I-64 EB and WB over Yenowine Lane (Str. 15 & Str. 16)
2002072/2002073	US 150 EB and WB over Little Indian Creek (Str. 18 & Str. 19)

### Logical Termini/Independent Utility

The project is approximately 5.98 miles in length and extends along I-64 for approximately 4.23 miles from the I-64 bridge over Main Street in New Albany to the US 150 interchange and along I-265 for approximately 1.75 miles north-northeast to approximately the Green Valley Road overpass. The project termini are considered logical, as the added travel lanes are essentially from the I-64/US 150 interchange to the west, the I-64/I-265 interchange to the east, and the I-265/State Street interchange to the northeast. Each end point is a location of potential traffic change because there is an interchange. The additional lane from the I-265 WB to I-64 EB ramp tapers back to the existing condition on I-64 north of Cherry Street because similar traffic benefits were obtained without extending the lane to Spring Street. The pavement work on I-64 extends to Main Street to match up with recently improved pavement as part of the Sherman Minton bridge project and avoid a gap of unimproved pavement. One additional I-265 EB lane will continue through the I-265 State Street interchange and taper back to the existing condition once through the interchange.

The proposed improvements have independent utility and will be usable without additional transportation improvements beyond the project limits. They will also not preclude future improvements beyond the project limits.

### Maintenance of Traffic (MOT)

The MOT plan is to maintain the existing number of lanes of traffic in each direction on I-64 and I-265 to the maximum extent possible. Intermittent lane restrictions will be implemented on I-64 and I-265 during off peak hours. Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, State Street, Cherry Street and Spring Street will be closed or have flaggers for short durations during construction of the bridges above and construction of foundations adjacent to those roadways. Interchange ramps at the I-64/US 150, I-64/I-265, and I-64/State Street interchanges will require short-term off-peak closures. Additional longer-term closures of ramps at I-64/Spring Street interchange will be necessary. Longer term single lane closures on State Street will also be necessary during I-265 bridge construction over State Street. These longer-term closures will likely last four to six months (Appendix B, pages 69-72 and 254-257). Additional details are

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

discussed further in the MOT During Construction section of the CE document.

### **Fulfillment of Purpose and Need**

The preferred alternative meets the purpose and need of the project by adding travel lanes, replacing or rehabilitating pavement, reconfiguring the I-64/I-265 interchange, and replacing or rehabilitating pavement. These improvements are anticipated to reduce traffic congestion by improving the LOS to a D or better in almost all segments in the design year (2046) (Appendix K, pages 63-64). Reducing congestion will also improve safety by reducing crashes related to congestion.

In the a.m. peak, I-64 EB would have a LOS of E approaching the Sherman Minton bridge. This is due to the existing number of lanes on the bridge acting as a bottleneck. In the p.m. peak, I-265 WB will be improved by the project, although it will still have a LOS E/F north of State Street in the design year (2046) (Appendix K, pages 63-64). This is due to a lack of mainline capacity extending upstream to Grant Line Road outside of the project limits.

Replacing or rehabilitating the pavement will improve the condition such that it will not require replacement for 20 years.

### **OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:**

*Provide a header for each alternative. Describe all discarded alternatives, including the No Build Alternative. Explain why each discarded alternative was not selected. Make sure to state how each alternative meets or does not meet the Purpose and Need and why.*

#### **Alternative 1**

A Final Engineer's Report, dated October 22, 2021, was prepared for this project. It analyzed alternatives for the Improve 64 project (Appendix K, page 3). The elements of Alternative 1 are described below.

- Add one lane to the I-64 EB entrance ramp and the I-64 WB exit ramp in the I-64/US 150 interchange (differs from preferred alternative)
- Add one lane to I-64 EB and WB from US 150 to I-265 (same as preferred)
- Maintain the left side exit from I-64 EB to I-265, add one lane to all ramps within the I-64/I-265 interchange, and add one lane to I-64 EB and WB through the interchange (differs from preferred alternative)
- Add one lane to I-64 EB from I-265 to just past the Spring Street exit ramp (differs from preferred alternative)
- Add two lanes to I-265 EB and one lane to I-265 WB from I-64 to State Street (same as preferred alternative)
- Not add capacity to the I-265/State Street interchange (same as preferred)
- Add one lane to I-265 EB from State Street to just west of the Green Valley Road overpass (same as preferred)

This alternative would reduce congestion and address the issue of aging pavement. Alternative 1 would meet the purpose and need of the project; however, this alternative utilizes a lower design speed and requires more design exceptions than the preferred alternative. It also has a higher cost without resulting operations benefits over the preferred alternative. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

#### **No Build Alternative**

This alternative would allow the existing lane configuration to remain the same, with no improvements. No natural resources would be impacted by this alternative. If selected, this alternative would result in increasing congestion, as well as continued deterioration of the pavement, which could potentially become a hazard to the traveling public. This alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the project because it fails to address congestion or aging infrastructure. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

**The No Build Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable because** (Mark all that apply):

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

**ROADWAY CHARACTER:**

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

Name of Roadway I-64 Mainline from US 150 to I-265  
 Functional Classification: Interstate  
 Current ADT: 69,020 VPD (2019) Design Year ADT: 94,560 VPD (2046)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 8,910 Truck Percentage (%) 7  
 Designed Speed (mph): 70 Legal Speed (mph): 70

	Existing		Proposed
Number of Lanes:	2 @ 12-foot-EB / 3 @ 12-foot WB		3 @ 12-EB / 4 @ 12-foot WB
Type of Lanes:	5 through		7 through
Pavement Width:	Varies from 40 to 50 EB Varies from 52 to 62 WB	ft.	Varies from 52 to 62 EB Varies from 64 to 74 WB
Shoulder Width:	Varies from 6 to 12 inside EB/WB Varies from 10 to 14 outside EB/WB	ft.	Varies from 6 to 12 inside EB/WB Varies from 10 to 14 outside EB/WB
Median Width:	Varies 38 to 80	ft.	Varies from 0 to 56
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway I-64 Mainline from I-265 to Spring Street  
 Functional Classification: Interstate  
 Current ADT: 66,980 VPD (2019) Design Year ADT: 84,980 VPD (2046)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 8,190 Truck Percentage (%) 6  
 Designed Speed (mph): 70 Legal Speed (mph): 70

	Existing		Proposed
Number of Lanes:	3 @ 12-foot EB / 3 @ 12-foot WB		4 @ 12-foot EB / 4 @ 12-foot WB
Type of Lanes:	6 through		8 through
Pavement Width:	Varies 52 to 62 EB Varies 52 to 62 WB	ft.	Varies from 64 to 74 EB Varies from 64 to 74 WB
Shoulder Width:	Varies from 6 to 12 inside EB/WB Varies from 10 to 14 outside EB/WB	ft.	Varies from 6 to 12 inside EB/WB Varies from 10 to 14 outside EB/WB
Median Width:	Varies 0 to 260	ft.	Varies 0 to 240
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway I-265 from I-64 to State Street  
 Functional Classification: Interstate  
 Current ADT: 63,860 VPD (2019) Design Year ADT: 82,080 VPD (2046)

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Design Hour Volume (DHV): 7,180 Truck Percentage (%) 6  
 Designed Speed (mph): 65 EB / 55 WB Legal Speed (mph): 65 EB / 55 WB

Existing		Proposed	
Number of Lanes:	3 @ 12-foot EB / 3 @ 12-foot WB	4 @ 12-foot EB / 4 @ 12-foot WB	
Type of Lanes:	4 through, 1 WB accel, 1 EB exit		
Pavement Width:	Varies 50 to 54 EB Varies 50 to 54 WB	ft.	Varies from 68 to 72 EB Varies from 68 to 72 WB
Shoulder Width:	Varies 4 to 6 inside EB/WB Varies 10 to 12 outside EB/WB	ft.	Varies 10 to 12 inside EB/WB Varies 10 to 12 outside EB/WB
Median Width:	58	ft.	Varies 0 to 46
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

Name of Roadway US 150 from Old Vincennes Road to I-64  
 Functional Classification: Minor Arterial  
 Current ADT: 25,570 VPD (2019) Design Year ADT: 36,680 VPD (2046)  
 Design Hour Volume (DHV): 3,560 Truck Percentage (%) 3  
 Designed Speed (mph): 50 Legal Speed (mph): 50

Existing		Proposed	
Number of Lanes:	2 @ 12-foot EB / 2 @ 12-foot WB	2 @ 12-foot EB / 2 @ 12-foot WB	
Type of Lanes:	4 through		
Pavement Width:	38 EB Varies 34 to 38 WB	ft.	38 EB / 38 WB
Shoulder Width:	4 inside / 10 outside EB 0 to 4 inside / 10 outside WB	ft.	4 inside / 10 outside EB 4 inside / 10 outside WB
Median Width:	Varies – 38 to 50	ft.	Varies – 38 to 50
Sidewalk Width:	N/A	ft.	N/A

Setting:  Urban  Suburban  Rural  
 Topography:  Level  Rolling  Hilly

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

**BRIDGES AND/OR SMALL STRUCTURE(S):**

*If the proposed action includes multiple structures, complete and duplicate for each bridge and/or small structure. Include both existing and proposed bridge(s) and/or small structure(s) in this section.*

Structure/NBI Number(s): See Appendix L, pages 1-15 Sufficiency Rating: See Appendix L, pages 1-15  
 (Rating, Source of Information)

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

Remarks:

The project includes preventive maintenance on six bridges, rehabilitation of two bridges, replacement of six bridges, construction of one new bridge in the I-64/I-265 interchange, and rehabilitation/replacement of 15 culverts.

Refer to Appendix L, pages 1-15, for additional information on the structures and type of work.

**MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (MOT) DURING CONSTRUCTION:**

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

*Discuss closures, detours, and/or facilities (if any) that will be provided for maintenance of traffic. Any known impacts from these temporary measures should be quantified to the extent possible, particularly with respect to properties such as Section 4(f) resources and wetlands. Discuss any pedestrian/bicycle closures. Any local concerns about access and traffic flow should be detailed as well.*

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is under development for the Improve 64 project. The goals are to construct the project in a way that is safe during construction for contractors as well as the traveling public, to minimize the number of lane closures, and to minimize ramp closures and local road detours. Two TMP meetings have been held with project team members on August 24, 2022 and May 5, 2023 (Appendix C, pages 69-82). TMP committee members include INDOT, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), FHWA, fire departments, police departments, emergency management agencies, local agencies, schools, and hospitals. Their input has informed the development of the proposed MOT plan for the project.

The MOT plan is to maintain the existing number of lanes of traffic in each direction on I-64 and I-265 to the maximum extent possible (Appendix B, pages 69-72 and 254-257). Intermittent lane restrictions will be implemented on I-64 and I-265 during off peak hours. Construction will be completed in five phases. The phases are generally described below.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- Phase 1 includes tree clearing and vegetation removal. Shoulder strengthening construction will occur during overnight single lane closures. Temporary widening will occur along I-64, I-265 and the I-64/I-265 interchange ramps by shifting traffic to help facilitate MOT in future phases. The inside added travel lane and the inside bridge extension of I-265 EB over State Street will be constructed by shifting I-265 traffic and closing one lane in each direction on State Street. The outside of I-265 WB and the ramp to I-64 WB will be constructed by shifting traffic to the inside shoulder.
- Phase 2 includes construction of the inside retaining walls, added travel lanes, and bridges along I-64 by shifting traffic to the strengthened and widened outside shoulders. The inside of I-265 WB and outside of I-265 EB will be constructed in this phase.
- Phase 3 includes construction of the outside shoulder and bridges over Quarry Road along I-64 by shifting traffic to the inside. I-64 EB traffic will cross over to I-64 WB to construct the new I-64/I-265 interchange including the new bridge for I-64 EB over the ramp to I-265 EB.
- Phase 4 includes cross overs to construct work on the I-64 bridge over Cherry Street and the I-64 bridge over Spring Street concrete pavement repair (including the associated ramp closures). I-265 WB traffic will cross over to I-265 EB to construct the deck repairs and overlay on the I-265 WB bridge over State Street.
- Phase 5 includes pavement patching and mill and overlay along I-64 by shifting traffic when construction is being performed on the same direction.

Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, State Street, Cherry Street and Spring Street will be closed or have flaggers for short durations during construction of the bridges above and adjacent to those roadways.

Interchange ramps at the I-64/US 150, I-64/I-265, and I-64/State Street interchanges will require short-term off-peak closures. Additional longer-term closures of ramps at I-64/Spring Street interchange will be necessary. Longer term single lane closures on State Street will also be necessary during I-265 bridge construction over State Street. These longer-term closures will likely last four to six months. Proposed detours for the I-64/Spring Street ramp closures are listed below:

- I-64 EB to Spring Street Ramp Closure: This is a four-to-six-month closure, and it will not overlap with the off-peak closure of I-64 EB ramp to I-265 EB or the lane reduction on State Street. The detour would be I-64 EB to I-265 EB, to the I-265/State Street interchange, exit to State Street, and turn right on Spring Street. The detour is approximately 3.6 miles long (Appendix B, page 254).
- I-64 WB to Spring Street Ramp Closure: This is a four-to-six-month closure, and it will not overlap with the lane reduction on State Street. The detour would be I-64 WB to I-265 EB, to the I-265/State Street interchange, exit to State Street, enter to I-265 WB, and exit to I-64 EB. The detour is approximately 5.6 miles long (Appendix B, page 255).
- Spring Street to I-64 EB Ramp Closure: This is a four-to-six-month closure, and it will not overlap with the lane reduction on State Street. The detour would enter I-64 WB from Spring Street, exit to I-265 EB, to the I-265/State Street interchange, exit to State Street, enter to I-265 WB, and exit to I-64 EB. The detour is approximately 5.6 miles long (Appendix B, page 256).
- Spring Street to I-64 WB Ramp Closure: This is a four-to-six-month closure, and it will not overlap with the lane reduction on State Street. The detour would be from Spring Street, turn right onto Scribner Drive, turn right onto W. Elm Street, turn left onto State Street to the I-265/State Street interchange, enter I-265 WB to I-64 WB. The detour is approximately 3.8 miles long (Appendix B, page 257).

The following commitments will be made to minimize impacts to local motorists: 1) Adjacent local streets (such as Quarry Road and Captain Frank Road, and Captain Frank Road and Cherry Street) will not be closed at the same time, and 2) Roads to be used as detour routes or likely alternate routes during full closures (such as Spring Street and State Street) will not be closed at the same time. These are included as commitments in the *Environmental Commitments*



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

section this environmental document.

There are no sidewalks along Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, or State Street. There are existing sidewalks along the north side of Cherry Street and along the south side of Spring Street. To minimize impacts to non-motorized travelers using these sidewalks, there will be no detours of the Cherry Street or Spring Street. Flaggers will be used to hold non-motorized travelers along the sidewalks during overhead work for safety purposes. The closure duration will be coordinated with INDOT construction and developed to minimize delay to non-motorized travel. This is included as a commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section this environmental document.

The lane, local road, and ramp closures will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists (including school buses and emergency services); however, no significant delays are anticipated, and all inconveniences will cease upon project completion. Delays will occur during construction but will cease with project completion. Coordination regarding the MOT will continue with local stakeholders during the development of the TMP for the project.

### ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:

Engineering: \$ 14,696,200 (2023) Right-of-Way: \$ 250,000 (2024) Construction: \$ 238,200,000 (2025)\*  
 Anticipated Start Date of Construction: Fall 2024

\*Note, the project construction cost listed in the differs from the construction cost listed above. A modification to the KIPDA Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and INDOT State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is underway to update the construction cost to the current estimate.

### RIGHT OF WAY:

Land Use Impacts	Amount (acres)	
	Permanent	Temporary
Residential	0	0
Commercial	0	0
Agricultural	0	0
Forest	0.26	0.44
Wetlands	0	0
Other:	0	0
Other:	0	0
TOTAL	0.26	0.44

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

The existing ROW consists of paved surfaces, maintained side slopes and median, rocky slopes, roadside ditches, wooded areas, and wetlands. The existing ROW limits vary throughout the project area and are generally described below (Appendix B, pages 5-12).

- Along I-64, from the I-64/Spring Street interchange to the I-64/I-265 interchange, the existing ROW varies from approximately 100 feet to 310 feet east from the centerline of I-64, and from approximately 100 feet to 305 feet west from the centerline of I-64.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- Along I-64, west of the I-64/I-265 interchange, the existing ROW varies from approximately 125 feet to 350 feet north from the centerline of I-64, and from approximately 115 feet to 300 feet south from the centerline of I-64.
- Along I-265, east of the I-64/I-265 interchange, the existing ROW varies from approximately 120 feet to 270 feet west from the centerline of I-265, and from approximately 125 feet to 240 feet east from the centerline of I-265.
- Along US 150, northwest of the I-64/US 150 interchange, the existing ROW varies from approximately 120 feet to 275 feet northeast from the centerline of US 150, and from approximately 105 feet to 280 feet southwest from the centerline of US 150.

The project requires 0.26 acre of permanent ROW from a wooded area north of I-64, and west of the I-64/I-265 interchange at a culvert inlet (Appendix B, page 7). The permanent ROW is necessary to ensure adequate drainage is maintained at this location.

The project also requires a total of approximately 0.44 acre of temporary ROW from four wooded areas at culvert inlet and outlet locations for access for replacement/rehabilitation of existing culverts (Appendix B, pages 5, 7, 8 and 9).

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

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

#### **SECTION A - EARLY COORDINATION:**

*List the date(s) coordination was sent and all resource agencies that were contacted as a part of the development of this Environmental Study. Also, include the date of their response or indicate that no response was received.*

Early coordination letters were sent on June 28, 2021 (to resource agencies and local stakeholders), April 13, 2023 (only to New Beginnings Community Church), May 8, 2023 (IDNR State Herpetologist), and May 11, 2023 (to only the New Albany Stormwater Department) (Appendix C, pages 1-12).

Agency	Date Sent	Date Response Received	Appendix
New Albany Mayor	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Police Department	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Fire Department	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Street Department	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Flood Control Department	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Parks and Recreation	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Planning & Zoning (Floodplain Admin.)	June 28, 2021	July 12, 2021	Appendix C, pages 14-15
New Albany Utilities	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Township Trustee	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Stormwater	May 22, 2023	No Response Received	N/A
Floyd County Surveyor	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Floyd County Sheriff	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Floyd County Engineer	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Floyd County Plan Commission Director (Floodplain Admin.)	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Floyd County Stormwater	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Agency	Date Sent	Date Response Received	Appendix
Floyd County Commissioner	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany Floyd County Schools Superintendent	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Wesley Chapel United Methodist Church	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Cherry Street Church of Christ	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Cherry Valley Par-3 Golf Course, City of New Albany Parks & Recreation	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Pleasant Valley Golf Practice Facility	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Holy Family School	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Community Montessori School	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Green Valley Elementary School	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Scribner Middle School	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Children's Academy Early Learning Center New Albany	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Andres Center (NPDES Permit Holder)	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Fairfield Inn and Suites (NPDES Permit Holder)	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency (KIPDA)	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
INDOT Seymour District, Environmental Manager	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR)	June 28, 2021	July 28, 2021	Appendix C, pages 19-22
IDNR State Herpetologist	May 8, 2023	May 11, 2023	Appendix C, page 23
US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Louisville District	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	June 28, 2021	July 15, 2021	Appendix C, page 18
National Parks Service, Midwest Regional Office	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)	June 28, 2021	No Response Received	N/A
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	June 28, 2021	July 14, 2021	Appendix C, pages 16-17
Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), Groundwater Section	June 28, 2021	July 1, 2020	Appendix C, page 13
New Beginnings Community Church	April 13, 2023	No Response Received	N/A
New Albany, Stormwater Department	May 11, 2023	No Response Received	N/A
Indiana Geological and Water Survey (IGWS), via webform	April 29, 2023	April 29, 2023	Appendix C, pages 24-25

All applicable recommendations are included in the *Environmental Commitments* section this environmental document.

### SECTION B – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

	Presence	Impacts	
		Yes	No
<b>Streams, Rivers, Watercourses &amp; Other Jurisdictional Features</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	
Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers			
State Natural, Scenic or Recreational Rivers			
Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) listed			
Outstanding Rivers List for Indiana			
Navigable Waterways			

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Total stream(s) in project area: 28,501 Linear feet Total impacted stream(s): 5,972 Linear feet

Stream Name	Classification	Total Size in Project Area (linear feet)	Impacted linear feet	Comments (i.e. location, flow direction, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
Falling Run Creek	Perennial	624	N/A	Located north of I-64/Spring Street interchange. Flows southwest beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 14).
Unnamed Tributary (UNT) 1 to Falling Run Creek	Ephemeral	528	N/A	Located within the I-64/Spring Street interchange infield. Flows northwest beneath W. Elm Street. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 2 to Falling Run Creek	Ephemeral	862	N/A	Located north of the I-64/Spring Street interchange, east of I-64. Flows northwest, parallel to I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 3 to Falling Run Creek	Ephemeral	558	N/A	Located within the I-64/Spring Street interchange infield, and west of I-64. Flows northwest beneath the I-64 eastbound ramp to Spring Street. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 14).
Green Run Creek	Intermittent	584	N/A	Located northeast of the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-265. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 1 to Green Run Creek	Ephemeral	411	N/A	Located northeast of the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-265. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 2 to Green Run Creek	Ephemeral	470	N/A	Located northeast of the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-265. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 14).
Hill Brook Creek	Intermittent	1,652	1,065	Located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 14).
Holy Run Creek	Intermittent	800	N/A	Located northeast of the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows east beneath I-265. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 1 to Holy Run Creek	Ephemeral	282	N/A	Located within the I-265/State Street interchange infield. Flows northeast between I-265 WB ramp to State Street and I-265 WB. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 14).
Little Indian Creek	Perennial	316	N/A	Located north of the I-64/US 150 interchange.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Stream Name	Classification	Total Size in Project Area (linear feet)	Impacted linear feet	Comments (i.e. location, flow direction, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
				Flows west beneath US 150. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 1 to Little Indian Creek	Intermittent	475	333	Located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows north beneath I-64, just west of Quarry Road. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 6 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 2 to Little Indian Creek	Ephemeral	398	385	Located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows northwest beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 6 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 3 to Little Indian Creek	Ephemeral	585	574	Located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows north beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 4 to Little Indian Creek	Ephemeral	33	N/A	Located south of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows south. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 14).
UNT 5 to Little Indian Creek	Ephemeral	973	N/A	Located west of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows southwest, south of I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 6 to Little Indian Creek	Intermittent	644	N/A	Located west of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows northwest beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 7 to Little Indian Creek	Intermittent	739	N/A	Located north of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows southwest beneath US 150. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 15).
Logan Hollow Creek	Intermittent	329	30	Located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Flows southwest beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 6 and Appendix F, page 15).
Lost Knob Brook Run Creek	Intermittent	396	N/A	Located southwest of Green Valley Road overpass. Flows southeast beneath I-265. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 15).
Trinity Run Creek	Intermittent	966	N/A	Located southwest of the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-265. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 1 to Trinity Run Creek	Intermittent	544	N/A	Located within the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-265 eastbound ramps to and from State Street. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 2 to Trinity Run Creek	Ephemeral	284	N/A	Located within the I-265/State Street interchange. Flows southeast beneath I-265

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Stream Name	Classification	Total Size in Project Area (linear feet)	Impacted linear feet	Comments (i.e. location, flow direction, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
				WB ramps to and from State Street. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 3 to Trinity Run Creek	Ephemeral	836	N/A	Located within the I-265/State Street interchange infield. Flows southwest, west of I-265 WB. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 15).
Valley View Creek	Perennial	7,438	161	Located west of I-64 between the I-64/ Spring Street interchange and the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southeast, parallel to I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, pages 9-10 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 1 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	79	N/A	Located east of I-64 EB between the I-64/ Spring Street interchange and the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southwest into UNT 2 to Valley View Creek. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 9 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 2 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	1,632	400	Located east of I-64 EB between the I-64/ Spring Street interchange and the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southeast, parallel to I-64 before flowing south beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 9 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 3 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	480	461	Located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southwest beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 9 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 4 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	700	661	Located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southwest beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 5 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	342	342	Located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange within interstate median. Flows southeast into UNT 4 to Valley View Creek. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 15).
UNT 6 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	126	49	Located south of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows west into UNT 7 to Valley View Creek. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16).
UNT 7 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	1,471	91	Located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southeast beneath the interchange ramps. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16).
UNT 8 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	118	118	Located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southwest. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16).

## Indiana Department of Transportation

 County Floyd

 Route I-64 and I-265

 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Stream Name	Classification	Total Size in Project Area (linear feet)	Impacted linear feet	Comments (i.e. location, flow direction, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
				16).
UNT 9 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	249	60	Located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows southwest into UNT 7 to Valley View Creek. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16).
UNT 10 to Valley View Creek	Ephemeral	872	537	Located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Flows south beneath I-64. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 7 and Appendix F, page 16).
UNT 11 to Valley View Creek (Existing Mitigation Site)	Ephemeral	705	705	Located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange between within interstate median. Flows southeast into UNT 3 to Valley View Creek. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, pages 8-9 and Appendix F, page 16).

Describe all streams, rivers, watercourses and other jurisdictional features adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts (both permanent and temporary) will occur to the features identified. Include if the streams or rivers are listed on any federal or state lists for Indiana. Include if features are likely subject to federal or state jurisdiction. Discuss measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.

Based on a desktop review, aerial maps of the project area, and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 5 and 15) there are 82 streams, rivers, watercourses, or other jurisdictional features within the 0.5-mile search radius. There are 12 streams, rivers, watercourses, or other jurisdictional features within or adjacent to the project area. That number was updated to 36 based on site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB.

A *Waters of the U.S. Determination/Wetland Delineation Report* was approved by INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office on July 18, 2023. Please refer to Appendix F, pages 1-25 for the *Waters of the U.S. Determination/Wetland Delineation Report*. It was determined that there are 36 likely jurisdictional waters within the investigated area. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

There are no streams listed as a Federal Wild and Scenic River, a State Natural, Scenic, and Recreational River, or on the Indiana Register's listing of Outstanding Rivers and Streams, nor are there any navigable waterways or National Rivers Inventory waterways present in the project area.

Four 303d Listed Streams impaired with *Escherichia Coli* (*E. Coli*) were identified within the project area in the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 5 and 15). The features were identified as Green Run, Lost Knob Brook, and two UNTs to Falling Run. The 303d Listed Streams correspond with Green Run Creek, Lost Knob Brook Run Creek, Holy Run Creek, and Trinity Run Creek, identified in the *Waters of the U.S. Determination/Wetland Delineation Report*. Workers who are working in or near water with *E. Coli* should take care to wear appropriate person protective equipment, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure.

The following likely jurisdictional streams will not be temporarily or permanently impacted by the project:

- Falling Run Creek
- Unnamed Tributaries (UNTs) 1-3 to Falling Run Creek
- Green Run Creek
- UNTs 1-2 to Green Run Creek

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- Holy Run Creek
- UNT 1 to Holy Run Creek
- Little Indian Creek
- UNTs 4-7 to Little Indian Creek
- Lost Knob Brook Run Creek
- Trinity Run Creek
- UNTs 1-3 to Trinity Run Creek
- UNT 1 to Valley View Creek

Falling Run Creek, UNTs 1-3 to Falling Run Creek, Green Run Creek, UNTs 1-2 to Green Run Creek, Holy Run Creek, UNT 1 to Holy Run Creek, Little Indian Creek, UNTs 4-7 to Little Indian Creek, Lost Knob Brook Run Creek, Trinity Run Creek, and UNTs 1-3 to Trinity Run Creek, and UNT 1 to Valley View Creek will be labeled on the plans as “Do Not Disturb.” This is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this document.

Potential temporary and permanent impacts to likely jurisdictional streams are described below:

- Hill Brook Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 14): This resource is an intermittent stream of poor quality, exhibiting an ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of 8 feet wide by 0.3 feet deep. The stream is located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of cobble, concrete, riprap, and silt. Approximately 1,065 feet of permanent impacts are anticipated due to structure lining and the installation of riprap. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 1 to Little Indian Creek (Appendix B, page 6 and Appendix F, page 14): This resource is an intermittent stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 4.3 feet wide by 0.3 feet deep. The stream is located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange, just west of Quarry Road. Its substrate consists of cobble and gravel. Approximately 333 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to replacement of the existing structure. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 2 to Little Indian Creek (Appendix B, page 6 and Appendix F, page 14): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 1.5 feet wide by 0.2 feet deep. The stream is located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Its substrate consists of gravel, cobble, and concrete. Approximately 385 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to replacement of the existing structure, the installation of riprap, and stream relocation. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 3 to Little Indian Creek (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 14): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 8 feet wide by 0.2 feet deep. The stream is located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Its substrate consists of bedrock and silt. Approximately 574 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to structure lining and the installation of riprap. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- Logan Hollow Creek (Appendix B, page 6 and Appendix F, page 15): This resource is an intermittent stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 3 feet wide by 0.3 feet deep. The stream is located east of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Its substrate consists of riprap. Approximately 30 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to the installation of a pipe extension. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- Valley View Creek (Appendix B, pages 9-10 and Appendix F, page 15): This resource is a perennial stream of average quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 11.5 feet wide by 0.5 feet deep. The stream is located west of I-64 between the I-64/Spring Street interchange and the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of cobble and gravel. Approximately 161 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 2 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 9 and Appendix F, page 15): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 6.6 wide deep by 1 foot deep. The stream is located east of I-64 between the I-64/Spring Street interchange and the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of silt. Approximately 400 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to structure lining, the installation of riprap, and channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 3 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 9 and Appendix F, page 15): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 6.6 feet wide by 1 foot deep. The stream is located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of silt, hardpan, and gravel. Approximately 461 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to structure lining, structure replacement, the installation of riprap, and stream relocation. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 4 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 15): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 3.5 feet wide by 0.25 feet deep. The stream is located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of silt and gravel. Approximately 661 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to structure lining, the installation of a pipe extension, the installation of riprap, and channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 5 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 15): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 2.6 feet wide by 0.25 feet deep. The stream is located within the median, southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of concrete. Approximately 362 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to stream relocation. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 6 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 4.25 feet wide by 0.42 feet deep. The stream is located south of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of silt. Approximately 49 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to the installation of riprap and channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 7 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 4.8 feet wide by 0.4 feet deep. The stream is located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of cobble, gravel, and silt. Approximately 91 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to the installation of a pipe extension, the installation of riprap, stream relocation, and channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- UNT 8 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 1 foot wide by 0.2 feet deep. The stream is located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of riprap and silt. Approximately 120 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to structure lining, the installation of riprap, and channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 9 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 16): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 4.2 feet wide by 0.1 feet deep. The stream is located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of cobble. Approximately 60 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to partial replacement of the structure. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 10 to Valley View Creek (Appendix B, page 7 and Appendix F, page 16): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 6 feet wide by 0.2 feet deep. The stream is located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Its substrate consists of gravel. Approximately 537 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to structure lining, the installation of riprap, and channel grading. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.
- UNT 11 to Valley View Creek (Existing Mitigation Site) (Appendix B, pages 8-9 and Appendix F, page 16): This resource is an ephemeral stream of poor quality, exhibiting an OHWM of 2 feet wide by 0.42 feet deep. The stream is located southeast of the I-64/I-265 interchange in the I-64 median. Its substrate consists of gravel and silt. This is an INDOT stream mitigation site (USACE No. LRL-2009-228-22-JPS-A) located in the vegetated median between I-64 EB and WB, south of Captain Frank Road. The mitigation site was constructed to offset impacts from a previous transportation project along I-64. Approximately 705 feet of permanent impacts are expected due to relocation. Temporary impacts will occur due to construction access and/or the installation of cofferdams for dewatering activities.

A total of 5,972 linear feet of permanent stream impacts are expected. A USACE Section 404 permit and IDEM Section 401 Water Quality Certification will be required. Mitigation may be required and will be determined during permitting.

Efforts to avoid and minimize impacts to water resources have been considered throughout the design process. In general, water resources located within the median are considered poor quality, and they have previously been disturbed due to encapsulation, relocation, the installation of scour protection, or other previous construction activities. By adding travel lanes in the median rather than outside the existing roadway, the majority of the Improve 64 project can be completed within the existing ROW and impacts to higher quality water resources (specifically Valley View Creek) and terrestrial habitat surrounding I-64 have been minimized. Avoidance alternatives would likely result in impacts to higher quality water resources and the acquisition of additional ROW. Avoidance alternatives are therefore not practicable.

### **Early Coordination**

USFWS responded to an early coordination letter on July 14, 2021, indicating that stream impacts may require permits from the USACE, IDEM's Water Quality Certification program, and IDNR. USFWS also provided recommendations to restrict below low-water work, restrict channel work and vegetation clearing, minimize the amount of hard armor in bank stabilization, implement temporary erosion and sediment control measures, and avoid work within the inundated part of the stream channel during fish spawning season (Appendix C, pages 16-17).

IDNR DFW responded on July 28, 2021, with concerns regarding stream impacts based on structure types, stream substrate, of natural bed substrate, scour protection/bank stabilization, and work timing restrictions (Appendix C, pages 19-22).

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

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

Open Water Feature(s)	Presence	Impacts	
		Yes	No
Reservoirs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lakes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Farm Ponds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Retention/Detention Basin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Storm Water Management Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Describe all open water feature(s) identified adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts (both permanent and temporary) will occur to the features identified. Include if features are likely subject to federal or state jurisdiction. Discuss measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.*

Based on a desktop review, the aerial maps of the project area, and the water resource map in the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 5 and 15) there are 45 open water features within the 0.5 mile search radius. There are two open water features adjacent to the project area. No open water features are present within the project area; therefore, no impacts are expected. That number was updated to zero based on site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB.

**Early Coordination**

USFWS responded to an early coordination letter on July 14, 2021, with no recommendation specific to open water features (Appendix C, pages 16-17).

IDNR DFW responded on July 28, 2021, with no recommendations specific to open water features (Appendix C, pages 19-22).

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

Total wetland area: 0.831 Acre(s)      Total wetland area impacted: 0.555 Acre(s)

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

Wetland No.	Classification	Total Size (Acres)	Impacted Acres	Comments (i.e. location, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
Wetland 1	Emergent	0.033	N/A	Located within the I-64/Spring Street interchange, south of W. Elm Street. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 10).
Wetland 2	Forested	0.034	N/A	Located north of the I-64/Spring Street interchange, between I-64 EB and the I-64 EB ramp to Spring Street. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 10).
Wetland 3	Emergent	0.013	N/A	Located north of the I-64/Spring Street interchange, east of I-64 WB. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 10 and Appendix F, page 10).
Wetland 4	Forested/ Emergent	0.383	0.383	Located just south of the I-64/I-265 interchange, between I-64 eastbound and WB. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 10).
Wetland 5	Emergent	0.031	0.031	Located within the I-64/I-265 interchange. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 10).

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Wetland No.	Classification	Total Size (Acres)	Impacted Acres	Comments (i.e. location, likely Water of the US, appendix reference)
Wetland 6	Emergent	0.052	N/A	Located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange, south of I-64 eastbound. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, pages 7-8 and Appendix F, page 10).
Wetland 7	Emergent	0.102	0.102	Located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange, north of I-64 WB. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 7 and Appendix F, page 11).
Wetland 8	Emergent	0.056	N/A	Located southwest of the I-64/US 150 interchange. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 5 and Appendix F, page 11).
Wetland 9	Emergent	0.013	0.013	Located southwest of the I-265/State Street interchange, south of I-265 eastbound. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 11).
Wetland 10	Emergent	0.074	N/A	Located just south of the I-265/State Street interchange, southeast of I-265 eastbound. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 11).
Wetland 11	Emergent	0.026	0.026	Located northeast of the I-265/State Street interchange, west of I-265 WB. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 11).
Wetland 12	Emergent	0.014	N/A	Located just west of the Green Valley Road overpass, south of I-265 eastbound. Likely a Water of the US (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 11).

**Wetlands** (Mark all that apply)

Wetland Determination  
 Wetland Delineation  
 USACE Isolated Waters Determination

**Documentation**

X
X

**ESD Approval Dates**

July 18, 2023
July 18, 2023

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

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

X
X
X

Describe all wetlands identified adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts (both permanent and temporary) will occur to the features identified. Include if features are likely subject to federal or state jurisdiction. Discuss measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.

Based on a desktop review, aerial maps of the project area (Appendix B, pages 5-12), and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 5 and 15) there are 67 wetlands within the 0.5-mile search radius. There is one wetland within or adjacent to the project area. That number was updated to 12 based on the site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB

A *Waters of the U.S. Determination/Wetland Delineation Report* was approved by INDOT Ecology and Waterway Permitting Office on July 18, 2023. Please refer to Appendix F, pages 1-25 for the *Waters of the U.S. Determination/Wetland Delineation Report*. It was determined that there are 12 potentially jurisdictional wetlands within the investigated area. The USACE makes all final determinations regarding jurisdiction.

The following potentially jurisdictional wetlands will not be temporarily or permanent impacted by the project:

- Wetland 1
- Wetland 2

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- Wetland 3
- Wetland 6
- Wetland 8
- Wetland 10
- Wetland 12

Wetlands 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12 will be labeled on the plans as “Do Not Disturb.” This is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this document.

Potential temporary and permanent impacts to likely jurisdictional wetlands are described below:

- Wetland 4 (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 10): This resource is an emergent/forested wetland approximately 0.383 acre in size. This poor quality wetland is located just south of the I-64/I-265 interchange, within the I-64 median and within the construction limits. Approximately 0.383 acre of Wetland 4 will be impacted due to the installation of earthen fill necessary for roadway widening. All impacts to the wetland are considered permanent impacts; therefore, no temporary impacts will occur.
- Wetland 5 (Appendix B, page 8 and Appendix F, page 10): This resource is an emergent wetland approximately 0.031 acre in size. This poor quality wetland is located within the I-64/I-265 interchange, inside the construction limits. Approximately 0.031 acre of Wetland 5 will be impacted due to the installation of earthen fill necessary for roadway widening. All impacts to the wetland are considered permanent impacts; therefore, no temporary impacts will occur.
- Wetland 7 (Appendix B, page 7 and Appendix F, page 11): This resource is an emergent wetland approximately 0.102 acre in size. This average quality wetland is located west of the I-64/I-265 interchange, north of I-64, within the construction limits. Approximately 0.102 acre of Wetland 7 will be impacted due to slope grading required at the inlet of a drainage structure. All impacts to the wetland are considered permanent impacts; therefore, no temporary impacts will occur.
- Wetland 9 (Appendix B, page 11 and Appendix F, page 11): This resource is an emergent wetland approximately 0.013 acre in size. This poor quality wetland is located southwest of the I-265/State Street interchange, south of I-265, within the construction limits. Approximately 0.013 acre of Wetland 9 will be impacted due to the installation of earthen fill necessary for roadway widening. All impacts to the wetland are considered permanent impacts; therefore, no temporary impacts will occur.
- Wetland 11 (Appendix B, page 12 and Appendix F, page 11): This resource is an emergent wetland approximately 0.026 acre in size. This poor quality wetland is located northeast of the I-265/State Street interchange, west of I-265, within the construction limits. Approximately 0.026 acre of Wetland 11 will be impacted due to the installation of earthen fill necessary for roadway widening. All impacts to the wetland are considered permanent impacts; therefore, no temporary impacts will occur.

Approximately 0.555 acre of permeant wetland impacts are anticipated due to earthen fill placed due to roadway widening. No temporary wetland impacts are anticipated. A USACE Section 404 permit and IDEM Section 401 Water Quality Certification will be required. Mitigation may be required and will be determined during permitting.

Where possible, wetland avoidance measures were implemented during project design. By adding travel lanes in the median rather than outside the existing roadway, impacts to higher quality water resources (specifically Valley View Creek) and terrestrial habitat surrounding I-64 have been minimized. The presence of wetlands was taken into

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

consideration when selecting areas for stormwater retention or detention. However, based on the purpose and need of this project as well as the position of wetlands within the median of I-64 (specifically Wetlands 4 and 5), avoidance was not always possible. Avoidance alternatives would likely result in impacts to higher quality water resources and the acquisition of additional ROW. Avoidance alternatives are therefore not practicable.

There is no practicable alternative to the proposed new construction in wetlands and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use. FHWA approval of this document will constitute approval of the adverse impacts to wetlands.

**Early Coordination**

USFWS responded to an early coordination letter on July 14, 2021, indicating that wetland impacts may require permits from the USACE, IDEM’s Water Quality Certification Program, and IDNR. USFWS also indicated that wetland impacts should be avoided, and any unavoidable impacts should be compensated for in accordance with agency mitigation guidelines (Appendix C, pages 16-17).

IDNR DFW responded on July 28, 2021, with recommendations for mitigation for riparian and wetland habitat impacts (Appendix C, pages 19-22).

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

	<b><u>Presence</u></b>	<b><u>Impacts</u></b>	
		Yes	NO
<b>Terrestrial Habitat</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Total terrestrial habitat in project area: 138.1 Acre(s)      Total tree clearing: 54.1 Acre(s)

*Describe types of terrestrial habitat (i.e. forested, grassland, farmland, lawn, etc) adjacent or within the project area. Include whether or not impacts will occur to habitat identified. Include total terrestrial habitat impacted and total tree clearing that will occur. Discuss measure to avoid, minimize, and mitigate if impacts will occur.*

Based on a desktop review, site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB, the aerial maps of the project area (Appendix B, pages 5-12), the majority of the terrestrial habitat within the project area consists of forests as well as maintained transportation ROW. The project will require up to approximately 138.1 acres of habitat disturbance, including approximately 54.1 acres of tree clearing and disturbance to 84 acres of maintained interstate ROW.

Dominant vegetation within the maintained portion of the project area consists of typical roadside vegetation, comprised of false tall rye grass (*Schedonorus arundinaceus*), tall fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*) yellow foxtail (*Setaria pumila*), and white clover (*Trifolium repens*). Dominant tree species included silver maple (*Acer saccharinum*), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), black walnut (*Juglans nigra*), Eastern red cedar (*Juniperous virginiana*), sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), hackberry (*Celtis occidentalis*), cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), and red bud (*Cercis canadensis*).

Avoidance alternatives are not practical because the majority of the roadway widening will occur within vegetated medians and vegetated side slopes within the existing ROW. Mitigation for tree removal beyond 100 feet from the existing road will be required as part of Section 7 informal consultation for federally listed bat species. This mitigation will be for 4.3 acres of tree removal and will be completed via payment to the “Rangewide In-Lieu Fee Program, the Conservation Fund.” No other mitigation for terrestrial habitat is anticipated.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

### Early Coordination

USFWS responded to an early coordination letter on July 14, 2021, with standard recommendations related to restricting vegetation clearing (Appendix C, pages 16-17).

IDNR DFW responded on July 28, 2021, with recommendations to revegetate all bare and disturbed areas with a mixture of native vegetation, using appropriate designed measures for controlling erosion and sediment, and for mitigation to riparian and wetland habitat (Appendix C, pages 19-22).

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

### Protected Species

#### Federally Listed Bats

Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) determination key completed  
 Section 7 informal consultation completed (IPaC cannot be completed)  
 Section 7 formal consultation Biological Assessment (BA) required

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

Determination Received for Listed Bats from USFWS:      NE       NLAA       LAA

#### Other Species not included in IPaC

Additional federal species found in project area (based on IPaC species list)  
 State species (not bird) found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR)

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

#### Migratory Birds

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

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

*Discuss IDNR coordination and species identified. Describe USFWS Section 7 consultation and determination received for Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat impacts. Discuss if other federally listed species were identified. If so, include consultation that has occurred and the determination that was received. Discuss if migratory birds have been observed and any impacts.*

### State Listed Species

Based on a desktop review completed by HNTB on April 27, 2023, and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 1-16) completed by VS Engineering on January 26, 2022, the IDNR Floyd County Endangered, Threatened and Rare (ETR) Species List has been checked. According to the IDNR DFW early coordination response letter dated July 28, 2021 (Appendix C, pages 19-22), the Natural Heritage Program's Database has been checked, and "the State threatened Longbeak Arrowhead (*Sagittaria australis*) and the state endangered Kirtland's Snake (*Clonophis kirtlandii*) have been documented within ½ mile of the project area."

The Division of Nature Preserves does not anticipate any impacts to the Longbeak Arrowhead as a result of the project. IDNR did not foresee impacts to the Kirtland's snake as a result of this project as long as the project work occurs within the current ROW and does not extend further south than the existing ROW along the stretch of SR 64/SR 150 that approaches New Albany from the northwest.

The eastern box turtle (*Terrapene carolina*), a state special concern species, was observed within the project area during field investigations. Coordination occurred with the IDNR state herpetologist who recommended if turtles are found within the work zone during construction, they should be relocated to an area of natural habitat immediately outside of the work zone. If this becomes a recurring problem, an entrenched silt fence should be installed along the edge of the work zone in that area to serve as a barrier for keeping them out of the work zone (Appendix C, page 23). This is

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* this environmental document.

### **Federally Listed Species**

An INDOT 0.5-mile bat review occurred on May 24, 2021. A review of the USFWS database did not indicate the presence of endangered bat species in or within 0.5 mile of the project area.

Project information was submitted through the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) portal, and an official species list was generated (Appendix C, pages 47-63). The project is within range of the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) (NLEB), gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), and pink mucket (pearly mussel) (*Lampsilis abrupta*). In addition, on September 12, 2022, USFWS published a proposal in the Federal Register to list the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) (TCB) as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). USFWS has up to 12 months from the date the proposal was published to make a final determination to list the TCB under the ESA or withdraw the proposal. The project is within the range of the TCB.

### **Indiana Bat and NLEB**

The *Rangewide Programmatic Informal Consultation for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat (NLEB)* online Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) determination key cannot be used for the project because proposed tree removal exceeds 20 acres. However, coordination with the USFWS indicated the project could use the *Rangewide Programmatic Informal Consultation for the Indiana bat and NLEB* and use hard copy forms to complete the key. Completion of the forms resulted in a *May Effect – Likely to Adversely Affect* determination for the Indiana bat and NLEB. The completed forms were sent to INDOT for review on September 14, 2023. INDOT approved the forms on September 18, 2023 and they were sent USFWS on the same day (Appendix C, pages 26-34).

Bridge and culvert inspections occurred in 2021-2022 and identified bats at one bridge location (Appendix C, pages 42-46). On July 30, 2021 a bridge inspection occurred on Bridge I64-122-04988 C which found bats and signs of bats. Guano was collected on July 30, 2021 and sent to Northern Arizona University for analysis. Guano analysis results were received from Northern Arizona University on October 21, 2021 and resulted in the big brown bat (*Eptesicus fuscus*). Guano analysis only resulted in a non-federally and non-state listed bat species using Bridge I64-122-04988 C. The guano collection plan along with the guano analysis results have been reviewed by INDOT during the USFWS coordination. No additional bat investigations are required at this time.

To minimize bat disturbance, the rehabilitation of the structure shall be completed after September 30 and before April 1. If the structure rehabilitation cannot be completed before April 1, the crevices shall temporarily be filled, for the entire length of the structure, with an expandable material. The structure shall also be inspected for bats prior to demolition, exclusion, or any construction activities. If signs of bats are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. Coordination occurred on May 16, 2023 with the project designer about exclusionary measure needed for the project. Details of the required procedures are outlined in the "Bat Inspection and Coordination" Unique Special Provision (USP). This is included as a commitment for further consideration in the *Environmental Commitments* this environmental document.

Bridge and culvert inspections occurred in 2021-2022 and identified bats at one bridge location. No other structures showed evidence of bats (Appendix C, pages 42-46). USFWS Bridge/Structure Assessment are only valid for two years. If construction will begin after June 17, 2023, an inspection of the structures listed in Appendix C, pages 42-46 by a qualified individual, must be performed. Inspection of the structures should check for presence of bats/bat indicators and/or presence of birds. The results of the inspection must indicate no signs of bats or birds. If signs of bats or birds are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. This firm commitment is included in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

### Gray Bat and Pink Mucket

A standard coordination letter was prepared for the gray bat and pink mucket (pearly mussel), and submitted for INDOT review on August 11, 2023. INDOT reviewed the standard coordination letter and it was submitted to USFWS for review on October 2, 2023 (Appendix C, pages 35-63). In the letter, FHWA requested USFWS concurrence with the following project effect determinations:

*Gray Bat:* Approximately 54.1 acres of tree removal will occur, of which most (48.6 acres), is within 100 feet of an existing road. Approximately 15.5 acres (29%) of the total tree removal is considered low quality bat habitat because it is on rock outcrops or steep slopes (2:1 or greater). The impacts to gray bat foraging areas will be minimal and occur when the bat is not present. There are no maternity colonies or hibernacula within or near the project area. Stream and wetland impacts will be mitigated in accordance with USACE and IDEM guidelines. New lighting will be installed and will be designed to minimize light trespass beyond the roadway.

Based on the review of existing data, assessment of likely suitable summer habitat, tree clearing quantities, and avoidance and minimization measures, the FHWA has determined the proposed project has an effect finding of “Not Likely to Adversely Affect” for the federally endangered gray bat.

*Pink Mucket (Pearly Mussel):* According to the Recovery Plan for the Pink Mucket Pearly Mussel (USFWS, 1985), the species is found in medium to large rivers (20 meters (66 feet) wide or greater) and its historic range included the Ohio River. The project will not impact the Ohio River. Valley View Creek is largest stream to be impacted and its width is 11.5 feet. Erosion and sediment control measures will be implemented to protect streams from sedimentation. Because there will be no impacts to the Ohio River and the impacted streams are unlikely to be large enough for the pink mucket (pearly mussel), the FHWA has determined the proposed project will have “No Effect” on this species.

### TCB

In addition, on September 14, 2022, the USFWS published a proposal in the Federal Register to list the TCB as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). USFWS has up to 12 months from the date the proposal was published to make a final determination to list the TCB under the ESA or withdraw the proposal. The project is within the range of the TCB. It is anticipated the project will use the revised *Rangewide Programmatic Agreement* for the TCB once the listing becomes effective.

### USFWS Response

On October 2, 2023, USFWS issued a concurrence letter verifying the project could rely on the Programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) (dated March 23, 2023) and is likely to adversely affect the Indiana bat and NLEB. The letter also concurred with the not likely to adversely affect finding for the gray bat because impacts to foraging areas will be limited and occur when gray bats are not on the landscape. There are no gray bat records in the immediate vicinity of the project and bridge/culvert assessments did not find evidence of gray bat use (Appendix C, pages 64-68).

Regarding the TCB, USFWS stated in their letter, the bat faces extinction primarily due to the range-wide impacts of white-nose syndrome (WNS), a deadly fungal disease affecting cave-dwelling bats across North America. Because tricolored bat populations have been greatly reduced due to WNS, surviving bat populations are now more vulnerable to other stressors such as human disturbance and habitat loss. Species proposed for listing are not afforded protection under the ESA; however, as soon as a listing becomes effective (typically 30 days after publication of the final rule in the Federal Register), the prohibitions against jeopardizing its continued existence and “take” will apply. Therefore, if this project or other future or existing projects have the potential to adversely affect tricolored bats after the potential new listing goes into effect, we recommend that the effects of the project on tricolored bat and their habitat be analyzed

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

to determine whether authorization under ESA Section 7 is necessary. Projects or programs with an existing Section 7 biological opinion may require reinitiation of consultation (Appendix C, pages 64-68).

Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs) (General AMM 1; Lighting AMM 1; Lighting AMM2; Tree Removal AMMs 1,2, and 3) are included as firm commitments in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document. In addition, commitments regarding payment to the Rangewide In-Lieu Fee Program for mitigation, contractors handling dead or injured bats, and reinitiating consultation if more than 54.1 acres of trees will be cleared, more than 4.3 acres of suitable habitat is removed between 100-300 feet of or the road, or the project takes more than five Indiana bats and/or five NLEBs, are also included as firm commitments in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

This precludes the need for further consultation on this project as required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended. If new information on endangered species at the site becomes available, or if project plans are changed, USFWS will be contacted for consultation.

**Geological and Mineral Resources**

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

Yes	No
<b>X</b>	
	<b>X</b>
	<b>X</b>

Date Karst Evaluation reviewed by INDOT EWPO (if applicable): September 8, 2021

*Discuss if project is located in the Indiana Karst Region and if any karst features have been identified in the project area (from RFI). Discuss response received from IGWS coordination. Discuss if any mines, oil/gas, or exploration/abandoned wells were identified and if impacts will occur. Include discussion of karst study/report was completed and results. (Karst investigation must comply with the current Protection of Karst Features during Planning and Construction guidance and coordinated and reviewed by INDOT EWPO)*

Based on a desktop review and the Indiana Karst Region map, the project is located in the designated Indiana Karst Region as outlined in the most current *Protection of Karst Features during Project Development and Construction*. According to the topo maps of the project area (Appendix B, pages 2-3), and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 5 and 15), one sinking-stream basin is located within the project area. Coordination with INDOT determined an additional karst evaluation was required due to the size, scope, and location of the project.

Hydrogeology Inc. completed the karst evaluation on March 10 and April 2, 2021. Findings of the karst survey were summarized in the *Karst Feature Survey* report completed by Hydrogeology Inc. on August 20, 2021 (Appendix L, pages 16-25). The *Karst Feature Survey* report was approved by INDOT EWPO on September 8, 2021. The karst survey did not identify any karst features within the project area. Eight non-karst springs were identified during the karst survey. The *Karst Feature Survey* report recommended avoiding the eight non-karst springs. If avoidance is not possible, flow from the springs should be perpetuated with a spring box or other engineered method. This is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

Impacts to three non-karst springs are anticipated (SP-1, SP-6, and SP-8). The flow from the springs will be perpetuated with spring boxes or other engineered method.

In the early coordination response dated April 29, 2023, IGWS indicated potential karst features exist in the project area (Appendix C, pages 24-25). The IGWS response also indicated there is high liquefaction potential and this project area is located within a floodway. IGWS also indicated that there is high potential of bedrock resources and sand gravel resources, and there were no active or abandoned mineral resources extraction sites in the project area. The response from IGWS was communicated with the designer on May 19, 2023. No impacts are expected because these features are not present within the project area.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

If unknown karst features are discovered during construction, all work within 100 feet of the feature shall stop and the Engineer shall be notified immediately. Karst features include, but are not limited to voids, caves, sinking streams, and sinkholes. The Department will provide the treatment measures to be incorporated for the feature. The karst feature shall be protected from sedimentation runoff. Work shall not resume in the area until directed by the Engineer. This is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

**SECTION C – OTHER RESOURCES**

<b>Drinking Water Resources</b>	<b>Presence</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Wellhead Protection Area(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Source Water Protection Area(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water Well(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Urbanized Area Boundary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Public Water System(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is the project located in the St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer (SSA):		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
If Yes, is the FHWA/EPA SSA MOU Applicable?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, is a Groundwater Assessment Required?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Check the appropriate boxes and discuss each topic below. Provide details about impacts and summarize resource-specific coordination responses and any mitigation commitments. Reference responses in the Appendix.*

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

**Wellhead Protection Area and Source Water Area**  
 In an early coordination letter dated July 1, 2020, IDEM stated that the project is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area or Source Water Area (Appendix C, page 13). No impacts are expected.

**Water Wells**  
 The IDNR Water Well Record Database website (<https://www.in.gov/dnr/water/3595.htm>) was accessed on May 9, 2023, by HNTB. No wells are located near this project. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

**Urban Area Boundary**  
 Based on a desktop review of IDEM’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) website (<https://www.in.gov/idem/stormwater/municipal-separate-storm-sewer-systems-ms4/>) by HNTB on May 11, 2023, this project is located in an Urban Area Boundary (UAB). An early coordination letter was sent on June 28, 2021, to the Floyd County MS4 Coordinator (Appendix C, pages 1-4). The Floyd County MS4 Coordinator did not respond within the 30-day time frame. An early coordination letter was sent to the New Albany MS4 Coordinator on May 11, 2023 (Appendix C, pages 9-12). The New Albany MS4 Coordinator did not respond within the 30-day time frame.

**Public Water System**  
 Based on a desktop review, site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB, the aerial maps of the project area (Appendix B, pages 5-12), and ongoing utility coordination, a Floyd County Water Company watermain is located along Quarry

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Road and an Indiana American Water watermain is located along Captain Frank Road. No excavation is required along Quarry Road; therefore, no impact to the Floyd County Water Company watermain is expected. Subsurface utility location will be completed to confirm the vertical depth of the Indiana American Water watermain. Utility coordination is ongoing for the project.

**Floodplains**

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

Presence

Impacts

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

If applicable, indicate the Floodplain Level?

Level 1     Level 2     Level 3     Level 4     Level 5

*Use the IDNR Floodway Information Portal to help determine potential impacts. Include floodplain map in appendix. Discuss impacts according to the classification system. If encroachment on a flood plain will occur, coordinate with the Local Flood Plain Administrator during design to insure consistency with the local flood plain planning.*

Based on a desktop review of the IDNR Indiana Floodway Information Portal website (<http://dnrmmaps.dnr.in.gov/appsphp/fdms/>) by HNTB on May 11, 2023, and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 5 and 15), this project is located in a regulatory floodplain as determined from approved IDNR floodplain map (Appendix F, page 25). An early coordination letter was sent on June 28, 2021, to the local Floodplain Administrator. The Director of the New Albany Plan Commission, who is also the local Floodplain Administrator, responded on July 12, 2021, indicating the Valley View Creek and Falling Run Creek are located within the project area and the project should considered possible future flooding when addressing these resources (Appendix C, pages 14-15).

Floodplains are mapped for the following streams located within the project vicinity: Little Indian Creek, Falling Run Creek, Holy Run Creek, and Valley View Creek (Appendix F, page 25). Little Indian Creek is located outside of the Improve 64 construction limits; therefore, no floodplain impacts are expected. The Falling Run Creek floodplain is mapped north of the I-64/Spring Street interchange. No impacts will occur below the base floodplain elevation of Falling Run Creek. The Holy Run Creek floodplain is mapped crossing I-265, north of the I-265/State Street interchange. No impacts will occur below the base floodplain elevation of Holy Run Creek. The Valley View Creek floodplain is mapped parallel to I-64 EB, north of the I-64/Spring Street interchange. By widening I-64 to the median, impacts to Valley View Creek and encroachments within the floodplain have been minimized to the extent possible.

This project qualifies as a Category 4 per the current INDOT CE Manual, which states that projects in this category involve replacement of existing drainage structures on essentially the same alignment.

Category 4 – no homes are located within the base floodplain of Valley View Creek within 1,000 feet upstream and no homes are located within the base floodplain of Valley View Creek within 1,000 feet downstream. The proposed structure will have an effective capacity such that backwater surface elevations are not expected to substantially increase. As a result, there will be no substantial adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values; there will be no substantial change in flood risks; and there will be no substantial increase in potential for interruption or termination of emergency service or emergency evacuation routes; therefore, it has been determined that this encroachment is not substantial.

Impacts within the Valley View Creek floodway will require the completion of an IDNR Construction in a Floodway Permit.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

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

Total Points (from Section VII of CPA-106/AD-1006\*) \_\_\_\_\_  
*\*If 160 or greater, see CE Manual for guidance.*

*Discuss existing farmland resources in the project area, impacts that will occur to farmland, and mitigation and minimization measures considered.*

Based on a desktop review, site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB, the aerial maps of the project area (Appendix B, pages 5-12), there is no land that meets the definition of farmland under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) within or adjacent to the project area. The requirements of the FPPA do not apply to this project; therefore, no impacts are expected. An early coordination letter was sent on June 28, 2021, to Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). NRCS responded on July 15, 2021, indicating that this project will not cause a conversion of prime farmland (Appendix C, page 18).

### SECTION D – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Minor Projects PA  Category(ies) and Type(s) \_\_\_\_\_ INDOT Approval Date(s) \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

**Full 106 Effect Finding**  
 No Historic Properties Affected  No Adverse Effect  Adverse Effect

**Eligible and/or Listed Resources Present**  
 NRHP Building/Site/District(s)  Archaeology  NRHP Bridge(s)

Documentation Prepared (mark all that apply)	ESD Approval Date(s)	SHPO Approval Date(s)
APE, Eligibility and Effect Determination	April 26, 2023	May 19, 2023
800.11 Documentation	April 26, 2023	May 19, 2023
Historic Properties Report or Short Report	January 4, 2022 (HPR), May 5, 2022 (Addendum)	February 9, 2022 (HPR), June 8, 2022 (Addendum)
Archaeological Records Check and Assessment	January 10, 2022 (Report) Nov. 18, 2022 (Addendum)	February 9, 2022 (Report), Jan. 17, 2023 (Addendum)
Archaeological Phase Ia Survey Report	January 10, 2022 (Report) Nov. 18, 2022 (Addendum)	February 9, 2022 (Report), Jan. 17, 2023 (Addendum)
Archaeological Phase Ic Survey Report		
Other:		

Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)  MOA Signature Dates (List all signatories) \_\_\_\_\_

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

If the project falls under the MPPA, describe the category(ies) that the project falls under and any approval dates. If the project requires full Section 106, use the headings provided. The completion of the Section 106 process requires that a Legal Notice be published in local newspapers. Please indicate the publication date, name of the paper(s) and the comment period deadline. Include any further Section 106 work which must be completed at a later date, such as mitigation from a MOA or avoidance commitments.

INDOT, acting on behalf of FHWA, is required to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (Section 106), and its implementing federal regulation, 36 CFR 800. Section 106 and 36 CFR 800 outline a process that requires FHWA and INDOT to evaluate the effects of undertakings on properties that are listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

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

Given the nature of the proposed project, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) was determined to include the proposed project area and portions of adjacent properties based on viewsheds from the project area and parcel boundaries. Scattered tree lines and forested areas, sections of which will be cleared, along the I-64, US 150, and I-265 corridors, are present near the project area, allowing limited visibility from nearby properties into the project area. Consideration of a new viewshed based on this tree clearing was taken into account. The aforementioned tree lines, in addition to scattered trees on residential lots, provide a natural buffer zone for the surrounding parcels. The APE takes into account the potential direct and indirect effects of the proposed project within the immediate contextual setting, which is comprised primarily of undulating forested land mixed with flat, grassy residential and commercial lots (Appendix D, page 51).

### **Coordination with Consulting Parties**

There are six consulting parties for the Improve 64 project (Appendix D, pages 119-121). The Section 106 review periods for the project are listed below. Additional details, including a more detailed timeline of consultation and consulting party comments letters are included in Appendix D.

#### **Early Coordination/Invitation to Section 106 Consultation**

Early coordination letters and Section 106 consulting party invitations were sent to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and 15 potential consulting parties on May 27, 2021. INDOT provided the same notification to seven Tribes on the same day. The letter discussed the project location, purpose and need, preliminary project description, briefly explained the Section 106 consultation process; and included an invitation to become a consulting party (Appendix D, pages 123-138). Written comments were received from the SHPO on June 25, 2021 and City of New Albany on July 12, 2021 (Appendix D, pages 139-142). The SHPO recommended inviting owners of historic properties if ROW would be required. The owners of four properties were added to the list of invited consulting parties, although ROW would not be required from these properties. The City of New Albany indicated they would like to be a consulting party and listed their concerns about resources that were not previously surveyed including post-World War II residences and a housing project along Valley View Court that housed victims of the 1937 flood. Additionally, they mentioned the West Haven Cemetery, an African American public cemetery. Post World War II residences were surveyed within the APE and were evaluated in the Historic Property Report (HPR) individually and as historic districts. The West Haven Cemetery was also evaluated in the HPR. CRA recommended that these resources were ineligible for individual and district listing in the NRHP. The residences along Valley View Court are located outside of the APE and will not be affected by the proposed project. Other concerns were identified, such as flooding along Valley View Creek and Falling Run Creek and the request for a noise study along I-64 in New Albany.

#### **Historic Property Report (HPR)/Phase Ia Archaeology Report**

The HPR was approved by INDOT on January 4, 2022 and was sent to the SHPO and consulting parties on January 10, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 143-154). The Phase Ia Archaeology Report was sent to the SHPO on the same day. INDOT provided the same notification to the Tribes on the same day. Written comments were received from the SHPO, Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, and the Eastern Shawnee Tribe (Appendix D, pages 155-160).

The Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma responded on January 19, 2022, stating they have, "...no objection at this

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

time to the proposed project. If, however, at any time items are discovered which fall under the protection of NAGPRA, the Peoria Tribe requests immediate notification and consultation. In addition, state, local and tribal authorities should be advised as to the findings and construction halted until consultation with all concerned parties has occurred.”

The Eastern Shawnee Tribe responded on January 21, 2022. In the letter they stated, “...we find our people occupied these areas historically and/or prehistorically. However, the project proposes **NO Adverse Effect** or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. Please continue project as planned. However, should this project inadvertently discover an archeological site or object(s) we request that you immediately contact the Eastern Shawnee Tribe, as well as the appropriate state agencies (within 24 hours). We also ask that all ground disturbing activity stop until the Tribe and State agencies are consulted. Please note that any future changes to this project will require additional consultation.”

The SHPO responded to the HPR and Phase 1a Archaeology Report in a letter dated February 9, 2022. The SHPO agreed with CRA’s recommendation in the February 9, 2022, letter that the Frank and George Devol Double House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34246; “outstanding”), Horatio Devol House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34245; “outstanding”), James Carr House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34202; “outstanding”), and the Reyse (Roy[s]ce)-Friend House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34204; “outstanding”) were eligible for listing in the NRHP. The SHPO also stated their concerns and disagreements with portions of the HPR in relation to the eligibility of the West End Historic District (IHSSI No. 043-446-08001-182), the Finchland Subdivision, the Glenview Heights Subdivision, and individual resources associated with the Oakwood Hills Subdivision. The SHPO also stated that the *Residential Planning and Development in Indiana, 1940-1973 Multiple Property Documentation Form* (MPDF) be used to evaluate the Village Pines Subdivision, but were in agreement that the resource was not eligible for listing in the NRHP. In response to these comments, CRA completed an addendum report in April 2022, to provide additional information about the West End Historic District (IHSSI No. 043-446-08001-182), the Finchland Subdivision, the Glenview Heights Subdivision, and individual resources associated with the Oakwood Hills Subdivision and to further assess their eligibility.

### HPR Addendum

The HPR addendum report was approved by INDOT on May 5, 2022, and sent to consulting parties and the SHPO on May 9, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 161-178). For the purposes of the proposed project and based on SHPO’s comments, CRA recommended that INDOT 23, a Ranch house, (904 Braeview Drive) is eligible for listing in the NRHP. The HPR addendum report transmittal letter dated May 9, 2022, describes the additional research and coordination that occurred regarding the eligibility of the Finchland and Glenview Heights Subdivisions. The Finchland and Glenview Heights Subdivisions will be considered eligible for the NRHP for this project. After additional research was conducted, CRA continued to recommend that the West End Historic District (IHSSI No. 043-446-08001-182) and INDOT 22 remain ineligible for listing in the NRHP.

SHPO responded to the HPR addendum in a letter dated June 8, 2022. They agreed with almost all of CRA’s recommendations except they stated that a portion of the West End Historic District (IHSSI No. 043-446-08001-182) was eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C as a good example of vernacular housing in a historically working-class neighborhood in New Albany. They also recommended that in addition to Criterion A, the Finchland Historic District was also eligible under Criterion C (Appendix D, pages 179-180). In response to the SHPO’s recommendations, CRA recommended that the West End Historic District was eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C and the Finchland Subdivision was eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C in addition to Criterion A for the purposes of the project, as the SHPO suggested.

On August 10, 2022, the Floyd County Historian, David Barksdale, stated his interest in being a consulting party at a CAC meeting for the project. On August 18, 2022, Greg Sekula of Indiana Landmarks Southern Regional Office, stated his interest in being a consulting party via an email after attending a public meeting for the project (Appendix D, page 181). He also asked that himself and his colleague, Laura Renwick, be notified of any future meetings. The Floyd County Historian and Indiana Landmarks Southern Regional Office were added as consulting parties.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

The HPR Addendum was mistakenly not sent to tribal consulting parties when it was originally sent to the SHPO and consulting parties on May 5, 2022. The HPR Addendum was sent to tribal consulting parties on February 2, 2023 (Appendix D, page 197). The Eastern Shawnee Tribe responded in a letter dated March 13, 2023 indicating "...the project proposes **NO Adverse Effect** or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe" (Appendix D, page 198).

### Effects Report/Phase Ia Archaeology Report Addendum

An Effects Report was prepared for the project to determine its potential to adversely affect historic properties. According to the Effects Report, the project would have no adverse effect on the Finchland Subdivision, Glenview Heights Subdivision, INDOT 23, Frank and George Devol Double House, Horatio Devol House, James Carr House, Reyse (Roy[s]ce)-Friend House, or the West End Historic District. The overall historic integrity of the historic districts and individually eligible resources will remain. The Effects Report was sent to the SHPO and consulting parties on January 3, 2023. The Phase Ia Archaeology Report Addendum was sent to the SHPO and on the same day (Appendix D, pages 182-193). INDOT provided the same notification to the Tribes on the same day. Written comments were received from the SHPO and the Eastern Shawnee Tribe (Appendix D, pages 194-196).

The Eastern Shawnee Tribe responded to the Effects Report in a letter dated January 24, 2023. They stated, "...the project proposes **NO Adverse Effect** or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe."

The SHPO responded to the Effects Report and the addendum Phase Ia archaeology report in a letter dated January 17, 2023. The SHPO agreed with the recommendations of both reports. Additionally, they stated that they appreciated the discussions of effects to each historic property. The letter concluded with SHPO asking INDOT for a finding.

### Archaeology

A Phase Ia archaeological reconnaissance survey was conducted for the majority of the Improve 64 project area in September and October 2021. The Phase Ia Archaeological Records Check and Reconnaissance Survey Report was completed by a Qualified Professional (QP) at CRA on January 5, 2022 (Travis and Harth, January 5, 2022) (Appendix D, pages 207-209). The Phase Ia archaeology survey identified three sites within the project area. As a result of these efforts, two sites (12FL223 and 12FL224) were recommended not eligible for listing in the NRHP and no further work is recommended. However, the NRHP eligibility of Site 12FL222 could not be assessed with the data derived from the Phase Ia survey, and the site may contain intact deposits that could provide important information about the history of New Albany. Therefore, project avoidance or further work to assess its integrity and NRHP eligibility is recommended for Site 12FL222. INDOT approved the Phase Ia report on January 10, 2022 and it was sent to the SHPO on that day (Appendix D, pages 143-154). The SHPO concurred with the findings of the report in a letter dated February 9, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 158-160).

Site 12FL222 will be avoided by all project activities. Site 12FL222 will be marked on the plans as "Environmental Sensitive Area – DO NOT DISTURB" and will be marked similarly on the ground during construction. These are included as firm commitments in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

An Addendum Phase Ia Archaeological Records Check and Reconnaissance Survey Report was completed by a QP at CRA on August 29, 2022 (Travis, October 21, 2022), due to small additions to the Improve 64 project area (Appendix D, pages 213-215). No additional sites were identified from the investigation. INDOT approved the Phase Ia addendum report on November 18, 2022 and it was sent to the SHPO and the Tribes on January 3, 2023 (Appendix D, pages 182-193). In a letter dated January 17, 2023, the SHPO agreed with the recommendations of the addendum report (Appendix D, pages 194-195).

In SHPO's concurrence letter with the No Adverse Effect finding dated May 19, 2023, regarding avoidance of Site 12FL222, state archaeological resources may exist underneath modern development and recommend during construction, work crews should be alert to the possible presence of archaeological artifacts (e.g., ceramics, glass, bone,



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

stone, tools, etc.) and features (e.g., foundations cisterns, privies, etc.) that may be encountered during construction. This is included as firm commitments in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

### **Historic Properties**

There are eight historic resources eligible for the NRHP in the APE. Of these, three are historic districts and five are individual properties. There are no resources listed in the NRHP in the APE.

An HPR was completed by a QP at CRA (Reynolds, December 22, 2021) and approved by INDOT on January 4, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 210-212). It was sent to the SHPO and consulting parties on January 10, 2022 (Appendix D, 143-154). The SHPO concurred with some of the findings of the report but questioned others in a letter dated February 9, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 158-160). See discussion above under *Historic Property Report (HPR)/Phase Ia Archaeology Report.*

In response to SHPO's comments on the HPR, an HPR Addendum was completed by a QP at CRA (Reynolds, April 14, 2022) and approved by INDOT on May 5, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 216-218). It was sent to the SHPO and consulting parties on May 9, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 161-178). The SHPO concurred with most of the findings of the report in a letter dated June 8, 2022 (Appendix D, pages 179-180). See discussion above under *HPR Addendum.*

Historic resources with the APE are listed below:

**Finchland Subdivision (INDOT 54 – 79 and 131)** – The Finchland Subdivision features Ranch homes on 137 lots from the late 1950s and early 1960s. These homes exhibit the typical rectilinear, massed, Ranch house form with either a gable or hip roof. The dwellings are clad in a multitude of materials, including brick veneer and vinyl siding. It appears that there were seven phases of the subdivision's development from 1952 to 1961, a commonality among Custom Developments. The subdivision is situated in a dense residential area just east of I-265 that began developing during the early 1950s. Historically, the area was rural farmland with forested areas. The Finchland Subdivision is recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criteria A and C using the *Residential Planning and Development in Indiana, 1940 – 1973 Multiple Property Documentation Form* (MPDF) as a good example of a planned, post-World War II subdivision in New Albany. The Finchland Subdivision is bounded by Glen Valley Road to the east, the rear parcel boundaries along Maevi Drive, West Daisy Lane to the south, and the rear parcel boundaries of residences located along Rossmore Drive, Finchleigh Drive, and Greenbriar Drive. CRA recommends that the NRHP boundary for this subdivision follow the same parameters.

**Glenview Heights Subdivision (INDOT 40 – 53)** – The Glenview Heights Subdivision features Ranch homes on 73 lots from the early 1970s. These homes exhibit the typical rectilinear, massed, Ranch house form with either a gable or hip roof. The dwellings are clad in a multitude of materials, including brick veneer and vinyl siding. The subdivision is an example of a Custom Development. It appears that there were two phases of the subdivision's development from 1971 to 1972. The subdivision is situated in a dense residential area just east of I-265 that began developing during the early late 1960s and early 1970s. Historically, the area was rural farmland with forested areas. The Glenview Heights Subdivision is recommended as eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A using the MPDF as a good example of a Post-World War II subdivision in New Albany. The Glenview Heights Subdivision is bounded to the north by Glenview Heights, to the east by Glen Valley Road, the rear parcel boundaries along Redwood Drive, and to the west by the I-265 corridor. CRA recommends that the NRHP boundary for this subdivision follow the same parameters.

**INDOT 23** – INDOT 23 is a Contemporary Ranch house that was constructed circa 1965. The residence is situated in a forested, residential area (Oakwood Hills Subdivision) south of I-64 that was developed during the early 1960s. Historically, the area was a dense, forested area. The one-story, frame, five-bay, Contemporary Ranch house is clad with board and batten and brick veneer. The facade features a small, central projecting gable that contains single-light, ceiling-height, wood sash, stationary windows and clerestory windows, alluding to the residence's Contemporary

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

architectural style. On the west and east elevations of this projection are single-light, ceiling-height, wood sash, stationary windows. Visible beneath the project gable are wood brackets, a classic feature of Contemporary architecture. The Ranch house is an excellent and likely unique example of a Contemporary Ranch house in Floyd County. Therefore, the Ranch house is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C using the MPDF. The resource's period of significance is circa 1965. CRA recommends that the NRHP boundary for INDOT 23 follow the parcel boundary.

**Frank & George Devol Double House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34246)** – The Italianate residence was constructed circa 1860. The dwelling is located in a residential area near downtown New Albany. The home was located around Schribner Park, which was demolished during the early 1960s due to the construction of I-64. The house received an IHSSI-rating of “outstanding” in the *1994 Floyd County Interim Report*. The potential period of significance, based on the residence's construction date, is circa 1860. The residence is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C as an excellent example of an Italianate dwelling in New Albany. The recommended NRHP boundary follows the legal parcel boundary for the resource.

**Horatio Devol House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34245)** – The vernacular residence was constructed between circa 1850 and 1860 and features Greek Revival influences. The dwelling is located in a residential area near downtown New Albany. The home was located around Schribner Park, which was demolished during the early 1960s due to the construction of I-64. The house received an IHSSI-rating of “outstanding” in the *1994 Floyd County Interim Report*. The potential period of significance, based on the residence's construction date, is between circa 1850 and 1860. The residence is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C as an excellent example of a vernacular dwelling with Greek Revival influences in New Albany. The recommended NRHP boundary follows the legal parcel boundary for the resource.

**James Carr House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34202)** – The James Carr House was originally a single-family residence constructed in circa 1853. The Federal style residence currently (2022) functions as a business. The residence is located on the outskirts of a residential and commercial area on the east side of I-64 in downtown New Albany. Historically, the area where the residence is located was a dense residential area of New Albany. However, many of the residences were razed as a result of the construction of I-64. The residence is an excellent example of a single-family, Federal residence with a symmetrical design established by window and door placement. The multi-light windows are typical of the Federal style, along with stone or cement lintels. Other features characteristic of the Federal architectural style include the brick cladding and decorative cornice. These original elements and their materials result in the structures as having a high degree of material integrity. The house received an IHSSI-rating of “outstanding” in the *1994 Floyd County Interim Report*. The potential period of significance, based on the residence's construction date, is circa 1853. The dwelling is an excellent example of the Federal architectural style in New Albany, comprised of original materials with minimal alterations. Therefore, the residence is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C. The recommended NRHP boundary follows the legal parcel boundary for the resource.

**Reyse (Roy[s]ce)-Friend House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34204)** – The dwelling was originally a single-family residence constructed circa 1855. The vernacular style dwelling with Greek Revival and Gothic influences currently (2022) operates as a business. The former residence is located on the outskirts of a residential and commercial area on the east side of I-64 in downtown New Albany. Historically, the area where the former residence is located was a dense residential area of New Albany. However, many of the residences were razed as a result of the construction of I-64. The business is an example of a single-family, vernacular residence with Gothic Revival and Greek Revival characteristics. Vernacular residences were common during the mid-nineteenth century in Indiana, when architectural styles were modest and largely determined by available materials and local building traditions. The potential period of significance, based on the residence's construction date, is circa 1855. The Reyse (Roy[s]ce)-Friend House is an excellent example of the transition from vernacular style frame houses focusing on function to larger, brick dwellings focusing more on aesthetics. The former residence attests to this through the use of late nineteenth-century additions and the introduction

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

of Greek Revival and Gothic Revival ornamentation, the latter of which was likely added during the late nineteenth century. The Greek Revival architectural characteristics are visible through the use of the ornately adorned door surrounds, complete with a central keystone decoration, the stone lintel and sills, the symmetrical facade, and the cornice lines emphasized by the wide eave returns. The bay window addition is typical of the Gothic Revival style. The porches meld the two styles together with the decorative woodwork with dentil and keystone/chevron imagery, along with ornately adorned capitals and incised, circular motifs. CRA recommends the Reyse (Roy[s]ce)-Friend House as individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C as a significant example of an intact, mid-nineteenth-century, vernacular resource in New Albany with an ability to convey the embodiment of vernacular architecture at the time through the combining of the Greek Revival and Gothic Revival architectural styles. The recommended NRHP boundary follows the legal parcel boundary for the resource.

**West End Historic District (IHSSI No. 043-446-08001-182)** – The West End Historic District is a previously recorded historic district that was surveyed as part of the *1994 Floyd County Interim Report*. The historic district retains a collection of working-class vernacular housing primarily constructed between circa 1830 and circa 1940. The housing stock includes a variety of housing forms and architectural styles including the following: 1) Shotgun cottages; 2) I-houses; 3) Pyramidal-roof cottages; 4) Gabled-ell houses; 5) Bungalows; and 6) American Foursquares. These houses were likely dwellings belonging to families that earned their living from river trades along the Ohio River in New Albany, such as dock work, warehousing, ship construction or maintenance. There is a total of 149 resources within the district. There are 40 “noncontributing” resources, 101 “contributing” resources, six (6) “notable” resources, one (1) “outstanding” resource, and one (1) resource that is listed in the NRHP, in addition to 34 demolished resources. Although material changes have occurred, the district maintains its overall architectural integrity. CRA recommends the West End Historic District as eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C, for the purposes of this project, as it represents a good collection of vernacular housing associated with a working-class neighborhood in New Albany. CRA recommends that the NRHP boundary of the West End Historic District is roughly bounded by West Elm Street to the north, West 6<sup>th</sup> Street and West 5<sup>th</sup> Street to the east, West Main Street to the south, and the legal parcel boundaries along a portion of West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, West 9<sup>th</sup> Street, and West 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

### Documentation Findings

The project will have No Adverse Effect on the historic properties. The Section 106 No Adverse Effect finding was signed by INDOT for FHWA, on April 26, 2023 (Appendix D, page 20). The 800.11(e) document and finding were sent to the SHPO and consulting parties on April 27, 2023 (Appendix D, page 6 and pages 10-225). They were sent to the Tribes on the same day. The SHPO concurred with the Section 106 No Adverse Effect finding in a letter dated May 19, 2023 (Appendix D, pages 1-2).

The Eastern Shawnee Tribe responded on June 15, 2023. In the letter they stated, “...the project proposes **NO Adverse Effect** or endangerment to known sites of interest to the Eastern Shawnee Tribe. Please continue project as planned. However, should this project inadvertently discover an archeological site or object(s) we request that you immediately contact the Eastern Shawnee Tribe, as well as the appropriate state agencies (within 24 hours). We also ask that all ground disturbing activity stop until the Tribe and State agencies are consulted. Please note that any future changes to this project will require additional consultation.” (Appendix D, page 3).

While vibration impacts are not anticipated for this project, as a precaution, the contractor will be required to prepare a *Construction Vibration Monitoring and Control Plan* for the project (Appendix D, pages 219-225). This is included as firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

### Public Involvement

To meet the public involvement requirements of Section 106, a legal notice of INDOT’s finding of No Adverse Effect was published in the *News and Tribune* on April 29, 2023 offering the public an opportunity to submit comment



**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Cherry Street (Appendix B, page 10). The parks are owned by the City of New Albany Parks and Recreation.

- Cherry Valley Par-3 Golf Course (Fuzzy Zoeller’s Par 3) is located adjacent to the west of I-64, just north of Cherry Street (Appendix B, page 9). The golf course is owned by the City of New Albany Parks and Recreation.
- Pleasant Valley Golf Practice Facility is mapped adjacent to the east of US 150, on the north side of Old Vincennes Road; however, this facility does not appear to be at that location and the phone number is not connected.

The project will not use any of these resources by taking permanent ROW and will not indirectly use the resources in such a way that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Access will be maintained to the properties and no MOT impacts are anticipated. Therefore, no 4(f) use is expected.

**Historic Properties**

There are eight historic resources recommended eligible for the NRHP in the APE (Appendix D, pages 15-18, and Appendix B, pages 5-12). Of these, three are historic districts and five are individual properties. There are no resources listed in the NRHP in the APE.

There are eight historic Section 4(f) resources located adjacent to the project area:

- Finchland Subdivision (INDOT 54 – 79 and 131)
- Glenview Heights Subdivision (INDOT 40 – 53)
- INDOT 23
- Frank & George Devol Double House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34246)
- Horatio Devol House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34245)
- James Carr House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34202)
- Reyse (Roy[s]ce)-Friend House (IHSSI No. 043-446-34204)
- West End Historic District (IHSSI No. 043-446-08001-182)

Through coordination with SHPO, it was determined that the project will have No Adverse Effect on these resources. No ROW will be acquired from any historic Section 4(f) resources, and access to all historic properties will be maintained throughout construction. As part of the Section 106 evaluation, FHWA has determined that this undertaking will not convert property from any Section 4(f) historic properties to transportation use.

The project will not use any of these resources by taking permanent ROW and will not indirectly use the resources in such a way that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired. Therefore, no 4(f) use is expected.

**Section 6(f) Involvement**

**Presence**

**Use**

**Section 6(f) Property**

**Yes**

**No**

*Discuss Section 6(f) resources present or not present. Discuss if any conversion would occur as a result of this project. If conversion will occur, discuss the conversion approval.*

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

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

A review of 6(f) properties on the INDOT ESD website revealed a total of three properties in Floyd County (Appendix L, page 26). None of these properties are located within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, there will be no impacts to 6(f) resources.

**SECTION F – Air Quality**

**STIP/TIP and Conformity Status of the Project**

- Is the project in the most current STIP/TIP?
- Is the project located in an MPO Area?
- Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area?
- If Yes, then:
  - Is the project in the most current MPO TIP?
  - Is the project exempt from conformity?
- If No, then:
  - Is the project in the Transportation Plan (TP)?
  - Is a hot spot analysis required (CO/PM)?

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

Location in STIP: Amendment 2 (Appendix H, pages 1-6)  
 Name of MPO (if applicable): Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency  
 Location in TIP (if applicable): Amendment 3, Page 15 (Appendix H, page 7)

Level of MSAT Analysis required?

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

*Describe if the project is listed in the STIP and if it is in a TIP. Describe the attainment status of the county(ies) where the project is located. Indicate whether the project is exempt from a conformity determination. If the project is not exempt, include information about the TP and TIP. Describe if a hot spot analysis is required and the MSAT Level.*

**STIP/TIP**

This project is included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-2026 Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency (KIPDA) Transportation Improvement Program (MPO TIP) (Appendix H, page 7) and the INDOT FY 2024-2028 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (Appendix H, pages 1-6). A modification to the TIP and STIP is underway to update the construction cost to the current estimate.

**Attainment Status**

This project is in Floyd County, which is currently in attainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and Carbon Monoxide (CO), and a maintenance area for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), according to the USEPA Greenbook (<https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html#IN>).

Ozone: Floyd County is currently a maintenance area for Ozone, under the 1997 8-hour Ozone standard, which was revoked in 2015 but is being evaluated for conformity due to the February 16, 2018, South Coast Air Quality Management District V. Environmental Protection Agency, Et. Al. Decision. The project’s design concept and scope are slightly different from what is reflected in both the KIPDA Transportation Plan (TP) (Appendix H, page 7) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and both conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Therefore, the conformity requirements of 40 CFR 93 have been met.

PM<sub>2.5</sub>: Floyd County is currently in attainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Under 40 CFR 93.123, this is not a project of air quality concern. Therefore, a hot spot analysis for PM<sub>2.5</sub> is not required.

CO: Floyd County is currently in attainment for CO. Therefore, a hot spot analysis for CO is not required.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

### **Mobile Source Air Toxics**

The purpose of this project is to reduce congestion by constructing additional travel lanes and reconfiguring the I-64/I-265 interchange. This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special mobile source air toxic (MSAT) concerns. As such, this project will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause a meaningful increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the no-build alternative.

Moreover, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations for vehicle engines and fuels will cause overall MSAT emissions to decline significantly over the next several decades. Based on regulations now in effect, an analysis of national trends with EPA's MOVES3 model forecasts a combined reduction of over 76 percent in the total annual emissions rate for the priority MSAT from 2020 to 2060 while vehicle-miles of travel are projected to increase by 31 percent (Updated Interim Guidance on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents, Federal Highway Administration, January 18, 2023). This will both reduce the background level of MSAT as well as the possibility of even minor MSAT emissions from this project.

### **Greenhouse Gas Analysis**

On January 9, 2023, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) issued the *National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change*. This is interim guidance to assist agencies in analyzing greenhouse gas (GHG), the climate change effects of their proposed actions, and the potential impacts of climate change on the proposed action under NEPA. CEQ issued the guidance as interim guidance, is seeking public comment on the guidance, and intends to either revise it in response to public comments or finalize it. CEQ's intent with the interim guidance is to provide greater clarity and more consistency in how agencies address climate change in NEPA reviews. CEQ intended the interim guidance to be immediately implemented upon its release.

Following CEQ guidance, a greenhouse gas analysis was completed for the Improve 64 project and compares the global warming potential (GWP) and the social cost of GHG emissions between project alternatives across the lifespan of the project. The analysis considers the preferred alternative and the no build alternative in the opening year (2026) and design year (2046). Traffic studies did consider an additional build alternative (Alternative 1 in the *Other Alternatives Considered* section above); however, mainline traffic volumes are projected to differ by no more than  $\pm 4\%$  during peak periods. Therefore, it is likely that both build alternatives would have similar GHG emissions.

This analysis compares the build and no build alternatives in terms of their GHG emissions and social costs. The analysis considers short-term (2026) annual effects and long-term (2046) annual effects. Short-term effects exhibit a 6.95% increase in GWP and social cost of GHG for the build alternative over the no build. Long-term effects indicate only a 1.37% and 1.35% increase for GWP and social cost, respectively. The majority of emissions impacts are due to vehicular emissions.

A secondary analysis was conducted to consider the cumulative effects of the project alternatives and projected improvement in vehicle fuel efficiency. While no build emissions are lower in this analysis, both the build and no build alternatives are anticipated to result in emissions that are substantially below 2019 levels.

INDOT concurred with the GHG analysis on November 1, 2023 (Appendix M, page 1). The full GHG analysis is in Appendix M, pages 2-43.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County FloydRoute I-64 and I-265Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

### SECTION G - NOISE

**Noise****Yes**      **No**Is a noise analysis required in accordance with FHWA regulations and INDOT's traffic noise policy?        Date Noise Analysis was approved/technically sufficient by INDOT ESD: October 12, 2023

*Describe if the project is a Type I or Type III project. If it is a Type I project, describe the studies completed to date and if noise impacts were identified. If noise impacts were identified, describe if abatement is feasible and reasonable and include a statement of likelihood.*

An early coordination letter was sent on June 28, 2021, to the New Albany Planning and Zoning Commission. They responded on July 12, 2021, indicating numerous residents along the I-64 corridor in New Albany have complained to the City about high levels of ambient noise from I-64 and, in particular, the use of engine brakes (Jake Brake) by semi-trucks descending from rural Floyd County into downtown New Albany and across the Sherman Minton Bridge. Interstate noise may be worsened by the Interstate's proximity to the southern limits of the Knobstone Escarpment, which rises some 150 feet above the adjacent freeway. The City believes that a noise study is warranted, and abatement measures will be necessary (Appendix C, pages 14-15).

Because this project involves the addition of travel lanes on I-64 and I-265, it is considered a Type 1 project. Therefore, in accordance with 23 CFR 772 and the INDOT Traffic Noise Analysis Procedure (2022) (Noise Policy), this action requires a formal noise analysis.

INDOT approved a Final Traffic Noise Technical Report on May 4, 2023. The approved final report was updated on August 28, 2023 to account for conflicts with overhead transmission lines identified during utility coordination for proposed Noise Barrier 6 (NB6). INDOT approved the Revised Final Traffic Noise Technical Report on October 12, 2023 (Appendix I, page 1). The latest version of the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) was used to model existing (2019) and design year (2046) worst (noisiest) hourly traffic noise levels within the Improve 64 study area.

A total of 836 TNM noise receivers representing 927 receptors, were modeled for the existing and proposed condition, including 744 receivers representing 799 Activity Category B receptor units (note six of these units qualify as a historic, 4(f) property), 83 receivers representing 114 Category C receptor units (note two of these units qualify as a historic, 4(f) property), four receivers representing eight (8) Category D receptor units, and five (5) receivers representing six (6) Category E receptor units.

The noise analysis results indicate 158 receiver locations, including 145 receiver locations representing 150 Activity Category B receptor units and 13 receiver locations representing 14 Category C receptor units, would be exposed to 2046 design year noise levels approaching or exceeding the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). The noise levels at these 164 receptor units would range from 66.0 to 75.9 dB(A) Leq(h). Substantial noise level increases, defined by the INDOT Noise Policy as a 15.0 dB(A) or greater noise level increase from existing and future, are not projected to occur within the study area.

Noise abatement was analyzed for impacted receptors per INDOT's Noise Policy. Eight noise barrier locations (one of which is a two-barrier system) were modeled in the study area. The noise barrier designs ranged from 435 to 5,274 feet in length with heights ranging from 8 to 22 feet and surface area ranging from 8,700 to 105,480 square feet. One noise barrier (NB3) was found not to be feasible as it does not meet INDOT's feasibility goal of 5 dB(A) reduction at a majority (greater than 50%) of the impacted receptors. Four noise barriers (NB1, NB2, NB4a and NB4b) meet INDOT's feasibility goal but are not reasonable as they either do not meet INDOT's Noise Reduction Design Goal (NRDG) of at least a 7 dB(A) reduction for a majority (greater than 50%) of the benefited first row receptors or



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

INDOT's Maximum Square Footage per Benefited Receptor criteria (NB1 and NB4a do not meet either of these requirements). Three noise barriers (NB5, NB6 and NB7) meet INDOT's feasibility and reasonableness goals and are recommended.

A Draft Traffic Noise Technical Report was completed on November 21, 2022. INDOT released this report for public involvement on November 21, 2022. It identified three locations where noise barriers are feasible and may be reasonable pending the viewpoints of the benefited residents and property owners. They are:

- NB5: located east of I-64 approximately 75 feet north of Cottom Street and 600 feet south of Cherry Street. NB5, a two-barrier system, is five feet off the proposed edge of pavement along I-64 WB. Because the Cherry Street overpass bridge is not being replaced with the project, the first segment is north of the Cherry Street overpass, and the second segment is south of the Cherry Street overpass.
- NB6: located east of I-265 from Maevi Drive to 400 feet south of the Green Valley Road overpass. NB6 is primarily five feet off the proposed edge of pavement along I-265 eastbound, except between Finchleigh Drive and Redwood Drive where the barrier is ten feet off the ROW. [Note NB6 was updated after the noise public involvement period due to conflicts with overhead utility lines. There is now a gap within a utility easement between Wedgewood Drive and Redwood Drive.]
- NB7: located west of I-265 from approximately 235 feet south of Village Pine Drive to 630 feet north of Barrington Court and is five feet off the proposed edge of pavement, except along the I-265 WB State Street off-ramp where it is 15 feet off the proposed edge of pavement due to sight line constraints.

In accordance with INDOT's Noise Policy, noise barrier survey postcards were mailed to benefited receptors and businesses that could have their line-of-sight blocked for these three noise barriers on December 20, 2022, asking if they were in favor of a noise barrier near their property. The transmittal letter also included an invitation to a noise public meeting. The noise public meeting was held on January 24, 2023, at the New Albany Schools Educational Support Center. The purpose of the noise public meeting was to educate neighborhood residents on INDOT's Noise Policy and encourage benefited receptors to complete a survey on whether they were in favor of a noise barrier at that location or not. Approximately 58 people attended the public meeting.

INDOT's Noise Policy requires a second noise survey mailing for each feasible and potentially reasonable noise barrier if the response rate is not 50% or greater. A second round of survey postcards was mailed to benefited receptors for Noise Barrier (NB) 5 and NB7 on February 13, 2023, who did not respond to the original survey because a 50% or greater response rate was not received with the first mailing. Hard copies of the survey postcard mailings were hand delivered to 18 residences on Ealy Street for NB5 because all original mailings were returned to sender as undeliverable.

Based on the results of the analysis and considering the viewpoints of benefited receptors and other considerations, INDOT is planning on constructing NB5, NB6, and NB7. Factors considered in recommending these noise barriers are as follows:

- Survey of Benefited Receptors. Surveys were sent to obtain the views of benefited receptors (property owners and residents) and a noise public meeting was held to describe the results of the noise analysis and encourage survey response. Seventeen percent (17%) of NB5 benefited receptors responded, with 81% expressing support. Fifty-four percent (54%) of NB6 benefited receptors responded, with 98% expressing support. Fifty-five percent (55%) of NB7 benefited receptors responded, with 93% expressing support.
- Although the response rate for NB5 was less than 50%, the majority of the responses were in favor of construction and the noise barrier will mitigate noise in a census block group with Environmental Justice (EJ) concerns.

Based on the studies completed to date, INDOT has identified 164 impacted receptors and has determined that noise

# Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

abatement is likely, but not guaranteed, at three locations. Noise abatement at these locations is based upon preliminary square footage and design criteria. Noise abatement in these locations has been estimated to be below both 1,000 and 1,250 square feet per benefited receptor and will reduce the noise level by a minimum of 7 dB(A) at a majority of the identified impacted receptors. A re-evaluation of the noise analysis will occur during final design. If during final design it has been determined that conditions have changed such that noise abatement is not feasible and reasonable, the abatement measures might not be provided. The final decision on the installation of any abatement measure(s) will be made upon the completion of the project's final design and the public involvement processes.

The viewpoints of the benefited residents and property owners were sought and were considered in determining the reasonableness of highway traffic noise abatement measures for proposed highway construction projects. INDOT will incorporate highway traffic noise consideration in on-going activities for public involvement in the highway program.

Upon completion of the environmental document phase, the noise study will be provided directly to the county's planning unit by the environmental preparer and/or member of the project team. If the project is in a municipality that has a planning unit, a noise study will also be provided to the municipality's planning unit. INDOT Environmental Services Division shall be copied on this correspondence. This is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document.

## SECTION H – COMMUNITY IMPACTS

### Regional, Community & Neighborhood Factors

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

Yes	No
<b>X</b>	
	<b>X</b>
	<b>X</b>
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	
<b>X</b>	

*Discuss how the project complies with the area's local/regional development patterns; whether the project will impact community cohesion; and impact community events. Discuss how the project conforms with the ADA Transition Plan.*

The project is located in the City of New Albany and extends into unincorporated Floyd County. The proposed project will require the acquisition of approximately 0.26 acre of new permanent ROW from a wooded area located along I-64. The ROW acquisition is not anticipated to have a substantial impact on the tax base or property values. The project will not result in substantial negative impacts to community cohesion, there will be no relocations, and the project will not divide existing neighborhoods or change community access. The project is expected to have positive impacts to the community by reducing congestion and improving safety on I-64 and I-265. There may be temporary inconveniences associated with construction, such as increased travel times, construction, noise, and fugitive dust. However, these will cease upon completion of construction activities.

According to the Fairs and Festivals website (<https://www.fairsandfestivals.net/>) and the Indiana Festivals website (<https://indianafestivals.org/>), there are a variety of scheduled festivals in and around the New Albany metro area, including the Harvest Homecoming Festival and the New Albany Holiday Craft Fair. There are also a variety of fairs and festivals scheduled in the City of Louisville, most notably the Kentucky Derby Festival. Additional fairs and festivals scheduled in the City of Louisville include craft fairs, holiday festivals, art shows, and expos. The TMP for this project is underdevelopment, and the proposed plan will allow for traffic to be maintained on I-64 and I-265 to the maximum extent possible for the duration of the construction period. Some short-term and long-term road closures will be required. Detours will be provided for all longer term interchange ramp closures. There may be short-term off peak

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

ramp and local road closures. See the *MOT During Construction* section of the document for additional detail. The project is not expected to substantially impair travel routes to these fairs and festivals, although typical delays in construction zones with reduced speeds and potential restrictions are anticipated during the project duration.

Floyd County's most recent transition/accessibility implement plan was updated and considered effective on August 16, 2022. Because the project involves adding travel lanes to an interstate and there are no pedestrian facilities within the project area, there are no applicable Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements for the project.

### Public Facilities and Services

*Discuss what public facilities and services are present in the project area and impacts (such as MOT) that will occur to them. Include how the impacts have been minimized and what coordination has occurred. Some examples of public facilities and services include health facilities, educational facilities, public and private utilities, emergency services, religious institutions, airports, transportation or public pedestrian and bicycle facilities.*

Based on a desktop review, the aerial map of the project area (Appendix B, pages 5-12), and the RFI report (Appendix E, pages 4 and 14), there are 16 religious facilities, 13 recreational facilities, 11 cemeteries, one hospital, four trails, and five schools located within the 0.5 mile of the project. The following properties or resources were confirmed to be adjacent to or near the project area during the site visits on June 16-17, 2021, July 21-23 and 28-30, 2021, October 5-7 and 24, 2021, April 4-5, 2022, August 13, 2022, and November 3, 2022, by HNTB:

- Two religious facilities are located adjacent to the project area. Wesley Chapel UMC is located adjacent to the west of US 150, just north of the US 150/I-64 interchange ramps (Appendix B, page 5). New Beginnings Community Church is located adjacent to the west of the exit ramp from I-265 to Paoli Pike (Appendix B, page 11). Cherry Street Community Church is located near the project area on Cherry Street, east of I-64. and it may be affected by the MOT plan, which includes anticipated short term flagging operations on Cherry Street.
- Four recreational facilities are located adjacent to the project area. Anderson Park and Falling Run Park/Billy Herman Fields are located adjacent to the east of I-64, just south of Cherry Street (Appendix B, page 10). Cherry Valley Par-3 Golf Course (Fuzzy Zoeller's Par 3) is located adjacent to the west of I-64, just north of Cherry Street (Appendix B, page 9). Pleasant Valley Golf Practice Facility is mapped adjacent to the east of US 150, on the north side of Old Vincennes Road; however, this facility does not appear to be at that location and the phone number is not connected.
- One cemetery, West Haven Cemetery, is located adjacent to the east of I-64, approximately 0.51 mile south of Captain Frank Road (Appendix B, page 9). No impacts to the cemetery are anticipated because all work will be within the existing ROW.

Early coordination letters were sent on June 28, 2021, to Wesley Chapel UMC, Cherry Street Church of Christ, City of New Albany Parks & Recreation, and Pleasant Valley Golf Practice Facility. An early coordination letter was sent to the New Beginnings Community Church on April 13, 2023. Early coordination letters were also sent to the following schools near the project area: Holy Family Elementary School, Community Montessori School, Green Valley Elementary School, Scribner Middle School, and Children's Academy New Albany Early Learning. None of the facilities responded to early coordination.

The TMP for this project will involve some short-term and long-term road closures, with detours provided for all I-64 interchange ramp closures, all I-265 interchange ramp closures, and all local road closures. The closures/lane restrictions will pose a temporary inconvenience to traveling motorists (including school buses and emergency services). These delays will cease upon project completion. Therefore, no significant impacts to any of these public facilities are expected. Access to all properties will be maintained during construction.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

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.

Utility coordination is ongoing for the project. There are several utilities within the project area, but only one has been identified as a relocation. LG&E transmission lines crossing over the I-64 westbound ramp at the I-64/I-265 interchange are too low for the minimum clearance needed for construction and will be raised with two temporary towers. The temporary towers will be located within the northeastern infield of the I-64/I-265 interchange. Additional subsurface investigation will be completed to determine if there will be conflicts with water and fiberoptic utility lines.

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

During the development of the project were EJ issues identified?

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

Does the project require an EJ analysis?

If YES, then:

Are any EJ populations located within the project area?

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

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

*Indicate if EJ issues were identified during project development. If an EJ analysis was not required, discuss why. If an EJ analysis was required, describe how the EJ population was identified. Include if the project has a disproportionately high or adverse effect on EJ populations and explain your reasoning. If yes, describe actions to avoid, minimize and mitigate these effects.*

Under FHWA Order 6640.23A, FHWA and the project sponsor, as a recipient of funding from FHWA, are responsible to ensure that their programs, policies, and activities do not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. Per the current INDOT Categorical Exclusion Manual, an EJ Analysis is required for any project that has two or more relocations or 0.5 acre of additional permanent ROW. The project will require acquisition of approximately 0.70 acre of additional ROW. This includes 0.26 acre of permanent ROW and 0.44 acre of temporary ROW. No relocations are expected. An EJ Analysis was completed because of the size of the project, location within the City of New Albany, and noise impacts identified in the noise analysis.

**Populations of EJ Concern**

Potential EJ impacts are detected by locating minority and low-income populations relative to a reference population to determine if populations of EJ concern exist 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). This project is located within Floyd County. However, since this interstate system is used by motorists in several surrounding counties, the COCs include Floyd County, City of New Albany, Clark County, the Town of Clarksville, Harrison County, the City of Jeffersonville, and Louisville-Jefferson County. The community that overlaps the project area is called the affected community (AC) and is compared to census block group information, depending on the availability of data. The ACs for this analysis are the census block groups immediately adjacent to the project area, as well as those in close proximity to account for potential broader changes associated with interstate access and travel patterns during construction. The COCs and ACs are shown in Appendix J, pages 14-16. All census block groups shown on the maps in Appendix J were identified as ACs.

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 was also analyzed for Limited English Proficiency (LEP) because it could inform public outreach efforts. Data from the 2016-2020 American Community Survey was obtained from the US Census Bureau Website <https://data.census.gov> on May 4, 2022, by HNTB. The data collected for low-income, minority and LEP populations within the AC are summarized in the tables in Appendix J, pages 19-23.

Of the 122 census block groups analyzed, a total of 75 census block groups (61.5%) showed populations of EJ concern. They are highlighted in yellow in the tables in Appendix J, pages 19-23. They include:

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

- Fourteen (14) census block groups showing only minority populations of concern.
- Twenty-two (22) census block groups showing only low-income populations of concern.
- Thirty-nine (39) census block groups showing both minority and low-income populations of concern.

The populations of EJ concern are primarily located in the developed areas of New Albany, Clarksville, and Louisville (Appendix J, pages 15-16).

Using the same methodology described above, a total of 29 census block groups showed elevated LEP populations (Appendix J, page 17).

Once populations of EJ concern are identified, the next step is to determine if they are expected to experience a disproportionately high and adverse impact from the project. The FHWA and USDOT EJ Orders state that “disproportionately high and adverse” refers to an adverse effect that (1) is predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population; or (2) will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.

The following benefits and burdens have been identified as potential considerations in determining whether the populations of EJ concern will experience disproportionately high and adverse impacts from the project.

### **Populations of EJ Concern Benefits and Burdens Analysis**

#### **Benefits**

- Reduced travel time and congestion – The area currently experiences congestion due to limited capacity of the roadway. Recurring freeway congestion on both I-64 between SR 62/64 and the Indiana/Kentucky state line and I-265 between I-64 and Grant Line Road results in peak period travel speeds below 20-mph and intermittent queueing with a high frequency of rear end and sideswipe crashes. Recurring congestion occurs on eastbound I-64 during typical weekday morning peak periods, beginning at the high-volume US 150 entrance ramp. On westbound I-64, congestion occurs during the typical weekday afternoon peak periods. Westbound I-265 experiences congestion during both the typical weekday morning and afternoon peak periods. In all three corridors, congestion problems are expected to become more acute as demand increases in the future. The highway capacity levels of service do not meet INDOT standards in the current conditions or the design year. The added capacity from the proposed project will result in reduced travel times and congestion; reduced queueing; and improved mobility within the Louisville metro area, which will benefit EJ and non-EJ populations similarly.
- Improved safety outcomes – The Final Engineer’s Report (October 2021) included historical crash analysis from 2017, 2018, and 2019 that identified several segments of I-64 that have a high crash frequency or high number of severe crashes. Crash types in these areas are largely associated with congestion (e.g., rear end crashes). Increased capacity is expected to reduce queueing, and therefore crashes are expected to be substantially reduced by the project. This increased safety will benefit EJ and non-EJ populations similarly.
- Improved condition of the roadway, bridges, and culverts – Replacement and/or rehabilitation of pavement on I-64 and I-265, as well as widening of shoulders, will benefit EJ and non-EJ populations similarly by improving driving conditions. Improved condition of bridges and culverts in the area will potentially improve drainage and benefit EJ and non-EJ populations similarly.
- Reduced noise – In accordance with INDOT’s Noise Policy, the Revised Final Traffic Noise Technical Report (August 28, 2023) identified three noise barriers that are likely to be constructed as part of the project (Appendix J, pages 15-16). The noise barriers are listed below:
  - NB5: located east of I-64 approximately 75 feet north of Cottom Street and 600 feet south of Cherry

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County

Floyd

Route

I-64 and I-265

Des. No.

1900162 (Lead), et al.

Street. NB5, a two-barrier system, is five feet off the proposed edge of pavement along I-64 westbound. Because the Cherry Street overpass bridge is not being replaced with the project, the first segment is north of the Cherry Street overpass, and the second segment is south of the Cherry Street overpass. NB5 is located adjacent to a census block group with minority populations of EJ concern and would mitigate noise impacts at 37 impacted receptors. Impacted receptors for the project are those that approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria (NAC); therefore, any residential receptor with a modeled noise level of 66 decibels or greater in the year 2046 is considered impacted. Twenty-six (26) of the 37 impacted receptors are considered impacted in the existing condition, meaning modeled noise levels for the year 2019 are already at or above 66 decibels. This means the noise barrier will provide a noise reduction from the current conditions because the modeled noise levels for 2046 with the barrier are lower than those modeled for 2019. An additional 107 non-impacted receptors would benefit (receive a 5 decibel or greater reduction in noise) from NB5.

- NB6: located east of I-265 from Maevi Drive to 400 feet south of the Green Valley Road overpass. There is a gap in the barrier near overhead transmission lines from Wedgewood Drive to Redwood Drive. NB6 is primarily five feet off the proposed edge of pavement along I-265 eastbound, except between Finchleigh Drive and Redwood Drive where the barrier is ten feet off the right-of-way boundary. NB6 is located adjacent to census block group with minority and low-income populations of EJ concern and would mitigate noise impacts at 34 impacted receptors. Impacted receptors for the project are those that approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria (NAC); therefore, any residential receptor with a modeled noise level of 66 decibels or greater in the year 2046 is considered impacted. Fifteen (15) of the 34 impacted receptors are considered impacted in the existing condition, meaning modeled noise levels for the year 2019 are already at or above 66 decibels. This means the noise barrier will provide a noise reduction from the current conditions because the modeled noise levels for 2046 with the barrier are lower than those modeled for 2019. An additional 162 non-impacted receptors would benefit (receive a 5 decibel or greater reduction in noise) from NB6.
- NB7: located west of I-265 from approximately 235 feet south of Village Pine Drive to 630 feet north of Barrington Court and is five feet off the proposed edge of pavement, except along the I-265 westbound State Street off-ramp where it is 15 feet off the proposed edge of pavement due to sight line constraints. NB7 is located adjacent to census block group with minority populations of EJ concern and would mitigate noise impacts at 37 impacted receptors. Impacted receptors for the project are those that approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria (NAC); therefore, any residential receptor with a modeled noise level of 66 decibels or greater in the year 2046 is considered impacted. Twenty-two (22) of the 37 impacted receptors are considered impacted in the existing condition, meaning modeled noise levels for the year 2019 are already at or above 66 decibels. This means the noise barrier will provide a noise reduction from the current conditions because the modeled noise levels for 2046 with the barrier are lower than those modeled for 2019. An additional 66 non-impacted receptors would benefit (receive a 5 decibel or greater reduction in noise) from NB7.

### **Burdens**

- Right-of-way acquisition – Approximately 0.70 acre of total right-of-way acquisition will be necessary at five locations along I-64 throughout the project area. The locations are in wooded areas at culvert inlet and outlet locations for the replacement and rehabilitation of existing culverts. The right-of-way is necessary for construction and access at the culverts and detention ponds. Permanent right-of-way acquisition is only needed at one location, totaling 0.26 acre, and is not within a census block group with minority and/or low-income populations of EJ concern. The remaining four locations are for temporary right-of-way acquisition and total 0.44 acre. One temporary right-of-way location, totaling 0.02 acre, will be required from a census block group with minority populations of EJ concern. Communities without populations of EJ concern will be impacted by more right-of-way acquisition than those with populations of EJ concern.
- Visual impacts due to tree clearing and noise barrier construction – Due to the construction of the project,

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

approximately 80 acres of trees will be removed. Approximately 79 acres (99%) will be within the existing transportation right-of-way. Tree clearing will be adjacent to both communities with populations of EJ concern and communities without populations of EJ concern, and both will be impacted similarly by the visual impact of the tree removal. Tree removal will be minimized where possible.

Visual impacts could also occur from construction of the three noise barriers, which are all adjacent to census block groups with minority and low-income populations of EJ concern (see discussion above). However, because the noise barrier survey showed the majority of benefited receptors who responded were in favor of the barrier construction, the noise mitigating benefits are anticipated to outweigh any negative visual impacts. INDOT evaluated the possibility of planting trees on the neighborhood side of each noise barrier. It is not feasible to plant trees on the neighborhood side of NB5 because there are existing trees at that location outside the area needed to access and maintain the barrier. For NB6 and NB7, it was determined no trees will be planted in the right-of-way because there are existing trees in most places along the right-of-way line to visually screen the noise barriers. For all areas near noise barriers, efforts have been made to minimize tree clearing where possible on the neighborhood side of the barrier to provide visual screening.

- Temporary inconveniences, dust, noise, etc. – During construction, temporary travel inconveniences, as well as increase in dust and noise will similarly impact populations with EJ concerns and populations without EJ concerns. Based on the length on each side of the project area, approximately 48% borders a population of EJ concern and 52% borders populations that are not of EJ concern. These impacts will cease with completion of the project. The temporary impacts associated with construction activities will be minimized by following INDOT's Standard Specifications.
- Air quality impacts from increased roadway capacity – The additional capacity of I-64 could potentially bring localized areas of decreased air quality. However, air quality may also be improved due to decreased vehicle idling time brought about by the reduction in congestion along the roadway. Any possible changes in air quality will similarly impact populations with EJ concerns and populations without EJ concerns. Based on the length on each side of the project area, approximately 48% borders a population of EJ concern and 52% borders populations that are not of EJ concern.
- Noise impacts – Noise impacts were analyzed in accordance with INDOT's Noise Policy. Based on the Revised Final Traffic Noise Technical Report (August 28, 2023), noise impacts were predicted for 164 receptors. Approximately 116 of the 164 impacted receptors (71%) are located within census block groups with populations of EJ concern. Of the 116 impacted receptors in census block groups with populations of EJ concern, 108 (93%) of these impacted noise receptors will be mitigated with a noise barrier (NB5, NB6, and NB7 described above). Although the percentage of impacted noise receptors in elevated low-income and/or minority census block groups (71%) appears to be “predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population,” the majority of these impacts (93%) will be mitigated by construction of noise barriers, ultimately benefitting the adjacent neighborhoods.
- Temporary Road Closures – The MOT plan will require that Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, and Cherry Street be closed for periods during construction of the bridges overhead and construction of foundations adjacent to the roadway. Interchange ramps at the I-64/US 150, I-64/I-265, and I-64/State Street interchanges will require short-term off-peak closures. Additional longer-term closures of ramps at I-64/Spring Street interchange will be necessary as well as single lane closures on State Street under I-265. These longer-term closures will likely last 4-6 months. There are minority populations with EJ concerns located adjacent to the east of the I-64/Spring Street interchange and northeast and northwest of the I-265/State Street interchange. There are low-income populations with EJ concerns located adjacent to the east and southwest of the I-265/State Street interchange.

The following commitments will be made to minimize impacts to local motorists: 1) Adjacent local streets (such as Quarry Road and Captain Frank Road, and Captain Frank Road and Cherry Street) will not be closed

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

at the same time, and 2) Roads to be used as detour routes or likely alternate routes during full closures (such as Spring Street and State Street) will not be closed at the same time. These are included as commitments in the *Environmental Commitments* section this environmental document.

There are no sidewalks along Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, or State Street. There are existing sidewalks along the north side of Cherry Street and along the south side of Spring Street. To minimize impacts to non-motorized travelers using these sidewalks, there will be no detours of the Cherry Street or Spring Street. Flaggers will be used to hold non-motorized travelers along the sidewalks during overhead work for safety purposes. The closure duration will be coordinated with INDOT construction and developed to minimize delay to non-motorized travel. This is included as a commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section this environmental document.

TARC provides bus service to New Albany within the project area. Bus Route 71 includes portions of I-64 and Spring Street (Appendix J, page 39). There are no bus stops along I-64 and the closest stop to the project area is at State Street and Elm Street. The project will not impact access to the bus stop at State Street and Elm Street or any other stops along Route 71. The following MOT measures will impact Route 71:

- I-64 westbound exit to Spring Street/Elm Street closure and detour - This closure is anticipated to last 4-6 months. The detour will use the interstates and will include I-64 westbound to I-265 eastbound, I-265 eastbound to the State Street interchange, I-265 westbound to I-64 eastbound (Appendix J, page 41). It will add approximately 6 miles and 10 minutes to the bus trip.
- Spring Street to I-64 eastbound closure and detour – This closure is anticipated to last 4-6 months. The detour will use the interstates and will include I-64 westbound to I-265 eastbound, I-265 eastbound to the State Street interchange, I-265 westbound to I-64 eastbound (Appendix J, page 42). It will add approximately 6 miles and 10 minutes to the bus trip.

TARC was invited to participate in the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) meetings on August 24, 2022 and May 5, 2023. Coordination specific to the I-64/Spring Street ramp closures and Route 71 occurred on August 31, 2023 (Appendix J, pages 44-45). TARC requested coordination prior to the project start date so they can include the detours in their system. Coordination with TARC prior to construction regarding detours is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section this environmental document.

During the short-term and longer-term closures, traffic would temporarily increase in some neighborhoods, including those with EJ populations. The closures at Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, and Cherry Street are anticipated to be intermittent and short term, likely lasting a weekend or less. There are not EJ populations immediately adjacent to Quarry Road, but there are EJ populations approximately 0.3 mile to the east. The interchange at I-265/State Street is likely to be used during the longer-term closures of the ramps at the I-64/Spring Street interchange. Additional locations that may see increased traffic during short and long-term closures include State Street, Spring Street, SR 62/64, Quarry Road, Captain Frank Road, West Street, Old Vincennes Road, Old Hill Road, and Paoli Pike. Residents and businesses along detour routes would experience temporary increases in noise and vehicular emissions, as well as longer travel times due to the increased congestion.

The detours for the I-64 eastbound exit ramp to Spring Street and Spring Street entrance ramp to I-64 westbound will be along State Street which is within a population of EJ concern. Land use adjacent to State Street is primarily commercial with some residential. Traffic currently using each ramp is approximately 5,000-6,000 vehicles per day. Traffic on State Street is approximately 11,000-30,000 vehicles per day depending on the location. During construction when the I-64/Spring Street interchange ramps are closed, assuming all



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

current daily ramp users follow the detour, the traffic on State Street is anticipated to increase by approximately 6,000 vehicles per day in the northbound direction (westbound I-64 entrance ramp closed) and 5,000 vehicles per day in the southbound direction (eastbound I-64 exit ramp closed). The increased traffic volumes on State Street during the detours is anticipated to be manageable through the monitoring and adjustment of signal timings by the INDOT Seymour District Traffic group when the detour routes are in effect. Contract provisions will be included so that the contractor coordinates with the INDOT Seymour District Traffic group prior to establishing the detours. Detours for the I-64 westbound to Spring Street exit ramp closure and Spring Street entrance ramp to I-64 eastbound will be along I-64 and I-265 which can accommodate additional traffic.

Detour routes will be temporary and will end once construction for the bridge or interchange ramp is complete. Based on the length on each side of the project area and those affected by detours and closures, approximately 48% of the project area borders a population of EJ concern and 52% of the project area borders populations that are not of EJ concern; therefore, this burden will be borne by both communities with EJ concerns and communities without EJ concerns.

### Conclusion

According to Federal guidance documents, a disproportionately high and adverse effect is defined as one that is:

- Predominantly borne by a low-income population and/or a minority population; or
- Suffered by the low-income population and/or minority population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-low-income and/or non-minority population.

The Improve 64 project will result in permanent impacts to communities with EJ concerns through acquisition of right-of-way, by increasing noise levels, altering the visual landscape, and temporarily changing travel patterns during construction. The majority of right-of-way acquisition will be in communities without populations of EJ concern. Noise impacts are anticipated to be mitigated through the construction of noise barriers. Although noise barriers could have a visual impact, the noise reduction would outweigh this. Visual impacts will occur from tree removal, but this will similarly affect both communities with populations of EJ concern and populations without EJ concerns. The project will also temporarily impact populations of EJ concern through construction-related vehicle emissions, dust, noise, and vibration. These temporary construction impacts will be minimized by following INDOT's Standard Specifications. Construction activities would also impact traffic operations in the project area. Lane restrictions, closures, and detours could cause delays and/or additional travel times for local and regional travelers, school buses, emergency responders, and transit buses. Coordination will occur with TARC regarding impacts to bus Route 71 closer to construction. This coordination is included as a firm commitment in the *Environmental Commitments* section this environmental document.

Minimization and mitigation for impacts to populations of EJ concern include:

- Construction of noise barriers that will provide a reduction in noise following construction and in the design year;
- Commitments to minimize impacts to local motorists by not closing adjacent streets or likely alternate detour routes at the same time; this is a commitment in the environmental document;
- Commitments to minimize impacts to pedestrian/bicyclists by using flaggers instead of detours and minimizing the delay experienced by those users; this is a commitment in the environmental document; and
- Commitments to minimizing impacts from construction activities by following INDOT's Standard Specifications.

Benefits to populations of EJ concern include mitigation for existing traffic noise following construction, as well as

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

reduced congestion and improved safety on I-64 and I-265.

The temporary and permanent adverse effects to communities with populations of EJ concern are not anticipated to be greater or more severe in magnitude than those borne by communities without populations of EJ concern.

In addition, communities with populations of EJ concern have been and will continue to be provided full and fair participation in the transportation decision-making process. Therefore, the Improve 64 project would not result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect to low-income and/or minority populations.

The full EJ analysis is included in Appendix J.

INDOT-Environmental Services Division (ESD) has reviewed the project information along with the EJ Analysis for the project. With the information provided, the project may require minimal right-of-way, require no relocations, and would not disrupt community cohesion or create a physical barrier. With the information provided, INDOT-ESD would not consider the impacts associated with this project as causing a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and/or low-income populations of EJ concern relative to non-EJ populations in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12898 and FHWA Order 6640.23a. No further EJ Analysis is required (Appendix J, page 1).

**Relocation of People, Businesses or Farms**

Will the proposed action result in the relocation of people, businesses or farms?  
Is a BIS or CSRS required?

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

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

*Discuss any relocations that will occur due to the project. If a BIS or CSRS is required, discuss the results in the discussion below.*

No relocations of people, businesses, or farms will take place as a result of this project.

### SECTION I – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & REGULATED SUBSTANCES

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

Documentation

- Red Flag Investigation (RFI)
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA)
- Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA)
- Design/Specifications for Remediation required?

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

Date RFI concurrence by INDOT SAM (if applicable): February 3, 2022

*Include a summary of the potential hazardous material concerns found during review. Discuss in depth sites found within, directly adjacent to, or ones that could impact the project area. Refer to current INDOT SAM guidance. If additional documentation (special provisions, pay quantities, etc.) will be needed, include in discussion. Include applicable commitments.*

Based on a review of GIS and available public records, the RFI was completed on January 26, 2022, by VS Engineering and INDOT SAM provided concurrence on February 3, 2022 (Appendix E, pages 1-16). Seven RCRA Generator/TSD sites, four State Cleanup Sites, 16 Underground Storage Tank (UST) sites, one Voluntary Remediation Program site, 22 Leaking Underground Storage (LUST) sites, 14 Brownfields sites, 21 Institutional Controls sites, 26 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Facilities, and 14 NPDES Pipe Locations are located within 0.5 mile of the project area.

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

Radio Transmitter Site (AI ID No. 32172) is located adjacent to the project area at 414 Daisy Lane, New Albany, Indiana. One 500 gallon diesel UST was closed in July of 1989. Impacted soil backfill was placed back into the excavation once removal was completed. Residual soil impacts remain on-site and the exact location of the site and the UST cavity is unknown. If excavation occurs in this area, proper handling, removal, and disposal of soil and/or groundwater may be necessary. No excavation is currently planned outside of the existing ROW near this site. No impact is expected.

Andres Center, NPDES permit expiration date February 12, 2022, is located adjacent to the project area. The permit for this site is terminated. No impact is expected. The RFI recommended coordination with this permit holder; however, coordination did not occur because the permit expired in February 2022.

Fairfield Inn and Suites, NPDES permit expiration date September 4, 2022, is located within the project area. The permit for this site is terminated. No impact is expected. The RFI recommended coordination with this permit holder; however, coordination did not occur because the permit expired in September 2022.

INDOT Des 1600310 Small Structure Replacement, NPDES permit expiration date April 22, 2023, is located within the project area. The permit for this site is terminated. No impact is expected. The RFI recommended coordination with this permit holder; however, coordination did not occur because the permit was terminated.

None of the hazmat sites identified will impact the project. Further investigation for hazardous material concerns is not required at this time.

### Part IV – Permits and Commitments

#### PERMITS CHECKLIST

Permits (mark all that apply)

Likely Required

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

- Nationwide Permit (NWP)
- Regional General Permit (RGP)
- Individual Permit (IP)
- Other

**IN Department of Environmental Management (401/Rule 5)**

- Nationwide Permit (NWP)
- Regional General Permit (RGP)
- Individual Permit (IP)
- Isolated Wetlands
- Rule 5
- Other

**IN Department of Natural Resources**

- Construction in a Floodway
- Navigable Waterway Permit
- Other

**Mitigation Required**

- US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit
- Others (Please discuss in the discussion below)

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

List the permits likely required for the project and summarize why the permits are needed, including permits designated as "Other."

A USACE Section 404 permit and IDEM Section 401 Water Quality Certification will be required due to impacts to wetlands and streams. Mitigation for impacts to wetlands and streams is anticipated and will likely occur through the IDNR In-Lieu Fee Mitigation Program. Mitigation details will be determined during permitting.

This project is anticipated to result in greater than one acre of ground disturbance activity, therefore a Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSGP) (formerly a Rule 5 permit) will be required.

An IDNR Construction in a Floodway (CIF) permit will be required due to project impacts below the base flood elevation of Valley View Creek. Mitigation for impacts to floodway habitat will be through the IDNR In-Lieu Fee Mitigation Program.

Applicable recommendations provided by resource agencies are included in the *Environmental Commitments* section of this environmental document. If permits are found to be necessary, the conditions of the permit will be requirements of the project and will supersede these recommendations.

It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to identify and obtain all required permits.

### ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

List all commitments and include the name of agency/organization requesting/requiring the commitment(s). Listed commitments should be numbered.

#### **Firm:**

1. If the scope of work or permanent or temporary ROW amounts change, the INDOT Environmental Services Division (ESD) and the INDOT Seymour District Environmental Section will be contacted immediately. (INDOT ESD and INDOT Seymour 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. This project will add approximately 21 acres of impervious surface. The designer will examine the project for inclusion of post-construction stormwater measures according to the INDOT Post-Construction Stormwater Management guidance document. (INDOT)
4. General AMM 1: Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs. (USFWS)
5. Lighting AMM1: Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during the active season. (USFWS)
6. Lighting AMM 2. When installing new or replacing existing permanent lights, use downward-facing, full cut-off lens lights (with same intensity or less for replacement lighting); or for those transportation agencies using the BUG system developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society, the goal is to be as close to 0 for all three ratings with a priority of "uplight" of 0 and "backlight" as low as practicable. (USFWS)
7. Tree Removal AMM 1: Modify all phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) to avoid tree removal. (USFWS)

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

8. Tree Removal AMM 2: Apply time of year restrictions 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 and IDNR DFW)
9. Tree Removal AMM 3: 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)
10. The INDOT Project Manager will assure that \$72,207.50 of Preliminary Engineering funds will be allocated to the Rangewide In-Lieu Fee Program, administered by The Conservation Fund, to resolve formal consultation under the Rangewide Programmatic (4.3 acres) X (1.5) x \$11,194.96 = \$72,207.50. Payment shall be in process at Ready for Contracts (RFC) date. (USFWS)
11. Contractors must take care when handling dead or injured bats (regardless of species), and any other federally listed species that are found at the Project site in order to preserve biological material in the best possible condition and protect the handler from exposure to diseases, such as rabies. Project personnel are responsible for ensuring that any evidence about determining the cause of death or injury is not unnecessarily disturbed. Reporting the discovery of dead or injured listed species is required in all cases to enable the Service to determine whether the level of incidental take exempted by the BO is exceeded, and to ensure that the terms and conditions are appropriate and effective. Parties finding a dead, injured, or sick specimen of any bat (regardless of species), or other endangered or threatened species, must promptly notify the USFWS Bloomington Field Office at (812) 334-4261. (USFWS)
12. A "Reinitiation Notice" is required if: more than 54.1 acres of total trees are to be cleared; more than 4.3 acres of removal of suitable habitat occurs between 100-300 feet from the edge of pavement; any tree clearing occurs beyond 300 feet from the edge of pavement; and if the project takes more than five Indiana bats and/or five NLEBs as a result of bridge, culvert, or structure activity; new information about listed species is encountered; new species is listed or critical habitat designated that the project may affect; the project is modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species; or, new information reveals that the project may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner not considered in the BO or the project information. (USFWS)
13. Bridge and culvert inspections occurred in 2021-2022 and identified bats at one bridge location (Bridge I64-122-04988 C). No other structures showed evidence of bats). USFWS Bridge/Structure Assessment are only valid for two years. If construction will begin after June 17, 2023, an inspection of the structures listed in Appendix C, pages 42-46 by a qualified individual, must be performed. Inspection of the structures should check for presence of bats/bat indicators and/or presence of birds. The results of the inspection must indicate no signs of bats or birds. If signs of bats or birds are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. (INDOT ESD)
14. Any work in a wetland area within ROW or in borrow/waste areas is prohibited unless specifically allowed in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit. (INDOT ESD)
15. Upon completion of the environmental document phase, the noise study will be provided directly to the county's planning unit by the environmental preparer and/or member of the project team. If the project is in a municipality that has a planning unit, a noise study will also be provided to the municipality's planning unit. INDOT Environmental Services Division shall be copied on this correspondence. (INDOT ESD)

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

16. Archaeology Site 12FL222 shall be avoided by all project activities. (IDNR SHPO)
17. Archaeology Site 12FL222 will be marked on the plans as “Environmental Sensitive Area – DO NOT DISTURB” and will be marked similarly on the ground during construction. (IDNR SHPO)
18. Archaeological resources may exist underneath modern development. During construction, work crews should be alert to the possible presence of archaeological artifacts (e.g., ceramics, glass, bone, stone, tools, etc.) and features (e.g., foundations cisterns, privies, etc.) that may be encountered during construction. (IDNR SHPO)
19. To avoid damage to historic properties, INDOT shall ensure that a Construction Vibration Monitoring and Control Plan (“Plan”) is developed by the design-build team prior to beginning any construction activities. The Plan shall at least include all buildings within historic properties or districts within 140 feet of project construction activities. The Plan will include the following key elements: (INDOT CRO)
  - a. The Plan will include the following key elements:
    - i. Identifying buildings that are sensitive to vibration;
    - ii. Conducting pre-construction surveys of residences, historic buildings, and other vibration-sensitive structures in the project corridor to determine the appropriate vibration limits for the type of structure and conditions of the structure;
    - iii. Developing and implementing a vibration monitoring program for construction activities; ensuring that, whenever vibration levels exceed the maximum thresholds identified in Table 1 below, construction work causing that vibration will immediately stop until such time as qualified professionals have determined that modifications have been made in the construction activities to assure that no damage shall occur to historic properties;
    - iv. Conducting post-construction surveys;
    - v. Phasing construction activities that create vibration so that multiple sources of vibration do not occur at the same time;
    - vi. Prohibiting or limiting certain activities that create higher vibration levels during specific nighttime hours;
    - vii. Developing a method for responding to community complaints; and
    - viii. Keeping the public informed of proposed construction schedules, and identifying activities known to be a source of vibration.
  - b. Maximum thresholds for historic properties that shall not be exceeded are shown in Table 1. The values are presented in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV), the accepted method for evaluating the potential for damage.
  - c. In the event vibration damage does occur as a result of the Improve 64 project construction activities (as evidenced by the pre- and post-construction surveys), INDOT shall ensure that the contractor will be responsible for the cost and repair of any vibration damage to historic properties. Any repairs shall be coordinated with the Indiana SHPO to ensure they are carried out in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. This will be contingent on property owners allowing pre and post construction surveys of their buildings.
  - d. Where access to privately owned property is necessary for monitoring or damage repair, consent shall be obtained prior to entry.

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

**Table 1. Construction Vibration Thresholds (PPV)**

Type of Structure	Ground-borne Vibration Impact Level (PPV)
New Residential Structures	1.0 in/sec
Non-historic Older Residential Structures	0.50 in/sec
Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)	0.30 in/sec
Fragile (non-engineered timber and masonry buildings)	0.20 in/sec
Extremely Fragile (buildings, ruins, ancient monuments)	0.12 in/sec

20. Radio Transmitter Site (AI ID No. 32172) is located adjacent to the project area at 414 Daisy Lane, New Albany, Indiana. One 500 gallon diesel UST was closed in July of 1989. Impacted soil backfill was placed back into the excavation once removal was completed. Residual soil impacts remain on-site and the exact location of the site and the UST cavity is unknown. If excavation occurs in this area, proper handling, removal, and disposal of soil and/or groundwater may be necessary. Refer to Appendix G of the SAM Manual for the recommended procedure to manage and report contamination. (INDOT SAM)
21. The *Karst Feature Survey* identified eight non-karst springs. If avoidance is not possible, flow from the springs shall be perpetuated with a spring box or other engineered method. (INDOT EWPO)
22. If unknown karst features are discovered during construction, all work within 100 feet of the feature shall stop and the Engineer shall be notified immediately. Karst features include, but are not limited to voids, caves, sinking streams, and sinkholes. The Department will provide the treatment measures to be incorporated for the feature. The karst feature shall be protected from sedimentation runoff. Work shall not resume in the area until directed by the Engineer. (INDOT EWPO)
23. Adjacent local streets (such as Quarry Road and Captain Frank Road, and Captain Frank Road and Cherry Street) will not be closed at the same time. (INDOT ESD)
24. Roads to be used as detour routes or likely alternate routes during full closures (such as Spring Street and State Street) will not be closed at the same time. (INDOT ESD)
25. There are existing sidewalks along the north side of Cherry Street and along the south side of Spring Street. To minimize impacts to non-motorized travelers using these sidewalks, there will be no detours of the Cherry Street or Spring Street. Flaggers will be used to hold non-motorized travelers along the sidewalks during overhead work for safety purposes. The closure duration will be coordinated with INDOT construction and developed to minimize delay to non-motorized travel. (INDOT ESD)
26. Green Run Creek, Lost Knob Brook Run Creek, Holy Run Creek, and Trinity Run Creek are 303d Listed Streams impaired with *Escherichia Coli* (*E. coli*). Workers who are working in or near water with *E. coli* should take care to wear appropriate person protective equipment, observe proper hygiene procedures, including regular hand washing, and limit personal exposure. (INDOT SAM)

## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

27. Falling Run Creek, UNTs 1-3 to Falling Run Creek, Green Run Creek, UNTs 1-2 to Green Run Creek, Holy Run Creek, UNT 1 to Holy Run Creek, Little Indian Creek, UNTs 4-7 to Little Indian Creek, Lost Knob Brook Run Creek, Trinity Run Creek, UNTs 1-3 to Trinity Run Creek, and UNT 1 to Valley View Creek will be labeled on the plans as "Do Not Disturb." (INDOT ESD)
28. Wetlands 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12 will be labeled on the plans as "Do Not Disturb." (INDOT ESD)
29. If turtles are found within the work zone during construction, they should be relocated to an area of natural habitat immediately outside of the work zone. If this becomes a recurring problem, an entrenched silt fence should be installed along the edge of the work zone in that area to serve as a barrier for keeping them out of the work zone. (IDNR Div. of Nature Preserves)
30. Coordination with TARC will occur prior to the project start date regarding impacts to bus Route 71 and so they can include the detours in their system. (INDOT ESD)

### **For Further Consideration:**

1. Restrict below low-water work in streams to placement of culverts, piers, pilings and/or footings, shaping of the spill slopes around the bridge abutments, and placement of riprap. Culverts should span the active stream channel, should be either embedded or a 3-sided or open-arch culvert, and be installed where practicable on an essentially flat slope. When an open-bottom culvert or arch is used in a stream, which has a good natural bottom substrate, such as gravel, cobbles and boulders, the existing substrate should be left undisturbed beneath the culvert to provide natural habitat for the aquatic community. (USFWS)
2. Minimize the extent of hard armor (riprap) in bank stabilization by using bioengineering techniques whenever possible. If riprap is utilized for bank stabilization, extend it below low-water elevation to provide aquatic habitat. (USFWS)
3. Avoid all work within the inundated part of the stream channel (in perennial streams and larger intermittent streams) during the fish spawning season (April 1 through June 30), except for work within sealed structures such as caissons or cofferdams that were installed prior to the spawning season. No equipment shall be operated below Ordinary High-Water Mark during this time unless the machinery is within the caissons or on the cofferdams. (USFWS)
4. Evaluate wildlife crossings under bridge/culverts projects in appropriate situations. Suitable crossings include flat areas below bridge abutments with suitable ground cover, high water shelves in culverts, amphibian tunnels and diversion fencing. (USFWS)
5. For purposes of maintaining fish and wildlife passage through a crossing structure, IDNR recommends bridges rather than culverts and bottomless culverts rather than box or pipe culverts. Wide culverts are better than narrow culverts, and culverts with shorter through lengths are better than culverts with longer through lengths. If box or pipe culverts are used, the bottoms should be buried a minimum of 6" (or 20% of the culvert height/pipe diameter, whichever is greater up to a maximum of 2') below the stream bed elevation to allow a natural streambed to form within or under the crossing structure. Crossings should: span the entire channel width (a minimum of 1.2 times the OHWM width); maintain the natural stream substrate within the structure; and have stream depth, channel width, and water velocities during low-flow conditions that are approximate to those in the natural stream channel. (IDNR DFW)



## Indiana Department of Transportation

County Floyd Route I-64 and I-265 Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

6. 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. Any riprap placed at the culvert's outlet should match the outlet/invert elevation at the upstream edge of the riprap apron. Smaller stone and fines should be mixed in to match the existing stream substrate particle distribution and provide impermeability of the riprap apron/substrate so the flow does not percolate through the voids below the riprap apron's surface. The slope of the riprap should be no steeper than 20:1 from the lip of the culvert pipe to the streambed. Riprap on the inlet side should have a slope no steeper than 5:1. Natural streambed material should be backfilled within the structure where possible as it can provide refuge for species using the culvert. Natural bed materials such as large cobble and boulders should be placed within the structure (anchored if necessary) to provide flow diversity and roughness/energy dissipation. (IDNR DFW)
7. Sump depth for a pipe or box culvert should be increased/adjusted to match the structure's design life according to the background rate of bed degradation/downcutting so that the culvert does not become perched long before the culvert requires replacement. Culvert width and gradient should be appropriate for the site conditions so that flows do not scour out material from the culvert. Stream simulation design should be applied with any crossing structure. Additional information is available in Publication No. FHWA-HIF-11-008, Federal Highway Administration, Culvert Design for Aquatic Organism Passage, October 2010 (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/11008/hif11008.pdf>). (IDNR DFW)
8. Impacts to non-wetland forest of one (1) acre or more should be mitigated at a minimum 2:1 ratio. If less than one acre of non-wetland forest is removed in a rural setting, replacement should be at a 1:1 ratio based on area. Impacts to non-wetland forest under one (1) acre in an urban setting should be mitigated by planting five trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height (dbh), for each tree which is removed that is 10" dbh or greater (5:1 mitigation based on the number of large trees) or by using the 1:1 replacement ratio based on area depending on the type of habitat impacted (individual canopy tree removal in an urban streetscape or park-like environment versus removal of habitat supporting a tree canopy, woody understory, and herbaceous layer). Impacts under 0.10 acre in an urban area may still involve the replacement of large diameter trees but typically do not require any additional mitigation or additional plantings beyond seeding and stabilizing disturbed areas. There are exceptions for high quality habitat sites however. (IDNR DFW)
9. Limit the use of riprap on the channel banks to toe protection and do not place riprap in the bed of the channel. Use alternative erosion protection materials whenever possible. From the riprap toe protection to the top of the bank, heavy duty erosion control blankets or turf reinforcement mats or a similar bioengineering materials should be used and these materials should be seeded with native plants to allow a natural, vegetated stream bank to develop. Information about bioengineering techniques can be found at <http://www.in.gov/legislative/iac/20120404-IR-312120154NRA.xml.pdf>. Also, the following is a USDA/NRCS document that outlines many different bioengineering techniques for streambank stabilization: <http://directives.sc.egov.usda.gov/17553.wba>. (IDNR DFW)
10. If LED lighting is used there is the potential for negative impacts to fish, wildlife and botanical resources as certain types of LED lighting can have negative impacts on both human and wildlife health and safety. The International Dark-Sky Association has developed a set of recommendations for those choosing LED lighting systems. These suggestions will aid in the selection of lighting that is energy and cost efficient, yet ensures safety and security, protects wildlife, and promotes the goal of reducing light pollution. The Division of Fish & Wildlife strongly encourages visiting the IDA's website to learn more about selecting lighting fixtures that minimize the harmful effects of lighting on humans and wildlife (see <http://darksky.org/lighting/lighting-basics/>) and about the potential negative impacts of improperly selected LED lighting systems (see <http://darksky.org/light-pollution/light-pollution-solutions/>). (IDNR DFW)

**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County Floyd

Route I-64 and I-265

Des. No. 1900162 (Lead), et al.

11. Do not excavate in the low flow area except for the placement of piers, foundations, and riprap, or removal of the old structure. (IDNR DFW)
12. Do not construct any temporary runarounds, access bridges, causeways, cofferdams, diversions, or pumpharounds. (IDNR DFW)
13. 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)
14. Bridge I64-122-04988 C, which carries I-64 over Cherry Street, has shown evidence of use (i.e. guano and/or live bats) by a non-listed bat species during the July 17, 2021 inspection. To minimize bat disturbance, the rehabilitation of the structure shall be completed after September 30 and before April 1. If the structure rehabilitation on any area of the bridge/structure the bats are using cannot be completed before April 1, the area(s) shall temporarily be filled with an expandable material prior to active bat season. The structure shall also be inspected for bats prior to demolition, exclusion, or any construction activities. If signs of bats are documented during this inspection, the INDOT District Environmental Manager must be contacted immediately. Coordination has occurred on May 16, 2023 with the project designer about exclusionary measure needed for the project. Details of the required procedures are outlined in the "Bat Inspection and Coordination USP". (INDOT)

## APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Appendix A: INDOT Supporting Documentation

Categorical Exclusion Level Thresholds Table .....	1
--	---

### Appendix B: Graphics

Project Location Map .....	1
United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic Maps .....	2
Project Improvements Overview Map .....	4
Aerial Photograph/Photograph Location Maps .....	5
Site Photographs .....	13
Preliminary Roadway Design Plans .....	24
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (US 150 over I-64, Des. Nos. 1800706 and 1800405) .....	154
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 EB over Quarry Road, Des. No. 1700207) .....	156
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 WB over Quarry Road, Des. No. 2200015) .....	164
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 WB over I-64 EB Ramp to I-265 EB, Des. No. 1702617) .....	172
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (New I-64 EB Ramp to I-265 EB, Des. No. 2200016) .....	180
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 WB over I-265 Ramp to I-64 EB, Des. No. 1800721) .....	187
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-265 WB Ramp to I-64 EB to I-265 EB, Des. No. 2200019) .....	195
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 EB over Captain Frank Road, Des. No. 2200017) .....	202
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 WB over Captain Frank Road, Des. No. 2200018) .....	211
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 over Cherry Street, Des. No. 1702614) .....	221
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-265 EB and Ramp over State Street, Des. Nos. 2000326 and 2000323) .....	227
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-265 WB over State Street, Des. No. 2000234) .....	235
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 over Spring Street, Des. No. 2200719) .....	242
Preliminary Bridge Design Plans (I-64 WB Ramp over I-64 Ramp to Spring/Elm Streets, Des. No. 2200718) .....	249
Preliminary I-64/Spring Street Ramp Closure Detours.....	254

### Appendix C: Early Coordination

Sample Early Coordination Letter .....	1
New Beginnings Community Church Early Coordination Letter.....	5
City of New Albany Stormwater Department Early Coordination Letter .....	9
Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) Ground Water Section Response .....	13
New Albany City Plan Commission Response.....	14
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Response .....	16
Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Response .....	18
Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) Response .....	19
IDNR State Herpetologist Response .....	23
Indiana Geological & Water Survey Automated Response .....	24
Section 7 Rangewide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Forms .....	26
Section 7 Standard Information Consultation Letter to USFWS.....	35
Section 7 USFWS Response .....	64
Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Meeting #1 Minutes (August 24, 2022).....	69

TMP Meeting #2 Minutes (May 5, 2023) .....	80
<b>Appendix D: Section 106 of the NHPA</b>	
State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Concurrence Letter for No Adverse Effect Finding.....	1
Eastern Shawnee Response Letter for No Adverse Effect Finding .....	3
No Adverse Effect Finding Public Notice .....	4
800.11(e) Documentation/Finding Transmittal Email to SHPO.....	6
800.11(e) Documentation/Finding Transmittal Email to Consulting Parties.....	7
800.11(e) Documentation/Finding Transmittal Email to Tribes.....	8
800.11(e) Documentation/Finding Report Distribution Letter .....	10
800.11(e) Documentation/Finding .....	15
<b>Appendix E: Red Flag and Hazardous Materials</b>	
Red Flag Investigation .....	1
<b>Appendix F: Water Resources</b>	
Waters of the U.S. Report .....	1
National Wetlands Inventory Maps .....	19
IDNR Floodplain Map .....	25
<b>Appendix G: Public Involvement</b>	
Sample Notice of Entry for Survey (February 12, 2021).....	1
Sample Notice of Entry for Survey (June 10, 2021).....	3
Sample Notice of Entry for Survey (March 31, 2022).....	4
Sample Notice of Entry for Survey (April 7, 2022).....	5
Sample Notice of Entry for Survey (August 5, 2022) .....	6
Original Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Member List.....	7
Additional CAC Member List .....	8
CAC Meeting #1 Minutes (August 3, 2021) .....	9
CAC Meeting #1 Presentation (August 3, 2021).....	12
CAC/Environmental Justice (EJ) Working Group Meeting Minutes (August 9, 2022) .....	17
CAC/EJ Working Group/Public Information Meeting #1 Presentation (August 9, 2022/August 17, 2022).....	20
Public Information Meeting #1 Public Notice (August 17, 2022) .....	35
Public Information Meeting #1 Flier (English) (August 17, 2022).....	37
Public Information Meeting #1 Flier (Spanish) (August 17, 2022) .....	38
Public Information Meeting #1 Project Fact Sheet (August 17, 2022) .....	39
Public Information Meeting #1 Project Frequently Asked Questions (August 17, 2022) .....	41
Public Comment Period #1 List of Commenters .....	44
Public Comment Period #1 Comments and Responses .....	46
Public Comment Period #1 Comments .....	70
<b>Appendix H: Air Quality</b>	
FHWA FY 2024-2028 STIP Approval Letter .....	1
INDOT FY 2024-2028 STIP Submittal Letter.....	3
FHWA FY 2024-2028 STIP Amendment 2 Approval Letter.....	5
KIPDA FY 2023-2026 TIP Amendment 3 Project Listing Page.....	7

**Appendix I: Traffic Noise Analysis**

Revised Final Traffic Noise Technical Report INDOT Approval Email ..... 1  
Revised Final Traffic Noise Technical Report Excerpt..... 2

**Appendix J: Environmental Justice Analysis Memorandum**

Environmental Justice Analysis INDOT Approval Email..... 1  
Environmental Justice Analysis Memorandum ..... 2

**Appendix K: Final Engineer’s Report Excerpt**

Final Engineer’s Report Excerpt ..... 1

**Appendix L: Additional Studies/Reports**

Design Criteria for Bridges Information and Tables ..... 1  
Karst Feature Survey Report ..... 16  
Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Grant List..... 26

**Appendix M: Greenhouse Gas Analysis**

Greenhouse Gas Analysis INDOT Concurrence Email..... 1  
Greenhouse Gas Analysis Memorandum ..... 2