FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

For

Indiana Project
Des. No. 1297017
Chicago Street, from Indiana/ Illinois state line to White Oak Avenue,
City of Hammond
Lake County, Indiana

An environmental assessment (EA) was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on March 16, 2015. This project provides for the reconstruction and widening of the Chicago Street corridor that utilizes three streets: Gostlin Street (from the Indiana/ Illinois state line to Sheffield Avenue), Sheffield Avenue (from Gostlin Street to Chicago Street), and Chicago Street (from Sheffield Avenue to White Oak Avenue).

A public hearing was held on April 22, 2015 on the EA. No revisions or modifications to the design of this project, which would alter the scope or intent of this project or would increase any impacts to either the natural or human environments, have been made.

The FHWA has determined that this project will have no significant impact on the natural and human environment. The FHWA is issuing a Section 4(f) de minimis finding on the Irving Park property. This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is based on the environmental assessment that has been independently evaluated by the FHWA and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the environmental issues and impacts of the proposed project. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an environmental impact statement is not required. The FHWA takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope and content of the enclosed Environmental Assessment.

7/27/2015

Date

Richard J. Marquis
Division Administrator
June 24, 2015

Mr. Rick Marquis  
Division Administrator  
FHWA, Indiana Division  
575 N. Pennsylvania St., Room 254  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: FONSI Request Packet  
Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction Project  
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana  
Des. No. 1297017

Dear Mr. Marquis:

We would request the timely review of the attached information packet necessary for the preparation of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) regarding the aforementioned project pursuant to 40 CFR, Part 1500.4q and paragraph 5 of the DOT Order 5610.1C implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. This information packet includes the following documents:

1. Approved Environmental Assessment (Text Only)  
2. Final Section 106 Documentation  
3. Final Section 4(f) Documentation (*de minimis*)  
4. Official Public Hearing Transcript and the disposition of the comments received  
5. Project Commitments

On March 16, 2015 the Environmental Assessment for this project was released by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for public involvement. A public hearing was held on April 22, 2015. Certification of Public Involvement was received on May 12, 2015 (Attachment 1).

The Section 106 Area of Potential Effect (APE) Determination (36 CFR 800.4(a)(1)), and the Finding of No Historic Properties Affected (36 CFR 800.4(c)(2)), was approved by INDOT, on behalf of FHWA, on July 15, 2013 and concurred with by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on August 20, 2013 (Attachment 3).

Irving Park, operated by the City of Hammond Department of Parks and Recreation, was identified in the project limits as a Section 4(f) resource. The proposed project would convert approximately 0.001 acre of land from Irving Park to a transportation use for reconstruction of the sidewalk along Irving Park Drive and Chicago Street. The City of Hammond Parks and Recreation Department has determined that the project would not
adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes that qualify Irving Park for protection under Section 4(f). The impacts to Irving Park was processed as a de minimis evaluation (Attachment 3). FHWA issuance of a de minimis finding will be concurrent with issuance of the FONSI. There are no other Section 4(f) resources or Section 6(f) resources associated with this project.

No revisions or modifications to the design of this project, which would alter the scope or intent of this project or would increase any impacts to either the natural or human environments have been made. All commitments made in the Environmental Assessment will be satisfied.

Upon the satisfactory completion of your review of the FONSI request information packet, we would request preparation of the necessary FONSI for this project in order to complete the NEPA process.

Sincerely,

Ronald E. Bales
Environmental Policy Manager
INDOT, Environmental Services Division

Attachments:

1. Approved Environmental Assessment (Text Only) – Pages 1-39
2. Final Section 106 Documentation – Pages 1-50
3. Section 4(f) Documentation (de minimis) – Pages 1-7
4. Official Public Hearing Transcript and the disposition of the comments received – Pages 1-50
5. Project Commitments – Pages 1-2
Attachment 1 (pages 1-39)
Approved Environmental Assessment (Text Only)
**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County: Lake  
Route: Chicago Street  
Des. No: 1297017  

**FHWA-Indiana Environmental Document**

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM**

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road No./County:</th>
<th>Chicago Street / Lake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation Number:</td>
<td>1297017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description/Terminus:</td>
<td>Reconstruction and widening of the Chicago Street corridor from the Indiana/Illinois state line to White Oak Avenue, the eastern Hammond city limits. The Chicago Street corridor utilizes three streets: Gostlin Street (from the Indiana/Illinois state line to Sheffield Avenue), Sheffield Avenue (from Gostlin Street to Chicago Street), and Chicago Street (from Sheffield Avenue to White Oak Avenue).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

**Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESM Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ES Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Release for Public Involvement**

**ESM Initials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th><strong>ES Initials</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Initials]</td>
<td>May 12, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certification of Public Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Signature]</th>
<th>May 12, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INDOT EIS/District Env. Reviewer Signature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature] Date: 3/16/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name and Organization of C/EIA Preparer:**

| Briana M. Hope and Amy L. Maltz, American Structurepoint, Inc. |

This is page 1 of 39  
Project name: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction  
Date: March 6, 2015

Form Valid: June 2013
Part I - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

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

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

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

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

Remarks:  
A Public Involvement Plan was prepared to outline the steps to be taken to engage the public in the project development. The Public Involvement Plan is included in Appendix F, Page F-1 to F-7. Public involvement activities include the following.

Project Website
The project website, www.GoChicagoStreet.com, is periodically updated with project-related information including:
- Project news, updates, and press releases
- Project schedules
- Listings of project meetings
- Summaries of prior public meetings
- Copies of various project-related documents
- Contact information for providing comments
- Project maps
- Links to related webpages including Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC), Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Press Releases and Public Notices
Press releases are provided by the project management team at key project milestones. These press releases are distributed to regional media including television, radio, and newspapers. Press releases are also posted to the City of Hammond’s webpage and the project website.

A Notice of Public Information Meeting and Planned Improvement was published on April 22, 2013 and April 29, 2013 in The Times of Northwest Indiana, and on May 1, 2013 in the Post Tribune, advertising two public information meetings to be held on May 7, 2013. The notice was also mailed to adjacent property owners. A copy of this public notice is included in Appendix F, Page F-8 to F-15. A summary of the public meetings is provided below.

A Legal Notice of Historic Effect and Section 4(f) Property Effect was published in The Times of Northwest Indiana on July 25, 2013 and the Post Tribune on July 27, 2013. The notice was also mailed to Section 106 Consulting Parties. A copy of this notice is included in Appendix C, Page C-45 to C-49. A thirty (30) day public comment period, ending on August 30, 2014, was offered. No comments were received.

Public Meetings
Two public information meetings were held on May 7, 2013. The first meeting was held at City Hall at 12:30 p.m. and was attended by approximately 35 people. The second meeting was held at Washington Irving
Middle School at 6:00 p.m. and was attended by approximately 25 people. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the project’s purpose and need, the alternatives being investigated, and to provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed project. Conceptual plans of the proposed project were on display for public review. Comment sheets were available at the meetings. One written comment was received from a property owner along the project corridor. The comment was in favor of Alternative 1.4 and cited property damage, safety concerns, and noise as negative existing conditions along the corridor. Public information meeting materials are located in Appendix F, Page F-8 to F-44.

Other Group Meetings
Community Advisory Committee (CAC) applications were made available at the May 7, 2013 public information meeting. All applications received were accepted. A CAC Meeting was held July 23, 2013 at the Hammond City Library at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was attended by sixteen people and provided an overview of the project along with a discussion of the design issues and community concerns related to the project. The meeting’s discussion was mostly centered on general project topics such as aesthetics, flooding, and snow removal. When asked to identify what they felt were the benefits of the project, CAC members cited investment in the community, bringing people back to the north side of the city, creating a boulevard, safety, and creating a noise buffer as being the primary benefits. The CAC members identified property acquisition and concerns regarding use of the roundabout, particularly by the elderly population, as being the negative aspects of the project. A copy of the meeting’s agenda, handout sheets, sign in sheets, and meeting minutes are included in Appendix F, Page F-45 to F-71. A second CAC meeting will be held after environmental approval as the project team moves forward with design.

Additional Outreach
In addition to the webpage, press releases, mailings to adjacent property owners, and legal notices typically utilized for project outreach, other non-traditional methods have been incorporated into the public involvement process for the proposed project. These methods include the use of lawn signs and flyers posted along the project corridor and announcements made via social media to distribute information on public meetings and project milestones. Additionally, project team contact information is included on the project website, including a dedicated project email address and consultant and city contact information. This has been done in an effort to provide the community with a consistent and easy method to reach the project team with comments and concerns.

Public Hearing
In accordance with the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Public Involvement Policy, regulation 23 CFR 771.111(h)(2)(iii), a public hearing will be held. The hearing will be scheduled after the approval of the Environmental Assessment (EA) document. The EA document will be made available for public review for a period of at least thirty (30) days. The public hearing will be advertised in local news media. Each identified property owner along the project corridor, as well as elected officials with an interest in the project, may be sent a copy of the public notice. The public hearing will include an informal open house, formal presentation, and formal public comment period. Comments will be accepted for thirty (30) days following the hearing. Comments or concerns brought forth by the public during this process will be documented and addressed in the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) request document which will be submitted to FHWA.

Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds
Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts? Yes X

Remarks: There is no known substantial controversy concerning this project with respect to community and/or natural resource impacts.
Part II - General Project Identification, Description, and Design Information

Sponsor of the Project: City of Hammond, Indiana
Local Name of the Facility: Chicago Street, Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue
INDOT District: LaPorte

Funding Source (mark all that apply): Federal X State X Local X Other*
*If other is selected, please indentify the funding source: ____________________________

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

The purpose of this proposed action is to improve safety, reduce congestion, enhance mobility, address deteriorating infrastructure, and create a unified east-west corridor along the Chicago Street corridor (former SR 312) from the Indiana/Illinois state line to White Oak Avenue, the eastern Hammond city limits.

The need of this proposed action is a result of existing safety, congestion, deteriorating infrastructure, and mobility concerns as well as a lack of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond.

Safety
Safety issues along the corridor include substandard horizontal curvature, substandard intersection turning radii, lack of designated turning lanes, unrestricted access, and poorly defined lane configurations. According to 2010-2012 accident data (Appendix I, Page I-100 to I-104) provided by the City of Hammond, the 2.1 mile long project corridor averaged 80 crashes a year or almost one crash every 4.5 days, with roughly 20 percent of these crashes resulting in either an injury or fatality and the remaining 80 percent resulting in property damage. Approximately 29 percent of the crashes annually were rear end collisions which are often the result of vehicles stopped in the travel lane due to congestion at intersections or vehicles stopped to turn into one of the numerous access points which line the project corridor.

In addition, Chicago Street is a designated truck route through Hammond, with approximately 2,700 commercial vehicles (20-percent of the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)) traveling this route daily. Given the existing variable lane widths; poor roadway geometry at Gostlin Street near the Indiana/Illinois state line; the tight turning radius at the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue; and the 90 degree turn and three-way stop at the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street, commercial vehicles maneuvering this corridor frequently experience difficulty. Vehicles, particularly semi-trailers, depart the pavement at intersections with substandard turning radii, traversing the sidewalks and residential property. These conditions result in the loss of loads; cause damage to curbs, sidewalks, and private property; and create a safety concern for pedestrians and bicyclists along the project corridor.

Congestion Mitigation
As part of the NIRPC Congestion Management Process (CMP), all regionally significant projects are evaluated for their potential impact on congestion relief prior to being amended into the Comprehensive Regional Plan. The goal of the CMP is to first relieve congestion through the implementation of demand management strategies, such as car pool promotion and school pool promotion; then growth management strategies, such as promotion of more transit and cargo oriented development and improvements to land use patterns; and finally transportation system strategies. If all recommended alternate strategies prove incapable of relieving congestion within the corridor, then capacity expansion may be considered.

In September 2011, the project corridor was evaluated by NIRPC’s Congestion Management Committee (CMC). The evaluation identified traffic congestion issues at a number of locations along Chicago Street. As indicated above, commercial vehicle traffic accounts for approximately 20 percent of the traffic along the project corridor. Large semi-trucks have a difficult time maneuvering turns along the project corridor, especially at the intersection of Gostlin Street...
and Sheffield Avenue and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. Semi-trucks frequently encroach on the opposing travel lane and/or adjacent sidewalk when making these turns and occasionally strike roadside barriers. The inability of large vehicles to easily maneuver through these intersections causes both traffic delays and safety concerns.

Another cause of congestion is the inconsistent lane structure along the Chicago Street corridor. West of the Indiana/Illinois state line, Brainard Avenue is comprised of two lanes in each direction and only one lane in each direction east of the Indiana/Illinois state line. East of Calumet Avenue (US 41), the Chicago Street corridor is comprised of two lanes in each direction. West of Calumet Avenue, the Chicago Street corridor is comprised of only one lane in each direction.

The NIRPC Congestion Management Evaluation Form for Capacity Adding TIP Projects for the Chicago Avenue Reconstruction and Widening Project indicates congestion and substandard level of service throughout the project corridor. Level of service (LOS) is a scale (A through F) which classifies operating conditions of roads. According to INDOT standards, an LOS of A, B, or C indicates a roadway is operating acceptably. Depicted below in Table 1 is a summary of the 2008 and projected 2040 traffic conditions along the Chicago Street corridor from the Congestion Management Evaluation Form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Volume /Capacity (V/C) Ratio for 2008</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM V/C Ratio for 2008</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM V/C Ratio for 2008</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offpeak V/C Ratio for 2008</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total V/C Ratio for 2040</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected AM V/C Ratio for 2040</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected PM V/C Ratio for 2040</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Offpeak V/C Ratio for 2040</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed/Posted Speed 2008</td>
<td>8.18/35 MPH = 23%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed/Posted Speed 2040</td>
<td>13.76/35 MPH = 39%</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Level of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobility
The vision for Northwest Indiana, as indicated in NIRPC’s 2040 Comprehensive Regional Plan: A Vision for Northwest Indiana (CRP), is focused on new growth and development in existing core urban areas, where infrastructure and urban service are readily available. Increasing the mobility, accessibility, and transportation options for people and freight was identified as one of the primary transportation goals in the CRP. The objectives of this goal, as they relate to freight mobility, include improving freight facilities connecting the region to national and global markets, reducing congestion on major freight routes, and integrating local, regional, and national transportation systems to facilitate the movement of freight between modes. The plan further identifies the need for a direct route between industrial facilities located in Illinois and Indiana. Chicago Street is currently a designated truck route through Hammond with approximately 2,700 commercial vehicles (20-percent of the AADT) traveling this route daily. To improve the mobility of people, Complete Streets are prioritized in the CRP. Complete Streets are streets designed to enable safe access for all roadway users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and public transit users.

Deteriorating Infrastructure
The existing asphalt pavement is severely deteriorated with significant cracking, including severe transverse cracking and block and edge cracking, and patching visible throughout the entire corridor. The pavement rating of “poor” or “structural improvements required” was assigned based on Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) Manual (Transportation Information Center, 2002). Curbs and sidewalks along the corridor are deteriorated due to age and being struck by vehicles making tight radius turns.
Develop an East-West Corridor

A need exists for an east-west corridor that connects the industrial areas which lie west of the project area with the manufacturing and commercial areas which lie east of the project area. Currently there is no feasible alternative east-west corridor which connects these two areas within the vicinity of the project corridor.

As previously indicated, commercial vehicle traffic accounts for approximately 20 percent of the traffic within the project corridor. The combination of large truck volumes and the existing substandard intersection turning radii results in congestion and unsafe conditions for other motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists along the corridor.

The project corridor is vital to many companies for the sale, manufacture, and distribution of their goods and services. Among these is the Lear Corporation, located at 1401 165th Street in Hammond, which manufactures seats and transports them via truck along the project corridor to the Ford manufacturing plant located at 12600 South Torrance Avenue in Illinois. Another example is Scrap Metal Services, located at 13830 Brainard Avenue in Burnham, Illinois, which uses the project corridor to transport scrap metal from steel mills and petroleum facilities located in the cities of Hammond and East Chicago, Indiana. In addition, the following industrial sites are located along or near the project corridor and utilize the designated truck route for transportation: Arrow Terminals – Kindermorgan, LZ Lamforder Company, Dakota System, American Sweetener Corporation, LaFarge North America, Chicago Enterprise Center, Calumet Lubricants, Calumet Container, Cargill, and Atlas Tube.

Furthermore, as the primary arterial for traffic entering the State of Indiana and the City of Hammond from Illinois and East Chicago, the Chicago Street corridor is a gateway into Hammond from both the east and the west. A secondary goal of the City of Hammond is to provide a gateway corridor into their community which includes appropriate sidewalks, curb and gutters, and lighting.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):

County: Lake
Municipality: City of Hammond

Limits of Proposed Work: Gostlin Street (from the Indiana/Illinois state line to Sheffield Avenue), Sheffield Avenue (from Gostlin Street to Chicago Street), and Chicago Street (from Sheffield Avenue to White Oak Avenue)

Total Work Length: 2.1 Mile(s)  
Total Work Area: 29.5 Acre(s)

Is an Interchange Modification Study / Interchange Justification Study (IMS/IJS) required? Yes¹ No
If yes, when did the FHWA grant a conditional approval for this project?

¹If an IMS or IJS is required; a copy of the approved CE/EA document must be submitted to the FHWA with a request for final approval of the IMS/IJS.

In the remarks box below, describe existing conditions, provide in detail the scope of work for the project, including the preferred alternative. Include a discussion of logical termini. Discuss any major issues for the project and how the project will improve safety or roadway deficiencies if these are issues.
Existing Conditions

The Chicago Street corridor (former SR 312) is classified as a Minor Arterial from the Indiana/Illinois state line to Calumet Avenue. East of Calumet Avenue, it is classified as a Principal Arterial. In 2009, the City of Hammond initiated discussions with INDOT regarding relinquishment of the SR 312 corridor to the city. The City requested relinquishment of this roadway due to poor maintenance of the roadway and the City’s desire to upgrade the project corridor to an urban gateway to the city. INDOT relinquished SR 312 to the City of Hammond in 2011 with the agreement that the corridor would remain a designated truck route. See Appendix I, Page I-105 to I-119 for a copy of the Road Transfer Memorandum of Agreement.

The existing storm water infrastructure consists of roadway inlets that lead to an enclosed storm sewer system, which outlets into the Grand Calumet River. The surrounding land use is a mix of residential, institutional, commercial, and light industrial, with many of the building faces located at the existing right-of-way line.

The Chicago Street corridor utilizes three streets: Gostlin Street (from the Indiana/Illinois state line to Sheffield Avenue), Sheffield Avenue (from Gostlin Street to Chicago Street), and Chicago Street (from Sheffield Avenue to White Oak Avenue).

- **Gostlin Street** consists of two 20-foot wide travel lanes. Curb is sporadic through this segment. West of Wabash Avenue, sidewalk is present on both sides of the roadway and offset approximately 12-feet behind the back of curb. Between Wabash Avenue and Sheffield Avenue, the sidewalk is not offset from the roadway.
- **Sheffield Avenue** consists of two 17-foot wide travel lanes with a 12-foot wide parking lane located adjacent to the northbound lane. No curb is present along this segment of Sheffield Avenue. Sidewalk is present on both sides of the roadway with no offset from the roadway.
- **Chicago Street**, from Sheffield Avenue to Calumet Avenue, consists of two 12-foot wide travel lanes with a 9-foot wide parking lane adjacent to both travel lanes. Curb is sporadic through this segment. Sidewalk is present on both sides of the roadway with no offset from the parking lane.
- **Chicago Street**, between Calumet Avenue and White Oak Avenue, consists of four 12-foot wide travel lanes with a 9-foot wide unimproved shoulder. Curb is sporadic through this segment. Sidewalk is present on both sides of the roadway with no offset from the shoulder. Adjacent residents often park their vehicles on the unimproved shoulder.

Logical Termini

The western terminus is the western limits of the City of Hammond and the Indiana state border with Illinois. The eastern terminus is the eastern limits of the City of Hammond.

Scope of Work – Preferred Alternative

In order to individually address the unique issues in different section of the corridor, the project is broken into four segments:

- Segment 1: Gostlin Street, from the Illinois/Indiana state line to Sheffield Avenue
- Segment 2: Sheffield Avenue, from Gostlin Street to Chicago Street, and Chicago Street from Sheffield Avenue to Hohman Avenue
- Segment 3: Chicago Street from Hohman Avenue to Baltimore Avenue
- Segment 4: Chicago Street from Calumet Avenue to White Oak Avenue

The overall preferred alternative for the corridor was selected by determining the preferred alternative for each of the four segments. The preferred alternative includes Segment Alternative 1.4, Segment Alternative 2.3, Segment Alternative 3.2, and Segment Alternative 4.2 (described in detail below). The preferred alternative would consist of approximately 2.1 miles of road reconstruction. The two proposed roundabouts would consist of a one-lane 18-foot wide circulatory roadway, 16-foot wide truck apron, and an 82-foot diameter center island. New concrete curb and gutter, enclosed storm sewer, and sidewalks would be installed throughout the project corridor.
Segment Alternative 1.4 Off-Alignment, Roundabout
The typical section of the realigned roadway would consist of two 12-foot wide travel lanes in each direction, a 17-foot wide raised median, and a 5-foot wide sidewalk offset 5 feet to the north of the roadway. The horizontal curve radius on Gostlin Street near the Indiana/Illinois state line would be corrected in order to meet INDOT design standards for a 40 mph design speed. The 40 mph design speed is intended to serve as a transition between the 45 mph speed limit in Illinois and the 35 mph speed limit in Indiana. This correction would be made by realigning the roadway to the south. The existing Gostlin Street would be retained and improved. Clark Avenue, Grover Avenue, and Wabash Avenue would not connect to the realigned roadway. Traffic from these streets would use Dearborn Avenue to connect to the realigned roadway. The existing Gostlin Street would no longer connect to Brainard Avenue or Sheffield Avenue. The intersection of the realigned roadway and Sheffield Avenue would be reconstructed as a one-lane roundabout with a right turn bypass lane from eastbound Gostlin Street to southbound Sheffield Avenue.

Segment Alternative 2.3 Free Flow with Roundabout
The typical section of this roadway segment would consist of one 12-foot wide travel lane in each direction, a 14-foot wide two-way left-turn lane, and a 6-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. The existing three-way stop intersection at Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street would be realigned and replaced with a continuous flow curve. A one-lane roundabout with a right turn partial bypass lane from westbound Chicago Street to northbound Hohman Avenue would be constructed at the existing intersection of Chicago Street and Hohman Avenue.

Segment Alternative 3.2 Widening the Curves
The typical section of this roadway segment would consist of two 12-foot wide travel lanes in each direction and a 6-foot wide sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. Chicago Street would be widened generally along the existing centerline. The roadway would be realigned slightly north between Towle Avenue and Henry Avenue, and slightly south between Henry Avenue and Torrence Avenue in order to minimize potential right-of-way and residential acquisitions.

Segment Alternative 4.2 Reconstruction
The typical section of this roadway segment would consist of two 12-foot wide travel lanes in each direction and a reconstructed 6-foot wide sidewalk on each side of the roadway.

Satisfaction of Project Purpose and Need
Safety
The preferred alternative addresses the existing safety need by reducing the number of access points between the western project limits and Sheffield Avenue, correcting horizontal curve radii and substandard intersection turning radii, and adding designated turn lanes.

Congestion Mitigation
According to the NIRPC analysis, the addition of travel lanes, demand management strategies, and roadway improvements is anticipated to improve the LOS of the project corridor from LOS D to LOS A. Table 2 provides a summary of the strategies considered by the CMP and the resulting impact on the LOS. As indicated below in Table 2, a combination of added travel lanes, demand management, and roadway improvements would yield the greatest level of service improvement.
Table 2. NIRPC Transportation Strategies to Improve LOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS 2008</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS with Demand Management* 2008</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS with Demand Management &amp; Improvements 2008</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS with Demand Management &amp; Added Travel Lanes 2008</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS with Added Travel Lanes, Demand Management, and Improvements 2008</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Demand Management includes strategies such as car pool promotion and school pool promotion

Mobility

The preferred alternative improves mobility by correcting horizontal curve radii and intersection turning radii, allowing commercial trucks to navigate the corridor easier and faster. The proposed roundabouts feature mountable truck aprons to allow trucks ample room to drive around the roundabouts. Mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists is also improved due to upgrades to sidewalks including ADA-compliance, construction of roundabouts for safer pedestrian street crossings at intersections, and the addition of shoulders where feasible.

Deteriorating Infrastructure

The preferred alternative would improve the condition of the roadway, sidewalks, and curbs throughout the project corridor. The storm and sanitary sewer would also be improved throughout the project corridor.

Develop and East-West Corridor

The preferred alternative would provide an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond and would effectively connect the industrial, manufacturing, and commercial areas identified in the project need with a roadway capable of handling heavy commercial truck traffic.

For the entire proposed project, a total of approximately 7.48 acres of new permanent and 2.34 acres of temporary right-of-way would be required. Based on 2016 costs, the estimated cost of the project is $19,606,577.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

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

No Build Alternative

This alternative would leave the existing Chicago Street corridor as it currently exists and would not include any safety improvements to the existing infrastructure.

This alternative is feasible and would avoid impacts to environmental justice communities and other resources along the project corridor. The geometrics of the existing roadway do not meet the current design standards, resulting in continued safety concerns. Additionally, this alternative does not address congestion management or enhancement of the east-west travel corridor through Hammond. This alternative would not be prudent as it does not meet the purpose and need for the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration.

ALTERNATIVE CORRIDORS

Several other roadways currently included in the highway system were analyzed for their potential to meet the purpose and need. Ultimately, all alternative corridors were dismissed from further analysis because they would fail to address the existing deteriorated conditions along the Chicago Street corridor. No local roadway alternative corridors were analyzed because this would require an alteration of the designated truck route along the former SR 312. During the relinquishment process, the City of Hammond agreed that the former SR 312 would remain a designated truck route. See Appendix I, Page I-105 to I-119 for a copy of the Road Transfer Memorandum of Agreement.
Alternative Corridor Utilizing I-80 / I-94

I-80/94 is an interstate freeway that runs east-west across Lake County. This roadway is located approximately 3.75 miles south of the Chicago Street corridor. According to the NIRPC CRP, the I-80/94 corridor had a LOS ranging from D to LOS F in 2008. This roadway currently carries up to 35,000 commercial vehicles per day and is a major through road for freight.

Traffic traveling between the East Chicago/Hammond border to the Indiana/Illinois state line/Hammond border, the termini for the proposed project, would have to travel 19.2 miles to reach the same termini via SR 152, I-80/94, and Brainard Avenue instead of the 2.6 miles between SR 152 and the western project limits via the existing corridor. It should also be noted that SR 152 is not part of the heavy truck route. Therefore heavy trucks would have to travel even further, taking SR 912, I-80-94, and Brainard Avenue, adding an additional 1.5 miles. In addition to the extra travel distance, the existing safety, congestion, mobility, and infrastructure concerns identified along the Chicago Street corridor in the project purpose and need would not be addressed. This alternative corridor was dismissed from further analysis because it does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

Alternative Corridor Utilizing I-90

I-90 is an interstate toll road that extends east-west across Lake County, Indiana from the City of Gary to Hammond where it turns north and extends north-south across Hammond, Indiana toward Chicago, Illinois. This roadway crosses the existing project corridor; however, there are no exits at Chicago Street. The closest exits are at US 41, approximately two miles north of the project corridor, and at SR 912, approximately four and one-half miles southeast of the project corridor. This roadway crosses into Illinois approximately 4.8 miles north of the Chicago Street corridor.

Traffic traveling from the East Chicago/Hammond city limits to the Indiana/Illinois state line/Hammond city limits, the termini for the proposed project, would have to travel over 20 additional miles along I-90 depending on which access to I-90 is utilized. Commercial traffic utilizing only truck routes could travel over 36 additional miles. In addition to the extra travel distance, the existing safety, congestion, mobility, and infrastructure concerns identified along the Chicago Street corridor in the project purpose and need would not be addressed. Also, this alternative corridor would not address the development of the east-west travel corridor through Hammond, as I-90 extends predominately northwest-southeast across Hammond. This alternative corridor was dismissed from further analysis because it does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

Alternative Corridor Utilizing SR 912 / US 41 / US 12 / US 20

Several State and US roadways form the local roadway network crossing Lake County, Indiana. These include SR 912, US 41, US 12, and US 20. SR 912 is a state freeway which extends north-south through Lake County from I-80 north to Indiana Steel in the East Chicago Harbor, then extends west to US 41 in Hammond. Currently, the bridge structure carrying SR 912 over the Indiana Harbor Canal has been removed, and traffic has been diverted onto local streets. The portion of SR 912 which extends east-west across Hammond is approximately two miles north of the project corridor. US 41 is a state roadway which extends north-south across Hammond along Calumet Avenue. This roadway crosses the project corridor. US 12 is a state roadway which extends northwest-southeast across the Hammond lake shore, south to Columbus Street in East Chicago, and east/southeast across Lake County. US 20 follows US 12 across the Hammond lake shore to Columbus Avenue in East Chicago, but proceeds south to Michigan Street in East Chicago and then extends east across Lake County Indiana. US 12 and US 20 connect again in the downtown portion of Gary, Indiana. US 20 is the designated heavy truck route across most of northern Indiana.

Traffic traveling from the East Chicago/Hammond city limits to the Indiana/Illinois state line/Hammond city limits would have to travel over 20 additional miles to reach the same termini depending on which route is utilized. In addition to the extra travel distance, the existing safety, congestion, mobility, and infrastructure concerns identified along the Chicago Street corridor in the project purpose and need would not be addressed. This alternative corridor was dismissed from further analysis because it does not meet the purpose and need of the project.
**BRIDGE ALTERNATIVE**

This alternative would relocate the roadway along Segments 1 and 2 using two bridges to connect Brainard Avenue directly to Chicago Street near the intersection of Chicago Street and Sheffield Avenue. The two bridges would be constructed to span three railroad lines. Bridges over these three rail lines would be required as opposed to at-grade crossings due to the proximity of other rail crossings in the project area and the angle at which the roadway would intersect with the rail lines. To meet the roadway grade clearance requirements while maintaining the required clearance of the three railroads, the westernmost bridge would need to begin approximately 550 feet west of the Indiana/Illinois state line, and reconstruction on Brainard Avenue would need to extend approximately 2,500 feet west of the Indiana/Illinois state line.

This alternative would improve safety along the project corridor by correcting the substandard horizontal curve, correcting the substandard intersection turning radii, restricting access to side streets and driveways, and improving the existing lane structure. This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, improving mobility, upgrading deteriorating infrastructure, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. However, the structures would be cost prohibitive for the City of Hammond, and the project area would extend beyond city and state boundaries. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further analysis.

**SEGMENT ALTERNATIVES**

In order to individually address the unique issues in different section of the corridor, the project area is broken into four segments. Segment alternatives were analyzed in detail. The table at the end of this section summarizes the findings of the segment alternatives analysis.

**Segment Alternative 1.1: On-Alignment, Shifted North, Roundabout**

The horizontal curve radius on Gostlin Street near the Indiana/Illinois state line would be corrected in order to meet INDOT design standards for a 40 mph design speed. The existing alignment would generally be maintained, but a slight shift to the north would be necessary for this curve correction. The roadway would be widened from one travel lane in each direction to two travel lanes in each direction. The intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue would be reconstructed as a one-lane roundabout with a right turn bypass lane from eastbound Gostlin Street to southbound Sheffield Avenue.

This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, improving mobility, upgrading deteriorating infrastructure, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. This alternative would improve safety by correcting the horizontal curve radius near the Indiana/Illinois state line, correcting substandard intersection turning radii, adding turn lanes, and improving lane configuration. However this alternative would still allow unrestricted access to homes and businesses, resulting in an increased potential for accidents. This alternative was not selected because it does not address all of the safety evaluation factors and therefore does not fully meet the project purpose and need. See Appendix A, Page A-23 for a map of Alternative 1.1.

**Segment Alternative 1.2: On-Alignment, Shifted North and South, Roundabout**

The horizontal curve radius on Gostlin Street near the Indiana/Illinois state line would be corrected in order to meet INDOT design standards for a 45 mph design speed. The existing alignment would generally be maintained, but a slight shift to the north and south would be necessary for this curve correction. The roadway would be widened from one travel lane in each direction to two travel lanes in each direction. The intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue would be reconstructed as a one-lane roundabout with a right turn bypass lane from eastbound Gostlin Street to southbound Sheffield Avenue.

This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, improving mobility, upgrading deteriorating infrastructure, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. This alternative would improve safety by correcting the horizontal curve radius near the Indiana/Illinois state line, correcting substandard intersection turning radii, adding turn lanes, and improving lane configuration. However this alternative would still allow unrestricted access to homes and businesses, resulting in an increased potential for accidents. This alternative was not selected because it does not address all of the safety evaluation factors and therefore does not fully meet the project purpose and need. See Appendix A, Page A-23 for a map of Alternative 1.1.
state line, correcting substandard intersection turning radii, adding turn lanes, and improving lane configuration. However this alternative would still allow unrestricted access to homes and businesses, resulting in an increased potential for accidents. This alternative was not selected because it does not address all of the safety evaluation factors and therefore does not fully meet the project purpose and need. See Appendix A, Page A-24 for a map of Alternative 1.2.

Segment Alternative 1.3: Off-Alignment, Turning Movement
The horizontal curve radius on Gostlin Street at the Indiana/Illinois state line would be corrected in order to meet INDOT design standards for a 45 mph design speed. This correction would be made by realigning the roadway to the south. The existing Gostlin Street would be retained and improved. Clark Avenue, Grover Avenue, and Wabash Avenue would not connect to the realigned roadway. Traffic from these streets would use Dearborn Avenue to connect to the realigned roadway. The existing Gostlin Street would no longer connect to Brainard Avenue or Sheffield Avenue. The roadway would be widened from one travel lane in each direction to two travel lanes in each direction. The intersection of the realigned roadway and Sheffield Avenue would be reconstructed as a signalized intersection with a free flow turn lane for traffic from eastbound Gostlin Street to southbound Sheffield Avenue.

The proposed roadway and right-of-way associated with this alternative extends too far to the south, conflicting with the NICTD rail line. Reconstruction and relocation of the NICTD rail line is not prudent due to the increased costs associated with relocation of the rail line. This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, upgrading deteriorating infrastructure, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. This alternative would improve safety by correcting the horizontal curve radius near the Indiana/Illinois state line, correcting substandard intersection turning radii, adding turn lanes, restricting access to homes and businesses, and improving lane configuration. However this alternative would not fully address the mobility of the corridor as free flow conditions would not be maintained at all times from northbound Sheffield Avenue to westbound Gostlin Street. This alternative was not selected because it does not fully meet the project purpose and need. See Appendix A, Page A-25 for a map of Alternative 1.3.

Segment Alternative 2.1: Turning Movement
The three-way stop intersection at Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street would be reconstructed with two turning lanes for vehicles traveling westbound on Chicago Street and turning north on Sheffield Avenue. This alternative would retain the required stop and 90 degree turn for vehicles traveling south on Sheffield Avenue and turning left onto eastbound Chicago Street.

This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, upgrading deteriorating infrastructure, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. This alternative would improve safety by correcting substandard intersection turning radii, adding turn lanes, and improving lane configuration. However, this alternative would not correct the horizontal curve radii for vehicles travelling south on Sheffield Avenue and turning left onto eastbound Chicago Street. In addition, this alternative would not fully address the mobility of the corridor as free flow conditions would not be maintained at all times from northbound Sheffield Avenue to westbound Gostlin Street. This alternative was not selected because it does not fully meet the project purpose and need. See Appendix A, Page A-29 for a map of Alternative 2.1.

Segment Alternative 2.2: Free Flow with Traffic Light
The three-way stop intersection at Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street would be eliminated and replaced with a continuous flow curve with a design speed of 35 mph. As part of the new curve, Sheffield Avenue south of Chicago Street would be realigned to tie into the proposed curve north of Chicago Street. The intersection of Chicago Street and Hohman Avenue would be improved and realigned to meet current design standards while tying into the proposed roadway realignment.

This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, upgrading deteriorating infrastructure, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. This alternative
would improve safety by correcting horizontal curve radii, correcting substandard intersection turning radii, adding turn lanes, and improving lane configuration. However, this alternative would not fully address the mobility of the corridor as free flow conditions would not be maintained at the intersection of Chicago Street and Hohman Avenue. This alternative was not selected because it does not fully meet the project purpose and need. See Appendix A, Page A-30 for a map of Alternative 2.2.

**Segment Alternative 3.1: Widening Along Existing Centerline**
This alternative would widen Chicago Street to two lanes in each direction equally along the existing centerline.

This alternative would meet all of the project’s purpose and need elements. However, this alternative was not selected because it would require more relocations, permanent right-of-way acquisition, and temporary right-of-way acquisition than Segment Alternative 3.2, resulting in increased cost. Due to the increased cost, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration. See Appendix A, Page A-34 for a map of Alternative 3.1.

**Segment Alternative 4.1: Resurfacing**
This alternative would mill and resurface the existing roadway, but would not include reconstruction or construction of curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sewers, roadway lighting, or traffic signals.

This alternative would meet the project’s purpose and need elements of congestion mitigation, improving mobility, and enhancing the development of an east-west corridor through the City of Hammond. This alternative would also address all applicable safety evaluation factors. However, given the current condition of the roadway and the lack of curb and gutter and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant sidewalks, this alternative was not considered reasonable. Inclusion of ADA compliant pedestrian facilities as well as reconstruction of the roadway and other infrastructure is necessary to receive federal funding and to properly maintain the roadway. Additionally, this alternative would not replace any underground infrastructure, potentially resulting in failure of the sanitary pipes located along the corridor. This alternative was not selected because it would not fully meet the project purpose and need to improve safety and infrastructure along the project corridor. See Appendix A, Page A-38 for a map of Alternative 4.1.

**SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PURPOSE AND NEED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Curve Correction</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard Intersection Turning Radii</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Designated Turn Lanes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Access</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Defined Lane Configuration</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable because (Mark all that apply):

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

Other (Describe)

**ROADWAY CHARACTER: Segment Alternative 1.4: Gostlin Street, from Indiana/Illinois State Line to Sheffield Avenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Classification:</th>
<th>Principle Arterial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current ADT:</td>
<td>25,633 VPD (2016)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Hour Volume (DHV):</td>
<td>3,320 Truck Percentage (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed Speed (mph):</td>
<td>35 Legal Speed (mph):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Lanes:</td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Width:</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width:</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROADWAY CHARACTER: Segment Alternative 2.3: Sheffield Avenue, from Gostlin Street to Chicago Street, and Chicago Street, from Sheffield Avenue to Hohman Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Lanes:</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Width:</td>
<td>17 ft.</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width:</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>6 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ROADWAY CHARACTER: Segment Alternative 3.2: Chicago Street, from Hohman Avenue to Baltimore Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Lanes:</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Width:</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>11-12 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width:</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
<td>6 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting: [X] Urban  [ ] Suburban  [ ] Rural  
Topography: [X] Level  [ ] Rolling  [ ] Hilly
**ROADWAY CHARACTER: Segment Alternative 4.2: Chicago Street from Calumet Avenue to White Oak Avenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current ADT:</td>
<td>14,913 VPD (2016)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Hour Volume (DHV):</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed Speed (mph):</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Lanes:</td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Width:</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>9 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width:</td>
<td>N/A ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width:</td>
<td>5 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setting: X Urban, Suburban, Rural
Topography: X Level, Rolling, Hilly

*Traffic data for 2016 (open to traffic year) and 2036 is shown in order to retain consistency with the air quality analysis (Appendix G, Page G-7 to G-42). For reference to 2012 and 2034 traffic data, see Appendix A, Page A-40.

**DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure/NBI Number(s):</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating: (Rating, Source of Information)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Spans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Restrictions:</td>
<td>ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Restrictions:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb to Curb Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside to Outside Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Channel Work:</td>
<td>ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Remarks:
No bridge or structure work is included in the scope of this project.

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

*If the proposed action has multiple bridges or small structures, this section should be filled out for each structure.*
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (MOT) DURING CONSTRUCTION:

Is a temporary bridge proposed? Yes  
Is a temporary roadway proposed? X  
Will the project involve the use of a detour or require a ramp closure? (describe in remarks) X  
Provisions will be made for access by local traffic and so posted. X  
Provisions will be made for through-traffic dependent businesses. X  
Provisions will be made to accommodate any local special events or festivals. X  
Will the proposed MOT substantially change the environmental consequences of the action? X  
Is there substantial controversy associated with the proposed method for MOT? X  

Remarks:

The proposed MOT includes phasing construction activities in order to allow the road to remain open throughout construction. However, temporary road closures and/or temporary widening may be required for the completion of work in some areas.

The proposed MOT would not substantially change the environmental consequences of the project as traffic will be maintained along the roadway during the majority of construction. No public or stakeholder comments have been made related to the impacts of the MOT beyond those concerned about having access to their homes and businesses during construction. Access shall be maintained to all residences and businesses throughout construction.

The travelling public may be impacted by the road restrictions or road closures during construction. However, these impacts would be temporary and minor in nature. The City of Hammond will provide the official detour routes to the local community in advance of construction. This information will be provided to the local news media and will be posted on the project website. Emergency service units and school corporations will be notified in advance of the start of construction and road closures.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Start Date of Construction:</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date project incorporated into STIP</td>
<td>July 11, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in an MPO Area?</td>
<td>Yes X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes,</td>
<td>Name of MPO</td>
<td>Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Project in TIP</td>
<td>Page 41, Lines 403-406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of incorporation by reference into the STIP</td>
<td>July 11, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIRM COMMITMENTS

1. If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, federal law and regulations (16 USC 470, et seq.; 36 CFR 800.11, et al) and State Law (IC 14-21-1) require that work must stop and that the discovery must be reported to the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology within 2 business days (IDNR).

2. If the scope of work or right of way amounts change, INDOT ES will be contacted immediately (INDOT).

3. If any potential hazardous materials are discovered during construction the IDEM Spill Line should be notified with details of the discovery within 24 hours. (IDEM)

4. IDEM recommends that appropriate structures and techniques be utilized both during the construction phase, and after completion of the project, to minimize the impacts associated with storm water runoff. (IDEM)

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

6. All facilities slated for renovation or demolition must be inspected by an Indiana-licensed asbestos inspector prior to renovation or demolition activities. If regulated asbestos-containing material (RACM) that may become airborne is found, demolition, renovation, or asbestos removal activities must be performed in accordance with notification and emission control requirements. (IDEM)

7. In all cases where a demolition activity will occur (even if no asbestos is found), the owner or operator must still notify IDEM 10 working days prior to the demolition. (IDEM)

8. IDEM encourages all efforts to minimize human exposure to lead-based paint chips and dust. (IDEM)

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

10. Wastes and unused building materials shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. (IDEM)

11. Stabilize all disturbed areas upon completion of land disturbing activities. (IDEM)
12. Sediment-laden water which otherwise would flow from the project site shall be treated by erosion and sediment control measures appropriate to minimize sedimentation. (IDEM)

13. A stable construction site access shall be provided at all points of construction traffic ingress and egress to the project site. (IDEM)

14. Public or private roadways shall be kept cleared of accumulated sediment that is a result of run-off or tracking. (IDEM)

15. Phase II ISA’s will be conducted on those properties recommended for additional investigation after Stage II plans are submitted and the environmental document has been approved. (City of Hammond)

16. Prior to making any connection to existing mains, the contractor shall contact the appropriate representative of the owner to advise the owner as to the method of operations, materials and equipment available to successfully complete the work, and provide an estimate of completion time to allow proper scheduling of the existing water utility operations. (City of Hammond)

FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Mini-parks could be provided on remnant parcels that are only partially used for the roadway improvements, and tree and shrub plantings could be provided to screen remaining residential area from the widened roadway. (USFWS)

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

3. Minimize and contain within the project limits all tree and brush clearing. (IDNR)

4. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat roosting (greater than 3 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark) from April 1 through September 30. (IDNR)

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

6. Plant five native trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height, for each tree which is removed that is ten inches or greater in diameter-at-breast height. (IDNR)
### RIGHT OF WAY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Impacts</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Industrial</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Park</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Remarks:**

The existing right-of-way varies along the project corridor with the minimum right-of-way width being 60-feet wide and the maximum right-of-way width being 100-feet wide. Approximately 7.48 acres of additional permanent right-of-way will be acquired for the construction of the proposed project. The right-of-way will be primarily acquired from residential, commercial, and industrial properties. Approximately 0.001 acre of permanent right-of-way will be acquired from Irving Park, a Section 4(f) property, for sidewalk reconstruction. Please see the Section D of this document for more information on impacts to Irving Park.

Thirty-five residences, seven commercial properties, and one industrial property will be acquired as part of the proposed project. A Conceptual Stage Relocation Study has been conducted for the proposed project and can be found in Appendix I, Page I-22 to I-83. Decent, Safe, and Sanitary replacement housing is available for home owners within the immediate vicinity of the project. This housing is anticipated to be within the home owners’ financial means upon inclusion of relocation benefits, including possible last resort payments. However, there is a lack of available rental properties within the immediate vicinity of the project and therefore those renting their residences may be forced to look elsewhere within the City of Hammond to locate replacement rental housing. While rental rates within the project area are some of the lowest within the area, it is anticipated that with relocation benefits, Decent, Safe, and Sanitary replacement rental housing will be readily available within the City of Hammond.

Each business relocation presents its own unique challenge in finding a suitable site to relocate, including the transfer of a liquor license, location dependent businesses, and an area to conduct automotive repairs. However, there is a wide variety of commercial properties available within the City of Hammond and therefore it is likely that these businesses will find a commercial property suitable for relocation within the city of Hammond.

Approximately 2.34 acres of temporary right-of-way will be acquired primarily for temporary widening. Project plans, including existing and proposed right-of-way limits are included in Appendix A, Page A-39 to A-490.
All right-of-way will be acquired in accordance with applicable federal and state procedures. Those procedures include specific requirements for appraisals, review appraisals, negotiations, and relocation benefits. Compliance with these procedures will assure the fair and equitable treatment of affected residents and businesses. The acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with 49 CFR 24 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended.

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

### SECTION A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

**Remarks:** There are no streams, rivers, watercourses, or jurisdictional ditches located within the project area. This was initially determined by referencing 2010 aerial photography and USGS Topographic Mapping and was field verified by American Structurepoint personnel during the August 9, 2012 field visit. The completed *Ecological Evaluation Form* (August, 2012) is included in Appendix E, Page E-1 to E-12.

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

**Remarks:** There are no reservoirs, lakes, farm ponds, detention basins, or storm water management facilities located within the project area. This was initially determined by referencing 2010 aerial photography and USGS Topographic Mapping and was field verified by American Structurepoint personnel during the August 9, 2012 field visit. The completed *Ecological Evaluation Form* (August, 2012) is included in Appendix E, Page E-1 to E-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total wetland area: 0.00 acre(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total wetland area impacted: 0.00 acre(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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

### Documentation

**Wetlands (Mark all that apply)**
- Wetland Determination
- Wetland Delineation
- USACE Isolated Waters Determination
- Mitigation Plan

### ES Approval Dates

**Improvements that will not result in any wetland impacts are not practicable because such avoidance would result in (Mark all that apply and explain):**
- Substantial adverse impacts to adjacent homes, business or other improved properties;
- Substantially increased project costs;
- Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems;
- Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts, or
- The project not meeting the identified needs.

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

### Remarks:

No wetlands are located within the project area. This was initially determined by referencing 2010 aerial photography and USGS Topographic Mapping and was field verified by American Structurepoint personnel during the August 9, 2012 field visit. The completed Ecological Evaluation Form (August, 2012), including National Wetlands Inventory mapping, is included in Appendix E, Page E-1 to E-12.

### Terrestrial Habitat

**Presence**

- Unique or High Quality Habitat

### Impacts

- Yes
- No

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

### Remarks:

The dominant habitat observed within the project area was maintained lawn. No unique or high quality habitat was observed. The completed Ecological Evaluation Form (August, 2012) is included in Appendix E, Page E-1 to E-12. Approximately 8 acres of lawn would be disturbed by construction activities. Tree and shrub cover is limited throughout the project corridor. Some tree and shrub removal would be conducted where necessary for equipment access.

A letter from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) dated January 8, 2013 stated that the relocation of Gostlin Street and the work on Chicago Street between Hohman Avenue and Torrence Avenue “could consist of the loss of significant numbers of shade trees which provide some bird and small mammal habitat while also providing green space amenities for the residents of the area.” The USFWS recommended the creation of mini-parks on remnant parcels as well as tree and shrub plantings to screen...
residential areas from the roadway. This recommendation has been added to the project commitments. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix B, Page B-6 to B-8.

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

### Karst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed project located within or adjacent to the potential Karst Area of Indiana?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are karst features located within or adjacent to the footprint of the proposed project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Remarks:**

The project is located outside of the legally designated karst area of the state as identified in the October 13, 1993, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between INDOT, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM), and USFWS. No karst features are known to exist within or adjacent to the proposed project area. The 1993 Karst MOU is not applicable to this project, and a karst assessment is not required. No karst features were noted on the Red Flag Investigation Mapping included in Appendix D, Page D-15.

### Threatened or Endangered Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the known range of any federal species</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any critical habitat identified within project area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal species found in project area (based upon informal consultation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State species found in project area (based upon consultation with IDNR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is Section 7 formal consultation required for this action?

**Remarks:**

Review of the USFWS listing of threatened and endangered species by county as published on the USFWS Region 3 Website (http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/lists/indiana-cty.html) indicates that two federally endangered species, the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and the endangered Karner blue butterfly (*Lycaeides melissa samuelis*), as well as two federally threatened species, Pitcher’s thistle (*Cirsium pitcheri*) and Mead’s Milkweed (*Asclepias meadii*), are noted in Lake County, Indiana.

Coordination with the USFWS in a letter dated January 8, 2013 indicated that while the proposed project is within the range of these federally endangered species, no habitat for any of these species is known within the proposed project area. The USFWS therefore stated that the project is not likely to adversely affect these endangered and threatened species and that no further consultation under Section 7 was required on this project. For reference see Appendix B, Page B-6 to B-8.

Coordination with IDNR - Division of Fish and Wildlife in a letter dated January 17, 2013 that the Natural Heritage Program’s data have been checked, and no plant or animal species listed as state or federally threatened, endangered, or rare have been reported to occur in the project vicinity. For reference see Appendix B, Page B-32 to B-33.
## SECTION B – OTHER RESOURCES

### Drinking Water Resources

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

If a SSA is present, answer the following:

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

#### Remarks:

The proposed project is located in Lake County; therefore, the project is not located within St. Joseph Sole Source Aquifer System, the only legally designated sole source aquifer in the state. Therefore, the FHWA/EPA Sole Source Aquifer Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is not applicable to this project, and a groundwater assessment is not required.

Coordination with the IDEM Drinking Water Branch in a letter dated December 21, 2012, confirmed that the project corridor is not located within a Wellhead Protection Area. See Appendix B, Page B-11 for reference to the IDEM coordination letter. Additionally, a review of the Wellhead Proximity Locator (http://idemmaps.idem.in.gov/whpa/) on April 23, 2014 indicated the proposed project is not located within a wellhead protection area.

Drinking water is provided by the City of Hammond within the project area. Existing water mains will be replaced as necessary throughout the project corridor. Short term interruptions of service can be expected while water mains are being installed and reconnected. The following special provision applies: Prior to making any connection to existing mains, the contractor shall contact the appropriate representative of the owner to advise the owner as to the method of operations, materials and equipment available to successfully complete the work, and provide an estimate of completion time to allow proper scheduling of the existing water utility operations.

### Flood Plains

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

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

#### Remarks:

The project does not encroach upon a regulatory floodplain as determined from available FEMA floodplain maps (Appendix E, Page E-10 to E-12). Therefore, it does not fall within the guidelines for the implementation of 23 CFR 650, 23 CFR 771, and 44 CFR.
**Farmland**

**Agricultural Lands**

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

**Prime Farmland (per NRCS)**

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

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

**Remarks:**

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), in a letter dated January 10, 2013, stated the proposed project would not cause a conversion of prime farmland. Since there will not be a conversion of prime farmland, the requirements of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) are not applicable and the completion of the CPA-106 is not required. No other alternatives other than those already discussed in this document will be considered without a reevaluation of the potential impacts upon farmland. This project will not have a significant impact on farmland. The NRCS response letter can be found in Appendix B, Page B-9.

**SECTION C – CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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

**Results of Research**

Eligible and/or Listed Resource Present

Archaeology

NRHP Buildings/Site(s)

NRHP District(s)

NRHP Bridge(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Historic Properties Affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation** (mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>ES/FHWA Approval Date(s)</th>
<th>SHPO Approval Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Properties Short Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Property Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>April 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Records Check/ Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase Ia Survey Report</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>June 27, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase Ic Survey Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase II Investigation Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Phase III Data Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APE, Eligibility and Effect Determination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>July 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800.11 Documentation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>July 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)  

MOA Signature Dates (List all signatories)

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

Remarks:  

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

The project is located in an urban section of the city of Hammond in North Township, Lake County, Indiana. The area of potential effect (APE) includes those areas of existing and proposed right-of-way and incidental construction, including immediately adjacent properties. At locations where property acquisitions are possible, or where larger improvements were recommended, the APE was expanded to account for these recommendations. See Appendix C, pages C-8 to C-13 for maps of the APE.

**Coordination with Consulting Parties:**

On December 19, 2012, the following parties identified in table below were invited to be Section 106 consulting parties. If no response was received to the consulting party invitation after thirty (30) days, it was assumed the parties involved did not wish to act as consulting parties. FHWA, INDOT, and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) are considered automatic consulting parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency / Organization</th>
<th>Agreed to be a Consulting Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Landmarks, Northwest Field Office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Office of Economic Development / Planning Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Historical Society</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Chicago Historical Society</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond Historical Society</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Zoning Office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Burnham</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Historic Preservation Coalition</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Landmarks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Nation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Nation, Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest County Potawatomi Community</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannahville Indian Community</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archaeology:
An Indiana Archaeological Short Report was prepared by Archaeological Consultants of Ossian personnel who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards as per 36 CFR Part 61. As part of this report, an Archaeological Records Review was conducted on January 29, 2013 and an archaeological field investigation was conducted on both February 12, 2013 and on June 1, 2013. Neither the records review nor the field reconnaissance identified any archaeological sites within the proposed project corridor. The report was approved by INDOT on June 27, 2013. The SHPO concurred with the findings of this report on August 20, 2013. A summary of the archaeological report is included in Appendix C, Page C-22 to C-25.

Historic Properties:
A Historic Property Report was prepared by Weintraut and Associates, Inc. personnel who meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards as per 36 CFR Part 61. The report was approved by INDOT in April 2013. No properties within the APE are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). However, the report did recommend the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 (089-338-40030) as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) due to its association with the ethnic and military heritage of Hammond’s Polish community, a significant ethnic community in Hammond and Lake County in the early to mid-twentieth century that continues to be represented in the region. A summary of the Historic Property Report is included in Appendix C, Page C-21 to C-21.

The SHPO correspondence on May 13, 2013 stated that the information presented in the Historical Properties Report did not make a strong enough case for Criteria A significance of the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 to merit NRHP eligibility. The SHPO did agree that no other buildings or structures that were identified within the APE appear to be individually eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and that it does not appear that any NRHP-eligible districts extend into the APE. SHPO concurred with the findings of the HPR with the exception of the one recommendation for the Polish Army Veteran’s Post No. 40 on May 13, 2013. SHPO’s correspondence is included in Appendix C, Page C-50 to C-51.

Documentation, Findings:
Correspondence received on August 20, 2013 from SHPO concurred with INDOT’s finding, on behalf of the FHWA, of No Historic Properties Affected. Additionally SHPO noted that there are no currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the proposed project area and they concur with the recommendation of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Indiana archaeological short report, that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at this proposed project area. This correspondence is included in Appendix C, Page C-50 to C-51.

Public Involvement:
A legal public notice of historic effect and 4(f) property effect was advertised in The Times of Northwest Indiana on July 25, 2013 and the Post Tribune on July 27, 2013. This public notice described the proposed project and stated that the proposed action would not affect properties or items listed on or eligible for the NRHP and that the FHWA had issued a “No Historic Properties Affected” finding for the project. The notice went on to request public input regarding the effect of the proposed project on the historic elements and stated that the documentation is available for review at the City of Hammond Engineering Department, the Hammond Public Library, and on-line. A thirty (30) day comment period, ending on August 30, 2013, was offered. No comments were received. A copy of this legal public notice is included in Appendix C, Page C-45 through C-49.

The Section 106 process has been completed as of August 30, 2013, and the responsibilities of the FHWA under Section 106 have been fulfilled.
### SECTION D – SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES/ SECTION 6(f) RESOURCES

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

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

**Evaluations**

- Programmatic Section 4(f)*
- “De minimis” Impact*
- Individual Section 4(f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife &amp; Waterfowl Refuges</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Natural Landmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Wildlife Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Nature Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluations**

- Programmatic Section 4(f)*
- “De minimis” Impact*
- Individual Section 4(f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Properties</th>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites eligible and/or listed on the NRHP</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluations**

- Programmatic Section 4(f)*
- “De minimis” Impact*
- Individual Section 4(f)

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

Discuss Programmatic Section 4(f) and "de minimis" Section 4(f) impacts in the remarks box below. Individual Section 4(f) documentation must be separate Draft and Final documents. For further discussions on Programmatic, “de minimis” and Individual Section 4(f) evaluations please refer to the “Procedural Manual for the Preparation of Environmental Studies”. Discuss proposed alternatives that satisfy the requirements of Section 4(f).

**Remarks:**

The US Department of Transportation Act of 1966 prohibits the use of certain public and historic lands for federally funded transportation facilities unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. The law applies to publicly owned parks, recreation areas, and wildlife/waterfowl refuges, and National Register eligible or listed historic properties. These properties are called Section 4(f) resources.

Irving Park, operated by the City of Hammond Department of Parks and Recreation, is located south of...
Chicago Street between Columbia Avenue and Irving Park Drive. Because Irving Park is a publicly owned park/recreation area, this property would be considered a Section 4(f) resource. The proposed project would convert approximately 0.001 acre of land from Irving Park to a transportation use for reconstruction of the sidewalk along Irving Park Drive and Chicago Street. See Appendix I, Page I-6 to I-7 for reference to project plans for this area. No adverse impacts to the recreational facilities within the park are anticipated. INDOT, on behalf of FHWA, determined that the Section 4(f) impact could be processed under a de minimis evaluation on May 2, 2013 (Appendix I, Page I-2).

The City of Hammond Parks and Recreation Department was identified as the official with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource and was contacted by American Structurepoint in a letter dated June 21, 2013 (Appendix I, Page I-4 to I-7). The letter described the proposed project, showed the proposed work on the Irving Park property, and indicated that the project is not anticipated to impact the recreational activities, features, and attributes of the park. In a letter dated July 30, 2013, the City of Hammond Parks and Recreation Department concurred that the proposed project would not affect the activities at Irving Park. This letter is included in the Section 4(f) materials in Appendix I, Page I-8.

A Legal Notice of Historic Effect and Section 4(f) Property Effect was published in The Times of Northwest Indiana on July 25, 2013 and the Post Tribune on July 27, 2013. The notice was also mailed to Section 106 Consulting Parties. A copy of this notice is included in Appendix C, Page C-45 to C-49. A thirty (30) day public comment period, ending on August 30, 2014, was offered. No comments were received. The Section 4(f) de minimis finding will be issued by FHWA in concurrence with the issuance of the FONSI.

### Section 6(f) Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yes      | No  | Section 6(f) Involvement

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

Based on review of the National Park Service (NPS) Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) website, there are no Section 6(f) properties located within or directly adjacent to the proposed project area. See Appendix D, Page D-21 to D-23 for a copy of the Lake County LWCF property listings.

### SECTION E – Air Quality

#### Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformity Status of the Project</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, then:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in the most current MPO TIP?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project exempt from conformity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the project is NOT exempt from conformity, then:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in the Transportation Plan (TP)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a hot spot analysis required (CO/PM)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of MSAT Analysis required?

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

Remarks:
The proposed project is located in Lake County, which is currently listed as a non-attainment area for the ozone standard (2008) and a maintenance area for the PM2.5 standard (1997). The USEPA issued designations for new PM2.5 standard (2012) on December 18, 2014. However, Lake County, Indiana was determined to have insufficient quality assured monitoring data to access compliance with the standard. As a result, Lake County, Indiana is listed as an “unclassifiable area.”

On September 18, 2014 INDOT and FHWA hosted an Interagency Consultation Group Meeting to discuss whether projects are “of air quality concern.” Current and forecast traffic volumes were compared to determine if changes in the Build vs. No-Build volume changes are “significant.” As a result of this meeting it was determined that the proposed project is not a project “of air quality concern.” Therefore, a hot spot analysis for PM2.5 is not required. For a copy of the meeting handout and the meeting minutes, see Appendix G, Page G-7 to G-42.

The project’s design concept and scope are both listed in the NIRPC 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the 2014-2017 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

An MSAT analysis is not required for the proposed project as the project will have no meaningful impact on traffic volumes or vehicle mix. Commercial vehicles currently account for approximately 20 percent of the vehicles mix and this is anticipated to remain consistent through the design year of 2034. The project is being proposed to address safety concerns repair deteriorating infrastructure, reduce congestion, improve mobility, and develop an east-west corridor. This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for CAA criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. As such, traffic volumes are not anticipated to increase as a result of this proposed project.

Moreover, 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 MOVES model forecasts a combined reduction of over 80 percent in the total annual emissions rate for the priority MSAT from 2010 to 2050 while vehicle-miles of travel are projected to increase by over 100 percent. This will both reduce the background level of MSAT as well as the possibility of even minor MSAT emissions from this project.

SECTION F - NOISE

Noise

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

X

ES Review of Noise Analysis  |  August 20, 2013
In accordance with 23 CFR 772 and the INDOT Traffic Noise Policy (effective July 13, 2011), this project is a Type I project and therefore requires a noise analysis of potential impacts and, whether there are feasible and reasonable ways to mitigate those impacts.

A noise analysis was prepared by the Corradino Group following the guidance in the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA’s) Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance (July 2010) and the Indiana Department of Transportation’s (INDOT’s) Traffic Noise Policy (July 2011).

All front row single-family dwellings were individually modeled (with minor exceptions in the east end of the corridor), as were the corridor’s three churches and two schools. In order to provide a representative sample, second row single-family dwellings were grouped by block, and multi-family units were represented by single receptors. Businesses were modeled individually or in groups, depending on their relationship to the road. As shown in the table below, 229 modeled receptors represent the 760 total receptors within the project area.

One hundred and thirty seven dwelling units, consisting of both multi-family and single-family, currently experience noise levels that approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). Currently traffic projections estimate that traffic will increase by 2.48 percent annually, meaning that traffic will increase by 84 percent by 2034 with or without the proposed project. This will equate to an additional 58 dwelling units experiencing noise levels that approach or exceed the NAC.

INDOT’s Noise Policy also notes a substantial noise increase is an increase in noise levels by 15.0 decibels. Because the project area is a very busy traffic corridor, no substantial noise increases were identified.

Noise mitigation for the proposed project would generally be accomplished by the construction of noise barriers due to limitations on the ability to acquire property for mitigation or to mitigate sites off public right-of-way. Noise barriers require long, uninterrupted segments to be feasible as gaps in the barriers allow noise to pass through making the desired noise reduction infeasible.

For the proposed project, all dwelling units, businesses, and churches where noise levels approach or exceed the NAC are in a front row location along the alignment and need access to the project roadway and sidewalks, meaning there would be continuous gaps in any barrier. Therefore, noise abatement would not be feasible at any of these locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Applicable NAC</th>
<th># Receptors</th>
<th># Modeled</th>
<th>Approach or Exceed NAC (2034)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Receptors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A noise barrier could be constructed at Irving Park along Chicago Street. However, the park is bordered by the NICTD commuter rail line and I-90 on the east side, both of which are elevated 15-20 feet from the surrounding grade level. The noise generated by the rail and highway facilities would not be reduced, thereby rendering the noise barrier ineffective to mitigate for noise impacts at Irving Park. Therefore, the noise barrier would not be feasible.

The Noll Institute is in a similar situation on the east side of I-90. The football and baseball fields and the main building of the catholic high school will experience noise levels exceeding the NAC, but there is no feasible mitigation due to the presence of I-90.

Based on the studies completed to date, no locations where noise abatement would be feasible have been identified based upon the inability to provide continuous, uninterrupted wall segments or in the case of Irving Park and the Noll Institute, the presence of I-90 and rail traffic. Therefore, noise abatement is not proposed as part of this project.

The full noise analysis report can be found in Appendix H, Page H-1 to H-192. Coordination with INDOT Environmental Services (ES) is included in Appendix H, Page H-193 to H-194.

### SECTION G – COMMUNITY IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional, Community &amp; Neighborhood Factors</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to community cohesion?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to local tax base or property values?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will construction activities impact community events (festivals, fairs, etc.)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the community have an approved transition plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No, are steps being made to advance the community’s transition plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project comply with the transition plan? (explain in the remarks box)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks: The proposed project will improve public safety and mobility throughout the project area and will comply with the local and regional development plans put forth by the City of Hammond as well as NIRPC. No substantial adverse community impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. The project will require a total of 35 residential relocations, 7 business relocations, and one industrial property relocation. The project will not negatively affect community cohesion as it will not substantially change access or travel patterns within the community.

On December 21, 2011, the City of Hammond implemented Resolution R19. This resolution adopted the ADA transition plan for the city and requires all public works projects to comply with the 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessible Design and the 2005 Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights of Way. The proposed project would fully comply with the ADA transition plan. Sidewalks throughout the project corridor would be upgraded or replaced in order to comply with ADA standards.

A letter from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) dated January 8, 2013 stated that the relocation of Gostlin Street and the work on Chicago Street between Hohman Avenue and Torrence Avenue “could consist of the loss of significant numbers of shade trees which provide some bird and small mammal habitat while also providing green space amenities for the residents of the area.” The USFWS recommended the creation of mini-parks on remnant parcels as well as tree and shrub plantings to screen residential areas from the roadway. This recommendation has been added to the project commitments. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix B, Page B-6 to B-8.
### Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

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

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

**Remarks:** The project will reconstruct and realign an existing roadway in an already developed area. It is not anticipated to result in any substantial indirect or cumulative impacts.

### Public Facilities & Services

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

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

**Remarks:** The proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantial impacts to public facilities and services. The proposed project will improve safety and mobility for both pedestrians and bicyclists. This is anticipated to have a beneficial impact on health and educational facilities within the vicinity of the proposed project. Temporary negative impacts will be experienced in the form of transportation delays during construction; however access to all businesses and residences along the project corridor will be maintained during construction.

Early coordination was sent to public agencies, including the highway department, sheriff’s department, fire department, public schools, and other local public agencies. No responses were received regarding potential impacts to public facilities or services. Public facilities or services may be impacted by the road restrictions or road closures during construction. However, these impacts would be temporary and minor in nature. The City of Hammond will provide the official detour routes to the local community in advance of construction. This information will be provided to the local news media and will be posted on the project website. Emergency service units and school corporations will be notified in advance of the start of construction and road closures.

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

**During the development of the project were EJ issues identified?**

**Does the project require an EJ analysis?**

**If YES, then:**

- **Are any EJ populations located within the project area?**
  - Yes | No |
  - X    |    |

- **Will the project result in adversely high or disproportionate impacts to EJ populations?**
  - Yes | No |
  - | X   |

**Remarks:** All Environmental Assessment level documents require an Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis. An EJ concern is considered any impact that would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on an environmental justice population. For EJ analysis, the reference community is typically a county, city, or town that contains the project and is called the community of comparison (COC). The community that overlaps the project limits is called the affected community (AC). Affected communities which are more than 50 percent minority or low-income are automatically EJ populations. For all other affected communities, an EJ population exists if the low-income population or minority population is 125 percent of the COC.

The project area is comprised of two Census Tracts, as determined by a review of the 2010 US Census Tracts (www.census.gov). These Census Tracts are considered to be the ACs. For this analysis, the City of Hammond was analyzed as the COC.

Within the COC, 21.15 percent of the population was considered low-income. A low-income EJ population would exist if the low-income population in the AC exceeds 26.43 percent (125 percent of the COC). A low-income population of EJ concern was identified in AC 2 - Census Tract 204.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW-INCOME POPULATION</th>
<th>COC</th>
<th>AC 1</th>
<th>AC 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td>Census Tract 203</td>
<td>Census Tract 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population for Whom Poverty Status is</strong> Determined</td>
<td>80,785</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>5,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population Below Poverty Level</strong></td>
<td>17,084</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>1,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Low-Income</strong></td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>15.04%</td>
<td>28.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>125 Percent of COC</strong></td>
<td>26.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AC Percent Low-Income Greater Than 125 Percent of COC?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AC Percent Low-Income Greater Than 50 Percent?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population of EJ Concern?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the COC, 56.91 percent of the population was considered minority. A minority EJ population would exist if the minority population exceeds 71.14 percent. Because the minority population in both ACs exceeds 50%, a minority EJ population is present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINORITY POPULATION</th>
<th>COC</th>
<th>AC 1</th>
<th>AC 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td>Census Tract 203</td>
<td>Census Tract 204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>81,312</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>5,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority Population</strong></td>
<td>46,276</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>4,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Minority</strong></td>
<td>56.91%</td>
<td>57.38%</td>
<td>74.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>125 Percent of COC</strong></td>
<td>71.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AC Percent Minority Greater Than 125 Percent of COC?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AC Percent Minority Greater Than 50 Percent?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population of EJ Concern?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the potential for disproportionate impacts to EJ communities within the AC, INDOT’s Equal Opportunity Division has been notified. Additionally, INDOT’s Environmental Services and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will be consulted to review how to avoid and, as necessary, mitigate any potential disproportionate impacts to the EJ communities within the ACs.

An evaluation of the Chicago Street project area, with respect to disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income or minority populations, was conducted. Based on the 2010 US Census data, the project area has a proportionately high minority population in both census tracts encompassing the project. Moreover, one of the two census tracts possesses a high low-income population. The proposed project will require thirty-five residential and seven commercial relocations. Based on this data, the potential for environmental justice impacts are present.

Analysis of positive and negative effects of the project on the project area, including low-income or minority populations, was performed. This analysis indicates the benefits of the project are greater than the identified burdens, demonstrating a lack of disproportionately high and adverse effects. Specifically, the proposed project will reduce congestion and traffic delay, enhance pedestrian facilities, improve [additional benefits].
motorist safety, improve commercial truck mobility, upgrade deteriorating infrastructure, and establish a gateway to the City of Hammond. Noted negative effects (burdens) include proposed residential and business relocations, increased traffic on Chicago Street, increased traffic noise, tree/greenspace removal, and temporary disturbances due to construction.

Significant efforts were made to engage and involve the public in the project planning process. The project team established a project website ([www.GoChicagoStreet.com](http://www.GoChicagoStreet.com)) and dedicated project email address ([GoChicagoStreet@structurepoint.com](mailto:GoChicagoStreet@structurepoint.com)), utilized lawn signs and flyers to announce public meetings and project updates, held two public information meetings, and developed a Community Advisory Committee. Notices for meetings were published in both English and Spanish.

Based on the evaluation of project benefits and burdens, the adverse effects of the project are not considered disproportionately high, and the positive effects of the project outweigh the noted negative effects. Significant efforts were made to encourage full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the project planning process, and suggestions and comments received from community participants are being considered in the final project design. As a result of this analysis and public involvement process, the requirements of Executive Order 12898 and the policy principles of the US DOT have been addressed, and no further evaluation is warranted. For reference to the EJ Analysis, see Appendix I, Page I-9 to I-37.

### Relocation of People, Businesses or Farms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposed action result in the relocation of people, businesses or farms?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a Business Information Survey (BIS) required?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Conceptual Stage Relocation Study (CSRS) required?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has utility relocation coordination been initiated for this project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of relocations:  
- **Residences:** 35  
- **Businesses:** 7  
- **Farms:** 0  
- **Other:** 1

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

Remarks: Relocations have been minimized to the extent practical. Existing structures to be relocated are generally within zero to thirty feet of the proposed edge of pavement. Significant property acquisition cannot be avoided due to the roadway alignment and profile.

A total of 35 residences are anticipated to be relocated as part of the proposed project. A Conceptual Stage Relocation Study was conducted in July 2014 for the proposed project and can be found in Appendix I, Page I-22 to I-83. Decent, Safe, and Sanitary replacement housing is available for home owners within the immediate vicinity of the project. This housing is anticipated to be within the home owners’ financial means upon inclusion of relocation benefits. However, there is a lack of available rental properties within the immediate vicinity of the project and therefore those renting their residences may be forced to look elsewhere within the city of Hammond to locate replacement rental housing. While rental rates within the project area are some of the lowest within the area, it is anticipated that with relocation benefits, Decent, Safe, and Sanitary replacement rental housing will be readily available within the city of Hammond.

Seven commercial properties and one industrial property would be relocated as part of the proposed project. Each business relocation presents its own unique challenge in finding a suitable site to relocate, including the transfer of a liquor license, location dependent retail, and an area to conduct automotive repairs. However, there is a wide variety of commercial properties available within the city of Hammond and therefore it is likely that these businesses will find a commercial property suitable for relocation within the city of Hammond. A Business Information Survey (BIS) was not required as the proposed project is not relocating more than 10 businesses or half of the community/neighborhood.
During property acquisition, it is possible that additional structures may be acquired. A partial strip right-of-way acquisition of the property at 4647 Johnson Avenue will also be required as part of the proposed project. This will likely require the acquisition of a shed in the backyard of this property.

The acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with 49 CFR 24 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended. Relocation resources are available to all residential and business relocatees without discrimination. No person displaced by this project will be required to move from a displaced dwelling unless comparable replacement housing is available to that person.

SECTION H – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & REGULATED SUBSTANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazardous Materials &amp; Regulated Substances (Mark all that apply)</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Flag Investigation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Specifications for Remediation required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/ Date</th>
<th>ES Review of Investigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X – LPA Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include a summary of findings for each investigation.

Remarks:

A Red Flag Investigation (RFI) was submitted to the City of Hammond and INDOT on September 12, 2012. Based upon comments received on the initial RFI, a revised RFI was submitted on February 26, 2013. The RFI identified 78 Hazardous Material Concern records within one-half mile of the project study area including seven underground storage tank sites and four leaking underground storage tank sites in direct proximity to the project corridor. A copy of the RFI is included in Appendix D, Page D-1 to D-40.

A Phase I Initial Site Assessment (ISA), conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Hazardous Materials Unit Operating Manual published by INDOT ES, was submitted to the City of Hammond, Indiana on December 19, 2012. A search of nationwide and local database sources was provided by FirstSearch Technology Corporation on August 10, 2012 and a site visit was conducted on the same date.

The Phase I ISA identified 17 sites along the project corridor that have a recognized environmental condition (REC). Of these, 12 sites were initially recommended for further investigation in the form of a Phase II limited subsurface investigation within or adjacent to the project right-of-way. However, after meeting with the City of Hammond on January 22, 2013, it was determined that no additional investigative work would be conducted on sites from which no right-of-way would be acquired. This would therefore eliminate Phase II work at four previously identified sites and bring the total number of properties recommended for Phase II work to a total of eight sites. These sites are summarized in the table below. The full Phase I ISA is included in Appendix D, Page D-41 to D-115 along with mapping identifying the specific location of the identified sites. A copy of the Phase I ISA was sent to INDOT on February 26, 2013.

Phase II ISA’s will be conducted on those properties recommended for additional investigation after Stage II plans are submitted and the environmental document has been approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>Additional Investigation Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ostrom’s Services</td>
<td>21-25 Gostlin Street</td>
<td>Active LUST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>208 Gostlin Street</td>
<td>Former gas tank (e.g. AST or UST) on site as identified on historic maps with no closure documentation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vacant Lot (Formerly Hammond Solvent Recovery)</td>
<td>241 Brunswick Street</td>
<td>US EPA Investigation; former solvent recovery facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Former store</td>
<td>233 Gostlin Street</td>
<td>Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Polish Army Veterans Association</td>
<td>241-243 Gostlin Street</td>
<td>Contamination on site as sourced from adjacent facility (former Hammond Solvent Recovery Plant)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Former gas station</td>
<td>4446 Sheffield Avenue</td>
<td>Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sheffield Scrap (Chuck's Towing &amp; Storage)</td>
<td>4648 Sheffield Avenue</td>
<td>NFRAP site</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Former gas station</td>
<td>4645 Hohman Avenue</td>
<td>Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KAR Service, Inc.</td>
<td>4714 Hohman Avenue</td>
<td>Former UST Site</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peter Olenik (Alex Auto Sales)</td>
<td>4703 Hohman Avenue</td>
<td>LUST site; documented contamination is not delineated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E-Z Tire Service</td>
<td>725 East Chicago Street</td>
<td>Historic LUST/UST; Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Former gas station (White Castle)</td>
<td>4632 Calumet Avenue</td>
<td>Gas tanks identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or sampling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>McDonald’s (former KAR Auto Service)</td>
<td>4635 Calumet Avenue</td>
<td>Historic LUST/UST; Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Speedway SuperAmerica</td>
<td>4705 Calumet Avenue</td>
<td>Active LUST Site; residual contamination near ROW</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Former gas station (Nick's Liquors)</td>
<td>4702 Calumet Avenue</td>
<td>Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Former gas station</td>
<td>936 Chicago Street</td>
<td>Gas tanks near the ROW as identified on historic maps with no documentation of closure or soil sampling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oil Exchange</td>
<td>1142 Chicago Street</td>
<td>Former UST site</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION I – PERMITS CHECKLIST

Permits (mark all that apply)  Likely Required

**Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section10 Permit)**
- Individual Permit (IP)
- Nationwide Permit (NWP)
- Regional General Permit (RGP)
- Pre-Construction Notification (PCN)
- Other
- Wetland Mitigation required
- Stream Mitigation required

**IDEM**
- Section 401 WQC
- Isolated Wetlands determination
- Rule 5 ♦
- Other
- Wetland Mitigation required
- Stream Mitigation required

**IDNR**
- Construction in a Floodway
- Navigable Waterway Permit
- Lake Preservation Permit
- Other
- Mitigation Required

**US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit**

Others (Please discuss in the remarks box below)

Remarks: A Rule 5 Permit from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management is anticipated because the proposed project will disturb more than one (1) acre of total land area. The City of Hammond, or its authorized agent, is responsible for obtaining all necessary permits.

SECTION J – ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

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

Remarks: Firm:
1. If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, federal law and regulations (16 USC 470, et seq.; 36 CFR 800.11, et al) and State Law (IC 14-21-1) require that work must stop and that the discovery must be reported to the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology within 2 business days (IDNR).
2. If the scope of work or right of way amounts change, INDOT ES will be contacted immediately (INDOT).
3. If any potential hazardous materials are discovered during construction the IDEM Spill Line should be notified with details of the discovery within 24 hours. (IDEM)
4. IDEM recommends that appropriate structures and techniques be utilized both during the construction phase, and after completion of the project, to minimize the impacts associated with storm water runoff. (IDEM)
5. Reasonable precautions must be taken to minimize fugitive dust emissions from construction and demolition activities. Dirt tracked onto paved roads from unpaved areas should be minimized. (IDEM)
6. All facilities slated for renovation or demolition must be inspected by an Indiana-licensed asbestos...
inspector prior to renovation or demolition activities. If regulated asbestos-containing material (RACM) that may become airborne is found, demolition, renovation, or asbestos removal activities must be performed in accordance with notification and emission control requirements. (IDEM)

7. In all cases where a demolition activity will occur (even if no asbestos is found), the owner or operator must still notify IDEM 10 working days prior to the demolition. (IDEM)

8. IDEM encourages all efforts to minimize human exposure to lead-based paint chips and dust. (IDEM)

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

10. Wastes and unused building materials shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. (IDEM)

11. Stabilize all disturbed areas upon completion of land disturbing activities. (IDEM)

12. Sediment-laden water which otherwise would flow from the project site shall be treated by erosion and sediment control measures appropriate to minimize sedimentation. (IDEM)

13. A stable construction site access shall be provided at all points of construction traffic ingress and egress to the project site. (IDEM)

14. Public or private roadways shall be kept cleared of accumulated sediment that is a result of run-off or tracking. (IDEM)

15. Phase II ISA’s will be conducted on those properties recommended for additional investigation after Stage II plans are submitted and the environmental document has been approved. (City of Hammond)

16. Prior to making any connection to existing mains, the contractor shall contact the appropriate representative of the owner to advise the owner as to the method of operations, materials and equipment available to successfully complete the work, and provide an estimate of completion time to allow proper scheduling of the existing water utility operations. (City of Hammond)

For Consideration:
1. Mini-parks could be provided on remnant parcels that are only partially used for the roadway improvements, and tree and shrub plantings could be provided to screen remaining residential area from the widened roadway. (USFWS)

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

3. Minimize and contain within the project limits all tree and brush clearing. (IDNR)

4. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat roosting (greater than 3 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark) from April 1 through September 30. (IDNR)

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

6. Plant five native trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height, for each tree which is removed that is ten inches or greater in diameter-at-breast height. (IDNR)

**SECTION K- EARLY COORDINATION**

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

Remarks: Early coordination letters were sent to the agencies listed below on December 19, 2012. These early coordination letters provided background on the project, existing conditions, and a description of the proposed project. The early coordination letters also summarized the Red Flag Investigation which was conducted in September 2012. Early coordination responses are included in Appendix B, Page B-6 to B-33.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Appendix Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>January 8, 2013</td>
<td>B-6 to B-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>January 10, 2013</td>
<td>B-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Geological Survey</td>
<td>January 23, 2013</td>
<td>B-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM, Groundwater Section</td>
<td>December 21, 2013</td>
<td>B-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEM</td>
<td>January 2, 2013</td>
<td>B-12 to B-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNR / Division of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>January 17, 2013</td>
<td>B-32 to B-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Mayor</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Office of Economic Development</td>
<td>January 23, 2013</td>
<td>B-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Zoning Office</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Office of Community Development</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Corporation Counsel</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond City Council</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond City Engineer</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Environmental Management</td>
<td>January 3, 2013</td>
<td>B-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Fire Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Chief of Inspections</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond City Attorney</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Police Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Sanitary District</td>
<td>January 9, 2013</td>
<td>B-24 to B-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Board of Sanitary Commissioners</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Superintendent</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Urban Enterprise Association</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Sewer Maintenance Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Streets Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hammond Water Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Township Trustees</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Township Resource Coordinator</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Township Director of Transportation</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Township Projects Coordinator</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Township Board Members</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator Honorable Dan Coats</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Senator Honorable Susan Glick</td>
<td>Undeliverable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative Honorable Pete Visclosky</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative Honorable Lonnie Randolph</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative Honorable Linda Lawson</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago Chief of Police</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago Fire Chief</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago Director of Emergency Management</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago City Planner</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago Mayor</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of East Chicago City Engineer</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Burnham, Illinois Chief of Police</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Burnham, Illinois Fire Chief</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Burnham, Illinois Mayor</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois DOT</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>B-27 to B-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond Development Corporation</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Health Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Final Section 106 Documentation
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION'S
SECTION 4(F) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (FOR HISTORIC PROPERTIES) AND
SECTION 106 FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS
AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT
ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS
EFFECT FINDING
CHICAGO STREET WIDENING AND RECONSTRUCTION
IN THE CITY OF HAMMOND, NORTH TOWNSHIP, LAKE COUNTY
DES. NO.: 1297017

AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT
(Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(1))
The Area of Potential Effects (APE) has been generally drawn to incorporate properties adjacent to the proposed road widening and reconstruction. At locations where property acquisitions are possible, or where larger improvements were recommended, the APE was expanded. The APE for archaeological resources was defined as the project footprint. (See Appendix A: Plans and Appendix B: Maps.)

ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS
(Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(c)(2))
No properties are listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) within the APE.

EFFECT FINDING
The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), acting on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), has determined a finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" is appropriate for this undertaking.

INDOT respectfully requests the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer provide written concurrence with the Section 106 determination of "No Historic Properties Affected" for the Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction project.

SECTION 4(F) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS (for historic properties)
This undertaking will not convert property from any Section 4(f) historic property to a transportation use. INDOT, acting on behalf of FHWA, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is "No Historic Properties Affected"; therefore no Section 4(f) evaluation is required.

Patrick Carpenter
Manager, Cultural Resources Office
Environmental Services
Indiana Department of Transportation

7-15-2013
Approved Date
1. DESCRIPTION OF THE UNDERTAKING
(Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(1))
The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to reconstruct and widen Chicago Street [formerly known as State Route (SR) 312] through Hammond from South Brainard Avenue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the city of Hammond. The entire length of the proposed project is approximately 2.1 miles. SR 312 coincides with three separate streets as it traverses the project study area, including Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street. The project limits, from west to east, begin at the intersection of Gostlin Street (SR 312) and South Brainard Avenue to the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. At this intersection the project study area turns east along Chicago Street to the study area’s eastern terminus at the intersection of Chicago Street and White Oak Avenue.

This project will consist of approximately 2.1 miles of road reconstruction. The typical section between Stateline Avenue and Sheffield Avenue will consist of two, 12-foot travel lanes in each direction with a 17-foot raised median; a 5-foot buffer area with 5-foot sidewalk, north of the roadway; and a 10-foot clear-zone south of the proposed roadway. The typical section between Hohman Avenue and Gostlin Street will consist of one, 12-foot travel lane in each direction with a 14-foot-wide two-way-left-turn-lane, with a variable width buffer area and a 6-foot sidewalk on either side of the roadway. Between Hohman Avenue and Calumet Avenue, the typical section will consist of two, 12-foot travel lanes in each direction with 6-foot sidewalk on each side of the roadway. Single-lane roundabouts are proposed at the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, as well as at Chicago Street and Hohman Avenue. Said roundabouts will consist of a single 18-foot circulatory roadway, 16-foot truck apron, and an 82-foot diameter center island. Lastly, new concrete curb and gutter, and an enclosed storm sewer will be installed along the length of the project. (See Appendix A: Plans.)

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

The APE has been generally drawn to incorporate properties adjacent to the proposed road widening and reconstruction. At locations where property acquisitions are possible, or where larger improvements were recommended, the APE was expanded. The APE for archaeological resources was defined as the project footprint. (See Appendix A: Plans and Appendix B: Maps.)

2. EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY HISTORIC PROPERTIES
Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(b), historians from Weintraut & Associates (W&A) initiated identification efforts by reviewing the National Register of Register of Historic Places (NRHP), Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures, the State Historical Architectural and Archaeological Research Database (SHAARD), the Indiana Historic Bridge Inventory, the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI) survey cards at the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA), and the Lake County Interim Report for previously identified properties, as well as prior Section 106 studies completed by W&A. In conducting research, historians examined primary and secondary resources. Documentary
research for the project included a review of county histories, monographs, historic plat maps, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, and online resources.

In a letter dated December 19, 2012, American Structurepoint described the project and invited the following parties to join Section 106 consultation for the Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction Project: Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); Indiana Landmarks, Northwest Field Office and Central Office; City of Hammond, City of Hammond Historic Preservation Commission; Hammond Historical Society; East Chicago Historical Society; City of East Chicago; Village of Burnham; Lake County Historic Preservation Coalition; and Lake County Historical Society. The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) were also included in the correspondence as participating agencies. Indiana Landmarks Northwest Field Office, City of Hammond Historic Preservation Commission, and the City of Hammond Zoning Department accepted the invitation to join consultation. SHPO is a designated consulting party. (See Appendix C: Consulting Parties and Appendix F: Correspondence.)

Historians from W&A conducted an aboveground survey of the APE on January 9, 2013. Historians recorded survey notes and took photographs of all Contributing properties more than fifty years of age in the APE. As part of the identification and evaluation efforts historians identified seventy-two properties rated or considered Contributing or higher. Sixteen properties had been previously recorded in the IHSSI survey. Of those, three properties were no longer extant. Historians identified an additional fifty-nine properties which were recommended as Contributing to the historic fabric of the City of Hammond and Lake County, Indiana. (See Appendix D: Photographs.)

On January 23, 2013, the SHPO responded to the list of consulting parties included in the Early Coordination letter dated December 19, 2012 and received December 26, 2012 by stating that the office did “not have any consulting parties to recommend beyond those whom you already have invited.” (See Appendix F: Correspondence.)

W&A completed a Historic Property Report (HPR) in March 2013. Historians for W&A recommended the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 as eligible for listing in the NRHP. (See Appendix E: Report Summaries.)

American Structurepoint transmitted the HPR to SHPO and consulting parties in a letter dated April 10, 2013, and requested comments. American Structurepoint transmitted the HPR to the owners of the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 on May 7, 2013. (See Appendix F: Correspondence.)

Also on May 7, 2013, SHPO emailed American Structurepoint and W&A requesting additional information regarding the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40. Specifically, SHPO asked: 1.) if the building was “used as a meeting place by members of Hammond’s Polish community in general—a place that would have been considered important to the a larger group” than the veterans’ association; 2.) the approximate date glass blocks replaced window panes; and 3.) if the historians were able to obtain any information about the building’s interior integrity. SHPO also inquired about the project activities at that location. (See Appendix F: Correspondence.)

W&A responded to the SHPO’s questions on May 8, 2013. W&A noted that their research “did suggest an association with the Polish community as a neighborhood grocery store from at least the 1920s through the 1930s based on the owner surnames or birthplaces.” Additionally, historians expressed the belief that “as a community structure . . . the building symbolizes the Polish presence in a working-class community that has few resources with integrity.” W&A also responded to SHPO’s questions on the estimated date of installation of glass bricks (c. 1930 to c. 1950), acknowledged their efforts to obtain information about the building’s interior were not successful; and provided information about proposed project activities. (See Appendix F: Correspondence.)
The Hammond Historic Preservation Commission responded to the HPR in a letter dated May 8, 2013. The Commission agreed with the eligibility recommendation of the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 and expressed concern about “the street design in front of this building.” The Commission did not agree with the ineligibility recommendation of the NIPSCO substation at 4533 Hanover Street but added “it appears that the street project would not adversely affect this building.” Finally, the Commission offered clarification regarding the incorporation dates of the town and city of Hammond and noted that the City of Hammond was named after Thomas Hammond, not George Hammond. (See Appendix F: Correspondence.)

SHPO responded to the HPR in a letter dated May 13, 2013. SHPO accepted the APE as defined in the HPR. SHPO did not concur with the recommendation of NRHP eligibility for the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40. SHPO stated, “Although the building evidently held some significance to the Polish community in Hammond, both while it served as a grocery store and while it was used by the veterans’ organization as a meeting hall, we are not sure that it is appropriate to view the significance of those two uses cumulatively.” SHPO also stated, “we do not know whether the interior the building has an appropriate level of integrity to support a case for its eligibility . . . “SHPO concurred “that no other buildings or structures that were identified within the APE appear to be individually eligible for inclusion in the National Register.” (See Appendix F: Correspondence.)

Archaeologists for Archaeological Consultants of Ossian (ACO) conducted a records check of the APE on January 29, 2013, and reviewed SHAARD, Cultural Resource Management and other reports, cemetery records, and historic maps for previously identified resources. ACO conducted a field investigation of the APE on February 12, 2013 and on June 1, 2013. Field investigations for the project included visual walkover and a total of sixty-three shovel test units. The Phase Ia reconnaissance did not locate archaeological resources within the APE. ACO completed an Indiana Archaeological Short Report (ASR) on June 16, 2013 and recommended the project be allowed to proceed as planned. (See Appendix E: Reports.)

Since no historic resources were located during archaeological reconnaissance, the ASR is being submitted to the SHPO concurrently with this 800.11(d) documentation.

No other efforts to identify historic properties took place as a result of this project.

A public notice of the finding of “No Historic Properties Affected” will be published in a local newspaper and the public will be afforded thirty (30) days to comment. If appropriate, this document will be revised to reflect public comment.

3. BASIS FOR FINDING
No historic properties are present within the APE for the Chicago Street Reconstruction undertaking. Therefore, a finding of No Historic Properties Affected is appropriate.
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APPENDIX A. Plans

See Appendix A, Page A-39 to A-272 of the EA
APPENDIX B. Maps

State Location Map (Appendix A, Page A-2 of EA)
USGS Topographic Map (Appendix A, Page A-3 of EA)
Aerial Map (Appendix A, Page A-4 of EA)
Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction Zoom-in Map 1
City of Hammond, North Township, Lake County, Indiana
Des. No.: 12970172005 Aerial Photo

Project Location:
City of Hammond, North Township, Lake County, Indiana

July 3, 2013

Note: Information shown on this map is not warranted for accuracy or merchantability. GIS data used to create this map are from the best known sources existing at this time. However, experience shows that many national databases are not all inclusive. Use of this map should be limited to planning, and should not replace field review or background checks with other sources. It is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This map does not represent a legal document.
Note: Information shown on this map is not warranted for accuracy or merchantability. GIS data used to create this map are from the best known sources existing at this time. However, experience shows that many national databases are not all inclusive. Use of this map should be limited to planning and should not replace field review or background checks with other sources. It is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This map does not represent a legal document.
APPENDIX C. Consulting Parties
### Parties in yellow participated as Section 106

#### Consulting Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency/Company</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Glass</td>
<td>James A. Glass, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Natural</td>
<td>Division of Historic</td>
<td>862 West Washington St, W234</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Carpenter</td>
<td>Mr. Patrick Carpenter</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Cultural</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Section</td>
<td>100 North Senate Ave, N442</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mast</td>
<td>Mr. Travis Mast</td>
<td>Indiana Department of Transportation</td>
<td>LaPorte District Office</td>
<td>315 East Boyd Blvd</td>
<td>LaPorte</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tolbert</td>
<td>Ms. Tiffany Tolbert</td>
<td>Indiana Landmarks, Northwest Field</td>
<td></td>
<td>808 E 3rd St.</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor McDermott</td>
<td>The Honorable Thomas</td>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td>5925 Calumet Ave</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dost ami</td>
<td>Stanley J. Dostami</td>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td>5925 Calumet Ave</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Taillon</td>
<td>Mr. Phil Taillon</td>
<td>City of Hammond</td>
<td></td>
<td>649 Conkey St.</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Woods</td>
<td>Mr. Bruce L. Woods</td>
<td>Lake County Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>2401 E Columbus Dr</td>
<td>East Chicago</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Donen</td>
<td>Ms. Gloria Donen</td>
<td>East Chicago Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>564 S State St.</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Evans</td>
<td>Ms. Peg Evans</td>
<td>Hammond Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>375 N Pennsylvania St</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Newland</td>
<td>Ms. Joyce Newland</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>625 Central Ave</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Novak</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Novak</td>
<td>City of Hammond Zoning Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>5925 Conkey St.</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Copeland</td>
<td>The Honorable Anthony</td>
<td>City of East Chicago</td>
<td>Mayor's Office</td>
<td>4527 Indianapolis Blvd</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Polk</td>
<td>The Honorable Robert Polk</td>
<td>Village of Burnham</td>
<td>Mayor's Office</td>
<td>14450 Main Ave</td>
<td>Burnham</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>60633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Christianson</td>
<td>Ms. Elisa Christianson</td>
<td>Lake County Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>341 Beverly Blvd</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Davis</td>
<td>Mr. Marshall Davis</td>
<td>Indiana Landmarks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1201 Central Ave</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McFrancis</td>
<td>Ms. Tamara Francis</td>
<td>NAGPRA Contact</td>
<td>Delaware Nation</td>
<td>PO Box 825</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>78005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Holton</td>
<td>Mr. Kerry Holton</td>
<td>NAGPRA Contact</td>
<td>Delaware Nation, Oklahoma</td>
<td>PO Box 823</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>78005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Frank</td>
<td>Mr. Harold Frank</td>
<td>Forest County Potawatomi Community</td>
<td>PO Box 340</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>54320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Methosad</td>
<td>Mr. Kenneth Methosad</td>
<td>Hamilton Indian Community</td>
<td>PO Box 340</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>54320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gamble</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Gamble</td>
<td>Miami Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>PO Box 1326</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>33155-1325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Oates</td>
<td>Ms. Julie Oates</td>
<td>Miami Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>PO Box 1326</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>78015-1326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ballard</td>
<td>Mr. John Ballard</td>
<td>Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma</td>
<td>PO Box 1327</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>78015-0110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Foman</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Foman</td>
<td>Paqua Tribe of Indiana</td>
<td>PO Box 1327</td>
<td>Paqua</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>78015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hecker</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Hecker</td>
<td>NAGPRA Contact</td>
<td>Paqua Tribe of Indiana</td>
<td>PO Box 1327</td>
<td>Paqua</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>78015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 106 Consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT ID</strong></td>
<td>Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY</strong></td>
<td>City of Hammond, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WILL PARTICIPATE</strong></td>
<td>☒ WILL NOT PARTICIPATE ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTACT PERSON</strong></td>
<td>Don Novak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDRESS</strong></td>
<td>29114 RGN 5925 Warrick Rd Hammonn, IN 46370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHONE</strong></td>
<td>219.853.6268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-MAIL</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:donnovak@city-of-hammond.com">donnovak@city-of-hammond.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE</strong></td>
<td>1-2-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Documented Section 106

APPENDIX D. Photographs
See photographs folder on this CD
(available upon request)
Documentation of Section 106

APPENDIX E. Report Summaries
Historic Property Report
Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
DES No.: 1297017
North Township, Lake County, Indiana

Prepared for
City of Hammond

Prepared by
WEINTRAUT & ASSOCIATES, INC.
Principal Investigator: Dr. Linda Weintraut
Authors: Kelly Lally Molloy, M.A., and Bethany Natali, M.A.
PO Box 5034
Zionsville, Indiana
(317) 733-9770
(Linda@weintrautinc.com)

March 2013
The City of Hammond, with funding from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing a project to improve driver safety by correcting the horizontal alignment deficiencies of Chicago Street, formerly State Road (SR) 312; improving the efficiency of the intersections at Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street and Hohman Avenue; providing new pedestrian facilities, where feasible, to create continuity for pedestrian traffic in the area; and maintaining a state of good repair of the road and utility infrastructure along the proposed project location. The project will consist of approximately 2.1 miles of road reconstruction.

The project is located in an urban (intermediate) section of the City of Hammond in North Township, Lake County, Indiana. Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.16(d), the Area of Potential Effects (APE) has been generally drawn to incorporate properties adjacent to the proposed road widening and reconstruction. At locations where property acquisitions are possible, or where larger improvements were recommended, the APE was expanded to account for these recommendations. (See APE Map in Appendix 2.)

As part of the identification and evaluation efforts for the Section 106 study of this undertaking, historians identified seventy-two properties rated or considered Contributing or higher. Sixteen properties had been previously recorded in the Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (IHSSI). Of those, three properties are no longer extant. Historians identified an additional fifty-nine properties which they are recommending as Contributing to the historic fabric of the City of Hammond and Lake County, Indiana. No properties within the APE are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NR). As a result of this Section 106 investigation, historians for W&A are recommending the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 (089-338-40039) as eligible for listing in the NR.

Project historians for Weintraut & Associates, Inc. (W&A) who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards identified and evaluated historic properties within the APE for this project in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), as amended, and 36 C.F.R. Part 800, Final Rule on Revision of Current Regulations, December 12, 2000, and incorporating amendments effective August 5, 2004.
Where applicable, the use of this form is recommended but not required by the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

Author: Larry Stillwell

Date (month, day, year): 6/16/13

Project Title: An Archaeological Field Reconnaissance of the Proposed Chicago Street Widening Project from White Oak Avenue to South Brainard Avenue (Des. No. 1297017) in Hammond, Lake County, Indiana.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to reconstruct and widen Chicago Street (formerly known as State Route SR 312) through Hammond from South Brainard Avenue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the City of Hammond. The entire length of the proposed project is approximately 2.1 miles. SR 312 coincides with three separate streets as it traverses the project study area, including Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street. The project limits, from west to east, begin at the intersection of Gostlin Street (SR 312) and South Brainard Avenue and continue east along Gostlin Street to the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, where the project study area continues south along Sheffield Avenue to the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. At this intersection, the project study area turns east along Chicago Street to the study area’s eastern terminus at the intersection of Chicago Street and White Oak Avenue.

The western end of the proposed project corridor is currently a two-lane roadway. Travelling east along the corridor, the roadway remains at two lanes until the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, where a left-turn lane is provided for both eastbound and westbound traffic. Turning south, Sheffield Avenue is a two-lane facility. No left-turn lane is provided at the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. Turning east onto Chicago Street from Sheffield Avenue, Chicago Street is a two-lane facility with striped on-street parking along both sides of the roadway up to its intersection with Calumet Avenue, where both left- and right-turn lanes are provided for eastbound and westbound traffic. East of Calumet Avenue, Chicago Street becomes a four-lane roadway with two eastbound and two westbound travel lanes and striped on-street parking along both sides of the roadway through to the end of the project study area. Left-turn lanes are provided for both eastbound and westbound traffic at the intersection of Chicago Street and Columbia Avenue.

The project study area is urban with residential, commercial, and industrial properties mixed in with some educational and religious facilities. The proposed project will include improvements to the existing roadway, including new pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sewers, roadway lighting, and new traffic signals. Several alternatives are currently being evaluated. The current proposed project includes realignment of Gostlin Street between the Indiana/Illinois state line and Sheffield Avenue, leaving the current alignment of Gostlin Street as a local access road between Clark Avenue and Wabash Avenue. The intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Gostlin Street will be shifted to the southwest and become a roundabout. Sheffield Avenue will be slightly realigned, and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street will realigned to eliminate the 90-degree turn. The intersection of Hohman Avenue and Chicago Street will also become a roundabout. Additionally, Chicago Street between Hohman Avenue and Torrence Avenue will be widened to accommodate these improvements. Intersection improvements are also proposed at Johnson Avenue, Pine Avenue, and Columbia Avenue.

This project is being proposed to improve safety, reduce congestion, and improve travel times.
through the project area. It is anticipated that new permanent right-of-way will be required from residential, commercial, park, and industrial properties. The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed in two phases with Phase I extending from Brainard Avenue to Calumet Avenue and Phase II extending from Calumet Avenue to White Oak Avenue.

INDOT Designation Number/Contract Number: 1297017
Project Number: 13FR8
DHPA Number: 
Approved DHPA Plan Number: 
Prepared For: American Structurepoint, Inc.
Contact Person: Ms. Briana Hope
Address: 7260 Shadetown Station
City: Indianapolis State: IN ZIP Code: 46256-3917
Telephone Number: 317 547 5590 E-mail Address: BHope@structurepoint.com
Principal Investigator: Larry N. Stillwell
Signature: 
Company/Institution: Archaeological Consultants of Ossian (ACO)
Address: PO Box 2374
City: Muncie State: IN ZIP Code: 47307
Telephone Number: 765 730 0524 E-mail Address: LSACO1029@aol.com
RESULTS

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

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

☒ Phase la reconnaissance has located no archaeological resources in the project area.
Phase Ia reconnaissance has identified landforms conducive to buried archaeological deposits.

Actual Area Surveyed: hectares: 2.39 acres: 5.9

Comments:

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

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

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

Cemetery Name:

Other Recommendations/Commitments:

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

Attachments

☒ Figure showing project location within Indiana.

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

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

☒ Photographs of the project area.

☐ Project plans (if available)

Other Attachments: Description of sites located near project area see Attachment 1.

References Cited: Attachment 2

Comments:

Curation

Curation Facility for Project Documentation: Ball State University
Documentation of Section 106

APPENDIX F. Correspondence
December 19, 2012

James A. Glass, PhD
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
402 West Washington Street, W274
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
South Brainard Avenue to White Oak Avenue
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana
Project No. 1297017

Dear Dr. Glass:

The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to reconstruct and widen Chicago Street (formerly known as State Route (SR) 312) through Hammond from South Brainard Avenue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the City of Hammond. The entire length of the proposed project is approximately 2.1 miles. SR 312 coincides with three separate streets as it traverses the project study area, including: Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street. The project limits, from west to east, begin at the intersection of Gostlin Street (SR 312) and South Brainard Avenue, and continue east along Gostlin Street to the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue where the project study area continues south along Sheffield Avenue to the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. At this intersection the project study area turns east along Chicago Street to the study area’s eastern terminus at the intersection of Chicago Street and White Oak Avenue.

The western end of the proposed project corridor is currently a two-lane roadway. Travelling east along the corridor, the roadway remains at two lanes until the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, where a left-turn lane is provided for both eastbound and westbound traffic. Turning south, Sheffield Avenue is a two-lane facility. No left-turn lane is provided at the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. Turning east onto Chicago Street from Sheffield Avenue, Chicago Street is a two-lane facility with striped on-street parking on both sides of the roadway up to its intersection with Calumet Avenue, where both left-and right-turn lanes are provided for eastbound and westbound traffic. East of Calumet Avenue, Chicago Street becomes a four-lane roadway with two eastbound and two westbound travel lanes and striped on-street parking on both sides of the roadway through to the end of the project study area. Left-turn lanes are provided for both eastbound and westbound traffic at the intersection of Chicago Street and Columbia Avenue.
The project study area is urban with residential, commercial, and industrial properties mixed in with some educational and religious facilities. The project area is generally flat and featureless and is located in the Northern Moraine and Lake Region of Indiana.

The proposed project will include improvements to the existing roadway, including new pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sewers, roadway lighting, and new traffic signals. Several alternatives are currently being evaluated. The current preferred alternative includes realignment of Gostlin Street between the Indiana/Illinois state line and Sheffield Avenue, leaving the current alignment of Gostlin Street as a local access road between Clark Avenue and Wabash Avenue. The intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Gostlin Street will be shifted to the southwest and become a roundabout. Sheffield Avenue will be slightly realigned, and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street will realigned to eliminate the 90-degree turn. The intersection of Hohman Avenue and Chicago Street will also become a roundabout. Additionally, Chicago Street between Hohman Avenue and Torrence Avenue will be widened to accommodate these improvements. Intersection improvements are also proposed at Johnson Avenue, Pine Avenue, and Columbia Avenue.

This project is being proposed to improve safety, reduce congestion, and improve travel times through the project area. It is anticipated that new permanent right-of-way will be required from residential, commercial, park, and industrial properties. Preliminary estimates indicate that xx acres of right-of-way will be necessary and approximately 40 residential relocations and 8 commercial relocations will be necessary.

The proposed project is anticipated to be constructed in two phases, with Phase I extending from Brainard Avenue to Calumet Avenue and Phase II extending from Calumet Avenue to White Oak Avenue. It is anticipated that Phase I will be begin in July 2015 with Phase II being let in September 2016. Estimated construction costs as of September 2011 were $16 million, with 80 percent of this total being provided by federal funding and 20 percent coming from local funding. Maintenance of traffic during construction will be coordinated with the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Illinois Department of Transportation, the City of East Chicago, and the City of Hammond.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.2(c), you are hereby invited to be a consulting party to participate in the Section 106 process. This process involves efforts to identify historic properties potentially affected by the undertaking; assess the effects of the undertaking on historic properties; and seek ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties.

We realize you and/or your organization may want to perform a formal review of properties that may be affected as part of this project and, therefore, may require more detailed information regarding the scope of the project. A Historic Property Report and Archaeological Investigation are underway and these documents will be submitted to you for review when complete.
The following organizations have been contacted and invited to become consulting parties with regard to potential historic resource impacts associated with the proposed roadway improvements. Please review this list, and provide any additional organizations you are aware of that may also have an interest in the potential historic resource impacts of this project.

- Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
- Indiana Department of Transportation
- Indiana Landmarks, Northwest Field Office
- Indiana Landmarks
- City of Hammond
- City of Hammond Historic Preservation Commission
- Hammond Historical Society
- East Chicago Historical Society
- City of East Chicago
- Village of Burnham
- Lake County Historic Preservation Coalition
- Lake County Historical Society

Per 36 CFR 800.3(f), we hereby request the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) notify this office if the SHPO is aware of any other parties that may be entitled to be consulting parties or should be contacted as potential consulting parties for the aforementioned project.

You are asked to review this information and provide any comments you may have relative to anticipated impacts of the project on areas in which you have jurisdiction or special expertise. To facilitate the development of this project, you are asked to reply within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received by that date, it will be assumed you have no comments at the present time. Your timely cooperation in the development of this project will be appreciated. Please contact me at (317) 547-5580 or by email at jmiles@structurepoint.com if there are any questions or if additional information is needed.

Very truly yours,

American Structurepoint, Inc.

Jason T. Miles, JD
Environmental Scientist

JTM:mgn

Enclosures

Cc: Glen Campbell, American Structurepoint, Inc.
City of Hammond
January 9, 2013

Jason T. Miles, JD
Environmental Scientist
American Structurepoint, Inc.
7260 Shadeland Station
Indianapolis, IN 46256

RE: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana
Project No. 1297017

Dear Mr. Miles:

Your December 19, 2012 letter to Patrick Swibes of the Hammond Historic Preservation Commission (HHPC) has been received in my office. On behalf of the HHPC, I am responding to your invitation to participate to indicate that the Hammond Historic Preservation Commission wishes to participate in the Section 106 process.

In reviewing your letter, you provide general descriptions of street changes and street realignments. It is unclear from your submission what the extent of the street reconstruction will be. From the description you have provided, we make a few assumptions that the project, in part, will go outside of the current right-of-way. We request more specific information to that point.

Secondly, you indicate that a result of your Red Flag Investigation was the identification of “several potentially historic sites”. Please identify which sites you have identified that may be impacted by this project.

Upon receipt of the requested information, we will conduct our evaluation and determine if any historic sites are affected in an adverse manner, followed by an appropriate response in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Brian L. Poland, AICP
Director of City Planning
January 23, 2013

Jason T. Miles, JD
Environmental Scientist
American Structurepoint, Inc.
7260 Shadeland Station
Indianapolis, Indiana 46256-3957

Federal Agency: Indiana Department of Transportation ("INDOT"), on behalf of Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA")

Re: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, South Brainard Avenue to White Oak Avenue (Des. No. 1297017; DHPA 14341)

Dear Mr. Miles:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 470f), implementing regulations at 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the "Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program in the State of Indiana" ("Minor Projects PA") the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer has surveyed your letter dated December 19, 2012, and received on December 26, for the aforementioned project in cites of Hammond and East Chicago in Lake County, Indiana, and Village of Burnham in Cook County, Illinois.

We do not have any consulting parties to recommend beyond whom you already have invited.

We will be glad to comment on the anticipated historic property report and report of the archaeological investigation, once the INDOT Cultural Resources Office has approved your distribution of those reports to us.

For more information about the reports that we will need to review, you can find INDOT’s Indiana Cultural Resources Manual at www.in.gov/indot/files/January_2008_Manual.pdf. The revised 36 C.F.R. Part 800 regulations that took effect on August 5, 2004, are at www.achp.gov, and the Minor Projects PA is at www.in.gov/indot/files/Minor_Projects_PA_signed_with_updated_Appendix_A_and_B.pdf

If you have questions about archaeological issues, please contact Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.IN.gov. Questions about buildings or structures should be directed to John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jcarr@dnr.IN.gov. In all future correspondence regarding this project, please refer to DHPA No. 14341.

Very truly yours,

Ron McAlphon
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

emc: Patrick Carpenter, Indiana Department of Transportation
Mary Kennedy, Indiana Department of Transportation
Shaun Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
Melanie Prather, Indiana Department of Transportation
Jason Miles, JD, American Structurepoint, Inc.
April 10, 2013

State Historic Preservation Officer
Attn: John Carr
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
402 West Washington Street, W274
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
   South Brainard Avenue to White Oak Avenue
   Hammond, Lake County, Indiana
   Des. No. 1297017
   DHPA No. 14341
   American Structurepoint No. 2011.00320

Dear Mr. Carr:

The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to reconstruct and widen Chicago Street (formerly known as State Route (SR) 312) through Hammond from South Brainard Avenue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the city of Hammond. The entire length of the proposed project is approximately 2.1 miles. SR 312 coincides with three separate streets as it traverses the project study area, including Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street. The project limits, from west to east, begin at the intersection of Gostlin Street (SR 312) and South Brainard Avenue, and continue east along Gostlin Street to the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue where the project study area continues south along Sheffield Avenue to the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. At this intersection the project study area turns east along Chicago Street to the study area's eastern terminus at the intersection of Chicago Street and White Oak Avenue.

A Historic Property Report: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, Des. No. 1297017, North Township, Lake County, Indiana has been prepared by Weintraut & Associates for the proposed project corridor (March 2013). This report was submitted to the Indiana Department of Transportation, Environmental Services, Cultural Resources Office (INDOT-ES/CRO) for review. INDOT-ES/CRO approved this report for release to Consulting Parties on April 8, 2013. A copy of this report including Stage 1 Preliminary Plans is included for your review and comment.
State Historic Preservation Officer  
April 10, 2013

Page 2

One property, Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 located at 241 Gostlin Street, was recommended as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its association with the ethnic and military heritage of the Hammond Polish community.

You are asked to review this information and provide any comments you may have relative to anticipated impacts of the project on areas in which you have jurisdiction or special expertise. To facilitate the development of this project, you are asked to reply within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received by that date, it will be assumed you have no comments at the present time. Your timely cooperation in the development of this project will be appreciated. Please contact me at (317) 547-5580 or by email at jmiles@structurepoint.com if there are any questions or if additional information is needed.

Very truly yours,
American Structurepoint, Inc.

[Signature]

Jason T. Miles, JD  
Environmental Scientist

JTM: jah

Enclosures

cc: Glen Campbell, American Structurepoint  
    City of Hammond Engineering Department, Stan Dostatni, City Engineer (Enclosure)  
    Patrick Carpenter, INDOT-ES/CRO  
    Travis Mast, INDOT LaPorte District  
    Linda Weintraut, Weintraut & Associates  
    State Historic Preservation Officer (Enclosure)  
    Don Novak, City of Hammond Zoning (Enclosure)  
    Brian Poland, Hammond Historic Preservation Commission (Enclosure)  
    Tiffany Tolbert, Indiana Landmarks (Enclosure)
May 7, 2013

Fidel and María Elena Salina
1332 18th Place
Chicago, Illinois 60608

Re: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
South Brainard Avenue to White Oak Avenue
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana
Des. No. 1297017
DHPA No. 14341
American Structurepoint No. 201100320

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Salina:

The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to reconstruct and widen Chicago Street (formerly known as State Route (SR) 312) through Hammond from South Brainard Avenue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the city of Hammond. The entire length of the proposed project is approximately 2.1 miles. SR 312 coincides with three separate streets as it traverses the project study area, including Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street. The project limits, from west to east, begin at the intersection of Gostlin Street (SR 312) and South Brainard Avenue, and continue east along Gostlin Street to the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, where the project study area continues south along Sheffield Avenue to the intersection of Sheffield Avenue and Chicago Street. At this intersection the project study area turns east along Chicago Street to the study area’s eastern terminus at the intersection of Chicago Street and White Oak Avenue.

A Historic Property Report: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, Des. No. 1297017, North Township, Lake County, Indiana has been prepared by Weintraut & Associates for the proposed project corridor (March 2013). This report was submitted to the Indiana Department of Transportation, Environmental Services, Cultural Resources Office (INDOT-ES/CRO) for review. INDOT-ES/CRO approved this report for release to Consulting Parties on April 8, 2013. A copy of this report including Stage 1 Preliminary Plans is included for your review and comment. Please note that the plans included in this report are preliminary and may change as the project progresses.
AMERICAN STRUCTUREPOINT, INC.

State Historic Preservation Officer
May 9, 2013
Page 2

One property, Polish Army Veterans' Post No. 40, located at 241 Gostlin Street, was recommended as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its association with the ethnic and military heritage of the Hammond Polish community. As the owner of the property, you are invited to be a consulting party.

You are asked to review this information and provide any comments you may have relative to anticipated impacts of the project on areas in which you have jurisdiction or special expertise. To facilitate the development of this project, you are asked to reply within 30 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received by that date, it will be assumed you have no comments at the present time. Please contact me at (317) 547-5580 or by email at GoChicagoStreet@structurepoint.com if there are any questions or if additional information is needed. Additionally, please visit GoChicagoStreet.com for additional information regarding the proposed project.

Very truly yours,
American Structurepoint, Inc.

Christine Meador
Environmental Scientist

CAM:taló

Enclosures

cc:  Glen Campbell, American Structurepoint
     City of Hammond Engineering Department, Stan Dostatni, City Engineer (Enclosure)
     Patrick Carpenter, INDOT-ES/CRO
     Travis Mast, INDOT LaPorte District
     Linda Weintraut, Weintraut & Associates
Anyone or all,

As I’ve been reviewing the HPR for this project, several questions about the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 (089-338-40030) and the project’s relationship to that building have occurred to me and to Frank Hurdis, whose advice I sought:

- Aside from PAVA’s use of the Post No. 40 building, did the research the historians conducted in preparing the HPR indicate that the building was important in local popular culture? In other words, was it used as a meeting place by members of Hammond’s Polish community in general—a place that would have been considered important to a larger group than just the PAVA members?

- I read on p. 18 that the building apparently began to be used for meetings of PAVA in 1948 and that PAVA met there as late as 1996. The boarding up of some of the windows is probably hard to date, but what’s your best guess as to when the glass blocks apparently replaced window panes?

- Am I correct in assuming that the historians did not have access to the interior of the Post No. 40 building and otherwise did not obtain any information about its interior features and condition, such that nothing is known about its interior integrity?

- What will happen to Gostlin St. immediately in front of the former Post No. 40 building? If I’m reading Zoom-in Map 1 in the HPR correctly, that part of Gostlin will be cut off from the roundabout that will replace the existing Gostlin-Sheffield intersection, and it appears that coming from west of Post No. 40, Gostlin will curve northward into Wabash Ave. After this project is finished, will there still be vehicular access to the short stretch of Gostlin in front of Post No. 40 (e.g., from where Gostlin will curve into Wabash), or will the only vehicular access directly to the building be from the north, via the alley? If access will be only from that north-south alley, would vehicles be able to reach the front of Post No. 40, or will even that part of Gostlin be removed? I realize that I’m getting into effects here, but how closely we scrutinize the proposed determination of individual National Register eligibility might depend on the ways and degree in which Post No. 40 is might be affected.

John L. Carr
Re: Des No 1297017, Chicago Street Widening & Reconstruction--Polish Army Veterans' Post No 40

1 message

Linda Weintraut <linda@weintrautinc.com>  Wed, May 8, 2013 at 3:25 PM
To: "Carr, John" <JCarr@dnr.in.gov>
Cc: JMiles@structurepoint.com, Kelly Molloy <Kelly@weintrautinc.com>, bethany w <bethany@weintrautinc.com>, "Tharp, Wade" <WTharp1@dnr.in.gov>, "Carpenter, Patrick A" <PACarpenter@indot.in.gov>, "Miller, Shaun (INDOT)" <smiller@indot.in.gov>

John,

Please see responses below. Please let us know if you have additional questions.

Thanks, Linda

Question: Aside from PAVA's use of the Post No. 40 building, did the research the historians conducted in preparing the HPR indicate that the building was important in local popular culture? In other words, was it used as a meeting place by members of Hammond's Polish community in general—a place that would have been considered important to a larger group than the just the PAVA members?

Response: The historians' research was directed at finding a symbolic link between this resource and a particular ethnic community. Research from city directories, in combination with Sanborn map research of the neighborhood and U.S. census records, did suggest an association with the Polish community as a neighborhood grocery store from at least the 1920s through the 1930s based on the owner surnames or birthplaces. Sanborn mapping from 1915 shows the APE is primarily working-class residences with a small number of commercial buildings (mostly located on Sheffield Avenue). As a community structure (first a local grocery and later as the PAVA Post No. 40), the historians believe the building symbolizes the Polish presence in a working-class community that has few resources with integrity. Initially, the owner/operator of the grocery occupied the same building; though by 1923 the grocers listed different residences.

Historians did not specifically research the property's connection to “popular culture” in the academic sense of an association with written materials, performances, and other ephemera associated with “mass” or “low brow” culture of the early twentieth century. Historians did not find any indication of a popular culture association with the building but were not looking for that, either, in conducting research.

Question: I read on p. 18 that the building apparently began to be used for meetings of PAVA in 1948 and that PAVA met there as late as 1996. The boarding up of some of the windows is probably hard to date, but what’s your best guess as to when the glass blocks apparently replaced window panes?

Response: Historians estimate the glass block was installed sometime between the 1930s to 1950s. This estimate is based on two factors: (1.) A spike in residential home construction in the APE from c. 1930 to c. 1950 characterized in part by the use of glass block as a decorative detail and (2.) The possible addition of the glass block when PAVA occupied the building in 1948.
Question: Am I correct in assuming that the historians did not have access to the interior of the Post No. 40 building and otherwise did not obtain any information about its interior features and condition, such that nothing is known about its interior integrity?

Response: That is correct. The building was not accessible at the time historians surveyed the APE. In conducting research for the building, historians eventually contacted the wife of a local council person who confirmed her husband had knowledge of the building’s use as the PAVA building. Further attempts to reach the city council person were not successful. In addition, historians attempted to contact representatives of the PAVA for information on the site; those attempts were also unsuccessful.

Question: What will happen to Gostlin St. immediately in front of the former Post No. 40 building? If I’m reading Zoom-in Map 1 in the HPR correctly, that part of Gostlin will be cut off from the roundabout that will replace the existing Gostlin-Sheffield intersection, and it appears that coming from west of Post No. 40, Gostlin will curve northward into Wabash Ave. After this project is finished, will there still be vehicular access to the short stretch of Gostlin in front of Post No. 40 (e.g., from where Gostlin will curve into Wabash), or will the only vehicular access directly to the building be from the north, via the alley? If access will be only from that north-south alley, would vehicles be able to reach the front of Post No. 40, or will even that part of Gostlin be removed? I realize that I’m getting into effects here, but how closely we scrutinize the proposed determination of individual National Register eligibility might depend on the ways and degree in which Post No. 40 is might be affected.

Response: American Structurepoint is currently evaluating different alternatives for the proposed project and therefore do not know exactly what will occur in the area of the Post No. 40 Building. The preferred alternative that was included in the HPR does cut off access in front of the building. Structurepoint has not completed any design yet on what will happen to the old roadway but it will not be open to through traffic. It maybe a parking lot, greenspace, or combination that reflects the old roadway. Structurepoint is open to suggestions. Please be aware that Structurepoint has not selected the preferred alternative as the definitive alternative to move forward as this alternative impacts the most residential properties and environmental justice populations. Other alternatives that do not impact as many residential properties impact the front of the Post No. 40 Building.

An alternative analysis is included with these responses for information and review. This document was just released yesterday to the public.

If the SHPO office has any further questions regarding the project design, please contact Christine Meador at: cmeador@structurepoint.com or 317-547-5580. Also, American Structurepoint has established a website for this project at http://gochicagostreet.com/.

On Tue, May 7, 2013 at 3:18 PM, Carr, John <JCarr@dnr.in.gov> wrote:

Anyone or all,

As I’ve been reviewing the HPR for this project, several questions about the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 (089-338-40030) and the project’s relationship to that building have occurred to me and to Frank Hurdis, whose advice I sought:

- Aside from PAVA’s use of the Post No. 40 building, did the research the historians conducted in preparing the HPR indicate that the building was important in local popular culture? In other words, was it used as a meeting place by members of Hammond’s Polish community in general—a place that would have been considered important to a larger group than the just the PAVA members?
I read on p. 18 that the building apparently began to be used for meetings of PAVA in 1948 and that PAVA met there as late as 1996. The boarding up of some of the windows is probably hard to date, but what's your best guess as to when the glass blocks apparently replaced window panes?

Am I correct in assuming that the historians did not have access to the interior of the Post No. 40 building and otherwise did not obtain any information about its interior features and condition, such that nothing is known about its interior integrity?

What will happen to Gostlin St. immediately in front of the former Post No. 40 building? If I'm reading Zoom-in Map 1 in the HPR correctly, that part of Gostlin will be cut off from the roundabout that will replace the existing Gostlin-Sheffield intersection, and it appears that coming from west of Post No. 40, Gostlin will curve northward into Wabash Ave. After this project is finished, will there still be vehicular access to the short stretch of Gostlin in front of Post No. 40 (e.g., from where Gostlin will curve into Wabash), or will the only vehicular access directly to the building be from the north, via the alley? If access will be only from that north-south alley, would vehicles be able to reach the front of Post No. 40, or will even that part of Gostlin be removed? I realize that I'm getting into effects here, but how closely we scrutinize the proposed determination of individual National Register eligibility might depend on the ways and degree in which Post No. 40 is might be affected.

John L. Carr
Team Leader for Historic Structures Review
Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
402 W. Washington St., Room W274
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Ph. No.: 317-233-1949 Fax No.: 317-232-0693

--

Linda Weintraut, Ph.D.
Weintraut & Associates, Inc.
PO Box 5034
4649 Northwestern Drive
Zionsville, Indiana 46077
317.733.9770 ext. 310
www.weintrautinc.com
May 8, 2013

Jason T. Miles, JD
Environmental Scientist
American Structurepoint, Inc.
7260 Shadeland Station
Indianapolis, IN 46256-3957

RE: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
South Brainard to White Oak Avenue
Hammond, Lake County, IN
Des. No. 1297017
DHPA No. 14341
American Structurepoint No. 2011.00320

Dear Mr. Miles

On behalf of the Hammond Historic Preservation Commission, I wish to respond to your correspondence of April 10, 2013 regarding the above referenced project.

The Hammond Historic Preservation Commission concurs with the recommendation that the Polish Army Veterans' Post No. 40 building at 241 Gostlin Street is eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The HPC does have a concern about the street design in front of this building. It appears from the proposed design that the current Gostlin Street in front of the building is being curbed at Wabash Avenue. This appears to eliminate street access to the building, the adjacent residential structure, and the alley. Eliminating the local street access to these properties would negatively affect their viability and negative affect access to city services in the alley. It is suggested that local street access is maintained up to the alley.

The HPC does not concur with the recommendation regarding the NIPSCO substation at 4533 Hanover Street and believes the eligibility of this building is worthy of further consideration. However it appears that the street project would not adversely affect this building.

Contrary to the sources quoted on page 6, the Town of Hammond was incorporated on December 3, 1883. The City of Hammond was incorporated on April 21, 1884. The City of Hammond was not named after George Hammond. It was named after Thomas Hammond, George's brother. George Hammond was quoted as saying that "Hammond would never be a permanent town" and was strongly opposed to the incorporation-
efforts. The source of this is the “Hammond, Indiana’s American Bicentennial Yearbook” p.50. The misinformation of who Hammond was named after is a serious local issue.

On behalf of the Hammond Historic Preservation Commission, this opportunity to comment on this project is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Brian L. Polaris, AICP
Director of City Planning

Cc: HPC files
May 13, 2013

Jason T. Miles, JD
Environmental Scientist
American Structurepoint, Inc.
7260 Shadeland Station
Indianapolis, Indiana 46256-3957

Federal Agency: Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”)

Re: Historic property report (Mollov and Natali, 3/2013) for the Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, South Brainard Avenue to White Oak Avenue, Hammond, Lake County (Des. No. 1297017; American Structurepoint No. 2011.00320; DHPA No. 14341)

Dear Mr. Miles:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. § 470f), 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the “Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program In the State of Indiana,” the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the historic property report (“HPR”) received with your cover letter dated April 10, 2013, and received on April 12, as well as e-mail messages from Dr. Linda Weintraub of Weintraub & Associates on May 8 and from Christine Meador of your firm on May 9, pertaining to the aforementioned project within the City of Hammond in Lake County, Indiana.

We accept the area of potential effects (“APE”) as it is described and depicted in the HPR, for the project as it has been described in your letter and in the HPR.

While we appreciate the effort that has been made to identify and evaluate the National Register of Historic Places Criterion A significance of the Polish Army Veterans’ Post No. 40 at 241 Goslin Street (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory No. 089-338-40030), we do not believe that the information presented to us to date makes a strong enough case for Criterion A significance to merit National Register eligibility. Although the building evidently held some significance to the Polish community in Hammond, both while it served as a grocery store and while it was used by the veterans’ organization as a meeting hall, we are not sure that it is appropriate to view the significance of those two uses cumulatively. Furthermore, at this point, we do not know whether the interior of the building has an appropriate level of integrity to support a case for its eligibility as either a grocery or a meeting hall, even if a stronger case for its significance could be made.

We agree with the evaluation of the HPR that no other buildings or structures that were identified within the APE appear to be individually eligible for inclusion in the National Register. Furthermore, it does not appear that any National Register-eligible districts extend into the APE.

The comments above pertain only to historic buildings or structures, because no information was provided about archaeological resources.

If you have questions about buildings or structures, please contact John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jccarr@dnr.in.gov. Questions about archaeological issues should be directed to Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.in.gov. In all future correspondence about the Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, please continue to refer to DHPA No. 14341.
Until further notice, please address all written, Section 106 correspondence intended for the Indiana SHPO staff to Chad W. Slider, Assistant Director for Environmental Review, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 402 West Washington, Room W274, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

Very truly yours,

Chris Smith
Interim Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

cc: Joyce Newland, Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
    Patrick Carpenter, Indiana Department of Transportation
    Shaun Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
    Molny Prather, Indiana Department of Transportation
    Jason Miles, JD, American Structurepoint, Inc.
    Christine Meador, American Structurepoint, Inc.
The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to reconstruct and widen Chicago Street (formerly known as State Route (SR) 312) through Hammond from South Brainard Avenue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the city of Hammond. The entire length of the proposed project is approximately 2.1 miles. SR 312 coincides with three separate streets as it traverses the project study area, including Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street.

The proposed improvements to the roadway include new pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sewers, roadway lighting, and new traffic signals. The proposed project would widen Gostlin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue. In order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond, a center median would also be included along Gostlin Street. The preferred alignment currently is the shifting of Gostlin Street to the south on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, from its intersection with Hohman Avenue to its intersection with Baltimore Avenue, Chicago Street would be widened from two lanes to four lanes. Roundabouts are anticipated at the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue, as well as Chicago Street and Hohman Avenue. Chicago Street will also be widened at the intersections with Johnson Avenue and Dearborn Avenue to accommodate designated left-turn lanes. Intersection improvements are also proposed at Pine Avenue and Columbia Avenue.

The proposed action does not affect properties or items listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has issued a No Historic Properties Affected finding for the project. In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, the views of the public are being sought regarding the effect of the proposed project on the historic elements as per 36 CFR 800.2(d), 800.3(e) and 800.6(a)(4). Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6(a)(4), the documentation specified in 36 CFR 800.11(d) is available for inspection in the Engineering Department, City of Hammond, 5925 Calumet Avenue, Hammond, Indiana 46320; at the Hammond Public Library located at 564 State Street, Hammond, Indiana 46320; and on-line at GoChicagoStreet.com. This documentation serves as the basis for the FHWA’s No Historic Properties Affected finding. The views of the public on this finding are being sought. Please reply to the contact listed below.

SECTION 4(F) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

This undertaking will not convert property from any Section 4(f) historic property to a transportation use. The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT), acting on behalf
of FHWA, has determined the appropriate Section 106 finding is “No Historic Properties Affected”; therefore, no Section 4(f) evaluation is required for historic properties.

This undertaking will convert approximately 0.001 acres of land from Irving Park to a transportation use for reconstruction of the sidewalk along Irving Park Drive and Chicago Street. No adverse impacts to the recreational facilities within the park are anticipated. FHWA intends to issue a *de minimis* Section 4(f) finding for this acquisition.

The views of the public on the undertaking are being sought. Comments must be received no later than August 30, 2013. Please direct any comments or questions to:

Ms. Christine Meador  
Environmental Scientist  
American Structurepoint, Inc.  
7260 Shadeland Station  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46256  
(317) 547-5580  
Fax: (317) 543-0270  
Email: cmeador@structurepoint.com or GoChicagoStreet@structurepoint.com

For additional information or to submit comments, visit GoChicagoStreet.com.
PUBLISHER'S CLAIM

CHARGES

[Editorial note: The charge for placing an item in the newspaper is $0.00 per column inch.]

A column inch equals 1/12 of a column wide (3.45 lines) at 7 point type. Each newspaper page would be calculated separately.]

$47.00

ITEM OF CLAIM

[Editorial note: The form requires a title, date, and signature.]

Title: Legal Clerk

[Editorial note: The form requires a statement indicating whether the document has a Web site and whether a public notice was posted on the same day it was published in the newspaper.]

[Signature]

Date: 07/05/13

[Editorial note: The form requires a statement indicating whether the document has a Web site and whether a public notice was posted on the same day it was published in the newspaper.]

[Signature]

Date: 07/05/13

[Editorial note: The form requires a statement indicating whether the document has a Web site and whether a public notice was posted on the same day it was published in the newspaper.]

[Signature]
ACCOUNT  100102438
AMERICAN STRUCTUREPOINT INC  0000612035  To  POST-TRIBUNE

1433 E. 83RD AVE., MERRILLVILLE, IN 46410-6307

LINE COUNT
Display Master (Must not exceed two actual lines, neither of which shall
more than four solid lines of the type in which the body of the
advertisement is set) -- number of equivalent lines
Head -- number of lines
Body -- number of lines
Tail -- number of lines
Total number of lines in notice

COMPUTATION OF CHARGES
87  Lires, 2 columns wide equals 174  equivalent lines at  $52.03
cents per line  0.299
Additional charges for notices containing rule or tabular work (50 per cent
of above amount)
Charge for extra proofs of publication ($1.00 for each proof in excess
of two)
TOTAL AMOUNT OF CLAIM  $52.03

DATA FOR COMPUTING COST
Width of single column in picas  7.33  Size of type  7.00  point
Number of insertions  1

Pursuant to the provisions of penalties of IC 5-11-10-1, I hereby certify that the foregoing account is
just and correct, that the amount claimed is legally due, after allowing all just credits, and that no part of the same
has been paid.
I also certify that the printed matter attached hereto is a true copy, of the same column width and type size,
which was duly published in said paper......1.......times. The dates of publication being as follows:

0000612035
7/27/13

Additionally, the statement checked below is true and correct:

...... Newspaper does not have a Web site.
......X.. Newspaper has a Web site and this public notice was posted on the same day as it was published in the
newspaper.
...... Newspaper has a Web site, but due to technical problem or error, public notice was posted on............
...... Newspaper has a Web site but refuses to post the public notice.

CATHY CYNCAR

DATE:  Jul 27, 2013  TITLE:  LEGAL CLERK
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PUBLI C NOTICE

LEGAL NOTICE OF HISTORIC EFFECT AND 40\(\text{F}\) PROPER TY EFFECT

Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, Hammond,
Indiana, JEA, No. 1287071, DHI A 14341

The City of Hammond, located in Lake County, Indiana, is developing a federal-aid project to widen and extend Chicago Street (formerly known as State Route SR 312) through Hammond along South Brien Ave-
nue, on the Indiana border with Illinois, to White Oak Avenue, at the eastern limits of the city of Hammond.

The entire length of the proposed project is approxi-
mately 2.1 miles. SR 312 is bisected by seven streets as it traverses the project study area, including Gasolin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street.

The proposed improvements to the roadway include new pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sew-
ers, roadway lighting, and new traffic signals. The pro-
posed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue. In order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond, a center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the south on new align-
mant, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the north on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the north on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the north on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the north on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the north on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.

The preferred alignment currently is to shift Gasolin Street to the north on new alignment, in order to correct the curve at the state line and the intersection of Sheffield Avenue. Sheffield Avenue would be widened with one travel lane in each direction with a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, the intersection with Holman Avenue is to be extended.

The proposed project would widen Gasolin Street from two lanes to four lanes between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gasolin Street and Sheffield Avenue, in order to meet the city’s access management strategy goal of having a gateway into Hammond. A center median would also be included.
August 20, 2013

Patrick Carpenter
Manager, Cultural Resources Office
Environmental Services Division
Indiana Department of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Federal Agency: Indiana Department of Transportation ("INDOT")
on behalf of Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA")

Re: Indiana archaeological short report (Stillwell, 6/16/2013), and INDOT's finding, on behalf of FHWA, of No Historic Properties Affected for the Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, extending from the intersection of Goslin Street and South Brainard Avenue to the intersection of Chicago Street and White Oak Avenue, a distance of approximately 2.1 miles (Des. No. 1297017; American Structurepoint No. 201100320; DHPA No. 14341)

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. § 470f), 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the "Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Indiana State Historic Preservation Office Regarding the Implementation of the Federal Aid Highway Program In the State of Indiana," the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO") has conducted an analysis of American Structurepoint's letter dated July 19, 2013, with enclosures, which were received on July 22, for the above-indicated project in the City of Hammond, Lake County, Indiana.

Based upon the submitted information and the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places within the proposed project area; and we concur with the recommendation of the archaeologist, as expressed in the Indiana archaeological short report (Stillwell, 6/16/2013), that no further archaeological investigations appear necessary at this proposed project area.

If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29) requires that the discovery must be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 252-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations.

As we had indicated in our May 13, 2013, letter, we do not believe that any above-ground properties identified in the historic property report (Molley & Natali, 3/2013) are eligible for inclusion in the National Register, either individually or as part of a district.

Therefore, we concur with the INDOT's July 15, 2013, finding, on behalf of the FHWA, of No Historic Properties Affected for this undertaking.

If you have questions about buildings or structures, please contact John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jcarr@dnr.in.gov. Questions about archaeological issues should be directed to Wade T. Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or
wtharp1@dnr.IN.gov. In any future correspondence about the Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction, please continue to refer to DHPA No. 14341.

Please address all Section 106 correspondence intended for review by the Indiana SHPO—whether for this or any other project—to Chad W. Slider, Assistant Director for Environmental Review, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, 402 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

Very truly yours,

Chris Smith
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

CC: WTP: JLC: JJS

CC: Christine Meador, American Structurepoint, Inc.

emc: Joyce Newland, Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
Patrick Carpenter, Indiana Department of Transportation
Shawn Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
Mary Kennedy, Indiana Department of Transportation
Melany Prather, Indiana Department of Transportation
Christine Meador, American Structurepoint, Inc.
Jason Miles, JD, American Structurepoint, Inc.
Larry Stillwell, Archaeological Consultant of5hlan
Linda Weinert, Ph.D., Weinert & Associates, Inc.
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Final Section 4(f) Documentation (de minimis)
From: Hope, Briana
To: Marlatt, Amy
Subject: FW: Des. No. 1297017 - Chicago Street in Hammond
Date: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 9:38:08 AM

Briana M. Hope
Project Manager, Environmental Services Group
7260 Shadeland Station, Indianapolis, Indiana 46256
T 317.547.5580 E bhope@structurepoint.com
F 317.543.0270 W www.structurepoint.com
C 317.997.5652

From: Bales, Ronald [mailto:rbales@indot.IN.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2013 3:26 PM
To: Meador, Christine
Cc: Campbell, Glen; Hope, Briana; Miles, Jason; Mcmullen, Kenneth B.
Subject: RE: Des. No. 1297017 - Chicago Street in Hammond

Chris,

INDOT – Environmental Services Division, through consultation with FHWA, would consider this a Section 4(f) use of Irving Park. Since this is not a significant part of the park, this could be processed under a section 4(f) *de minimis* evaluation. The main components of the *de minimis* evaluations are; a summary of the *de minimis* evaluation within the EA, a letter from the official with jurisdiction concurring with the impacts to the park and the *de minimis* application, and a public notice informing the public of the *de minimis* finding (30 day comment period).

Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Ron Bales
INDOT-Environmental Services Division
317-234-4916

From: Meador, Christine [mailto:CMeador@structurepoint.com]
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2013 8:57 AM
To: Bales, Ronald
Cc: Campbell, Glen; Hope, Briana; Miles, Jason
Subject: Des. No. 1297017 - Chicago Street in Hammond

Ron:

As we have been moving forward with preliminary design options we have determined that portions of the existing sidewalk along Irving Park Road, adjacent to Chicago Street and Irving Park are not
within the existing right-of-way. As part of the Chicago Street improvements, we will be upgrading all the sidewalks to ADA compliance. This will involve reconstruction of the existing sidewalk along Irving Park including slightly widening the sidewalk. In order for this to be included in the project, apparent existing right-of-way/new right-of-way will have to be acquired from the park. For reference see the attached mapping. We anticipate that 335 square feet of permanent right-of-way will be acquired. Both the existing right-of-way and the park are owned by the City of Hammond.

Within Irving Park, on the south side of Chicago Street, there is an existing 4 foot wide sidewalk that is approximately 10 feet south of the back of curb at approximately the existing right-of-way line. This sidewalk will be removed and the right-of-way will be re-graded and grassed. A replacement sidewalk will be constructed entirely within the existing right-of-way at the back of the new curb. A potential future project being investigated by others includes addition of a multi-use path along the park in approximately the location of the existing sidewalk.

As the existing sidewalk is part of the urban streetscape accessible to all, not a part of the park proper, and the area to be acquired is a grassed area adjacent to the existing sidewalk, this does not appear to be a significant recreational resource. As such, I would propose this acquisition is not a Section 4(f) use of the park. Can you please review and let me know if INDOT concurs with this assessment.

Thank you for your assistance on this project and have a great day.

Chris

______________________________
Christine A. Meador
Project Manager, Environmental Services Group
7260 Shadeland Station, Indianapolis, Indiana 46256
T 317-547-5580   E cmeador@structurepoint.com
F 317-543-0270   W www.structurepoint.com

Follow us on Facebook

Voted “Best Place to Work” 2009-2011

DISCLAIMER:
This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute, utilize, or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. No design changes or decisions made by e-mail shall be considered part of the contract documents unless otherwise specified, and all design changes
June 21, 2013

Mr. Patrick Moore Sr., Administrator
Hammond Parks and Recreation Department
3825 Sohl Avenue
Hammond, Indiana 46320

Re: Section 4(f) Coordination
Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana
Des. No. 1297017
Project No. 201100320

Dear Mr. Moore:

The City of Hammond is developing a federal-aid project to improve safety, reduce congestion, enhance mobility, address the deteriorating infrastructure, and create a unified east-west corridor along Chicago Street (former SR 312) between South Brainard Avenue at the Indiana border with Illinois and White Oak Avenue at the city of Hammond’s border with the city of East Chicago. The existing Chicago Street (former SR 312) corridor traverses three separate roadways, including Gostlin Street, Sheffield Avenue, and Chicago Street as it extends through Hammond.

Various alternatives are being examined for each of the roadways along the project corridor from the state line to Calumet Avenue. All alternatives under evaluation propose to widen Gostlin Street from one lane in each direction to two lanes in direction between the project’s western terminus at Brainard Avenue and the intersection of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue. In order to meet the city’s goal of having a gateway into Hammond, a center median would also be included along Gostlin Street. All alternatives would also modify the existing configuration along Sheffield Avenue by maintaining one travel lane in each direction, while adding a continuous center left-turn lane. Finally, from its intersection with Hohman Avenue to its intersection with Baltimore Avenue, Chicago Street would be widened to two lanes in each direction. Chicago Street will also be widened at the intersections with Johnson Avenue and Dearborn Avenue to accommodate designated left-turn lanes. Proposed improvements throughout the corridor also include new pavement, curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sewers, roadway lighting, and traffic signals.

Chicago Street from Calumet Avenue to White Oak Avenue will reconstruct the existing roadway including curb and gutter, sidewalks, storm sewers, roadway lighting, and traffic signals. Reconstruction of the existing roadway would require the acquisition of minor amounts of strip right-of-way and temporary right-of-way for reconstruction of the sidewalks, curb and gutter, and drive entrances.

For additional information, preliminary design alternatives have been prepared for the project corridor and are summarized in the Alternative Analysis document located on the project website at GoChicagoStreet.com.

In order to construct the project, right-of-way will need to be acquired from Irving Park located at Chicago Street and Columbia Avenue. Right-of-way to be acquired consists of minor strip right-of-way
along the existing sidewalk proposed for reconstruction along Irving Park Drive. We anticipate that 335 sf of permanent right-of-way will be acquired. The existing stone shoulder will be removed and curb constructed adjacent to the travel lane on Chicago Street, eliminating on-street parking between Columbia Avenue and Irving Park Drive. Sidewalk will also be reconstructed along Chicago Street, adjacent to the back of curb. All efforts will be made to minimize the right-of-way acquisition and any permanent or temporary impacts to park equipment or features. No adverse impacts to the recreational facilities within the park are anticipated.

Because Irving Park is significant and publically owned, it is considered a Section 4(f) resource. Analysis of potential impacts to Section 4(f) resources is required for any federally-funded transportation project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has developed guidance for projects that do not have significant impacts to Section 4(f) properties. Impacts evaluated under this guidance are termed *de minimis* if they meet certain criteria.

The following criteria must apply for a project to be considered to have *de minimis* impacts to a section 4(f) resource.

1. An official or officials with jurisdiction over the resource must agree in writing the proposed project will not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f).
2. The transportation use of the Section 4(f) resource, together with any impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation or enhancement measures incorporated into the project, does not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f).
3. The official(s) with jurisdiction over the property are informed of FHWA’s or FTA’s intent to make the *de minimis* impact finding based on their written concurrence that the project will not adversely affect the activities, features, and attributes that qualify the property for protection under Section 4(f).
4. The public has been afforded an opportunity to review and comment on the effects of the project on the protected activities, features, and attributes of the Section 4(f) resource.

The project fulfills or will fulfill all criteria listed above and is not expected to adversely affect the Section 4(f) property. Per criteria Item 1 above, if you agree the proposed Chicago Street Widening and Rehabilitation Project will not adversely affect the Section 4(f) resource under your jurisdiction, we respectfully request your written concurrence. Your written statement of approval must be obtained in order to complete the Section 4(f) *de minimis* evaluation and will be included in the Environmental Documentation for the project.

Project mapping has been included with this letter for your reference. Please feel free to provide your correspondence via standard mail, email, or fax as you would prefer. To facilitate the development of this project, your timely cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Please contact me at (317) 547-5580 or cmeador@structurepoint.com if there are any questions or if additional information is needed.

Very truly yours,
American Structurepoint

Christine Meador
Environmental Scientist

CAM:alo

Enclosures

cc: Stan Dostatni, City of Hammond
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July 30, 2013

Ms. Christine Meador
Environmental Scientist
7260 Shadeland Station
Indianapolis, IN 46256-3957

Re: Section 4(f) Coordination
Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana
Des. No. 1297017
Project No. 201100320

Dear Ms. Meador,

The City of Hammond Parks Department has reviewed and approved the proposed right-of-way from Irving Park located at Chicago Street and Columbia Avenue.

The proposed projects will not affect the activities at Irving Park.

If there are any further questions or other concerns, please feel free to contact the Hammond Civic Center (219) 853-6378.

Respectfully,

Patrick Moore, Sr.
Administration
City of Hammond, Parks & Recreation
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Official Public Hearing Transcript and the disposition of the comments received
In the Matter Of:

Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction

Public Hearing

April 22, 2015
RE: Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction
Indiana/Illinois State Line to White Oak Avenue
Hammond, Lake County, Indiana

Designation No. 1297017

Report of Proceedings had in the above-entitled matter before me, Catherine M. Stefaniak, CSR, Notary
Public in and for the County of Lake, State of Indiana, at Washington Irving Middle School Auditorium, 4727 Pine Avenue, Hammond, Indiana, on Wednesday, April 22, 2015, at 6:13 p.m.

STEWART RICHARDSON & ASSOCIATES
Registered Professional Reporters
150 West Lincolnway, Suite 1005
Valparaiso, IN 46383
(219) 462-3436
HEARING AGENDA

1. Meeting called to order
   By Chris Murphy

2. Explanation of the hearing purpose and process
   By Briana Hope

3. Project description
   By Eric Wolverton

4. Environmental document
   By Amy Marlatt

5. Public statement session
   By Briana Hope

6. Adjournment
   By Briana Hope

7. Questions and answers
MR. MURPHY: Good evening, everybody. We'll just give everybody a minute to take a seat, find a seat. I would like to welcome you all and thank you all for participation in tonight's public meeting in providing information on the Chicago Street Safety Improvement Project that the City of Hammond is undertaking.

RANDOM MEETING-GOERS: We can't hear you.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you all for coming this evening. I appreciate your participation in our public meeting on the Chicago Street Highway and Safety Improvement Widening Reconstruction Project that the City of Hammond is undertaking to provide benefits to the transportation system for the community and for the city.

My name is Chris Murphy. I'm vice-president for transportation for American Structurepoint Engineers. We're the consulting engineer on the project working with the City of Hammond and INDOT on delivering this project to construction for the improvement.

As you've all had at least a few minutes' opportunity to appreciate, we've got information on the project throughout the room. And please take a few minutes, if you haven't already before the
presentation, after the presentation to review the project. And certainly, if you have any questions, we have people who are located here about the room that are available to answer the questions.

I would like to make a quick introduction of the project team that is available here tonight starting with the City of Hammond. We have the engineer -- city engineer Stan Dostatni here and the assistant city engineer Mark Gordish and engineer Jonathan Parker. And they're available to help answer questions that you may have after tonight's presentation.

On the American Structurepoint team, in addition to myself, we have Eric Wolverton, the project manager for American Structurepoint. We also have Briana Hope, our environmental specialist here tonight, and the rest of our team, Amy Marlatt, Jeromy Grenard, Brian Ralstin, Regina Whetstone. And we also have back in the corner, our right-of-way land acquisition specialist team, Skip Tennancour and Kelly Dean. And we do have somebody here, a relocation specialist, also, Joe. I appreciate you being here tonight. Thank you very much.

With that, let's get the program started. I'm
going to ask Briana Hope -- she'll begin the presentation here this evening. And thank you, again, for participating. Briana?

MS. HOPE: Thank you. Okay. So I'm going to talk a little bit about the setup of the hearing tonight and how we're going to go through this. So we're here to hear about the project. We're going to go through a project description. We're going to hear a little about the right-of-way impact, the anticipated project costs and schedule and as well as the land acquisition process.

We're also here tonight for the presentation of the environmental document or the environmental assessment that was prepared for the project. That document evaluates the potential impact that that project could have on both the human and the natural environment.

And, of course, we're here tonight to get your comments, to get the public's comments. This is a project in your community. It's important to you. We want to hear what you have to say about it. I will talk a little bit more about how that process will work.

We also advertised the public notice twice in the local newspaper, the Northwest Indiana Times
both on April 7th and April 14th. We mailed a copy of that legal notice to as many affected property owners as possible. If you did not get a copy of that and you think you should have, please make sure you did sign in when you came in and that we can read it. Because any additional mailings that we need to send out, we will use this, and we'll use that sign-in sheet to add to that list if you did not get anything.

So the public notice also talked about the environmental document or the environmental assessment. That is available currently at the Hammond Public Library, as well as online at ChicagoStreet.com. If you haven't had a chance to take a look at that and still want to, it will be available for the two weeks following the public hearing at these locations.

All right. So the public comment, why -- this is why we're here tonight, to get your input. There's a few ways that you can do that. You can come up and make a comment tonight. We had a sign-in sheet at the front for speakers. If you would like to make a comment, we'll go through that list first. If you signed up, and you don't want to make a comment, that's okay. If you didn't sign
up, and you still would like to make a comment, then we'll have you come up. And I will talk a little bit more about that after the presentation. We will go through that process for formal public comment.

In the back of your information packets that you picked up, there's a comment sheet in the back. You can fill that comment sheet out. You can hand it to one of the project representatives here tonight. You can email it. You can mail it. You can fax it. That comment deadline is May 7th. So if you're going to mail it, we ask that you have it postmarked by May 7th.

All comments that we receive tonight verbally, if you come up and decide you want to make a public comment for the public record, we won't be answering those verbally tonight. We will be transcribing them, taking them back and responding in writing. If you do have some additional questions that you might have that you don't necessarily want on the public record, we will be available after the presentation to answer those one-on-one like we were prior to the presentation.

So again, like I said, all the comments that we receive tonight will be transcribed. They won't
be addressed verbally by us. If you come up to make that public comment, they will be addressed in writing and as part of the environmental process. So again, if you want to see the response to those comments tonight, make sure that you're on the mailing list if you did not get something already. And again, if you have any questions after the formal -- after we close the formal public hearing, we will be available.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Eric Wolverton to talk more specifically about the project.

MR. WOLVERTON: First, I would like to thank everyone for coming out tonight and coming to learn about the project and to provide input. It's an important step to the process that we're going through now.

I would like to start out and just talk briefly about the project and the project location. As many of you have probably seen as you walked around and looked at the exhibits here tonight, the project starts along Gostlin Street at the Indiana/Illinois state line border, proceeds east along Gostlin Street to Sheffield. At that point, it turns to go south along Sheffield to Chicago
Avenue. Once it connects with Chicago Avenue, it turns eastward and continues all the way to the corporate boundary of the City of Hammond and East Chicago at White Oak.

I would like to talk briefly about the purpose of the project. The purpose of the proposed project is to improve safety, reduce congestion, enhance mobility, address the deteriorating infrastructure, and create a unified east-west corridor along Chicago Street through the City of Hammond.

Project need. As you can see in some of these pictures, there's definitely some safety issues along the corridor. This project seems to correct many of those. Some of those include substandard horizontal curvature of the roadway itself, substandard intersection turning radii, lack of designated turn lanes along the corridor, the existing unrestricted access to Chicago Street, Sheffield Avenue and Gostlin Street, and better defined lane configurations.

The second point with the project need is congestion. Current traffic models show that in the future -- well, existing and in the future that the roadway performs a poor level of service which
is a way that we grade congestion along the
corridor, so we want to address that with the
project as well.

Third point is mobility. There's substandard
pedestrian facilities along the corridor. This
project will address many of those. It will also
assist in the mobility of the commercial trucks.
Presently, there is in excess of 20 percent trucks
that travel along the corridor that are large
vehicle trucks, so this will help the mobility of
those vehicles as well.

Deteriorating infrastructure. If you live in
the area, I'm sure there's several areas where the
pavement is failing or in poor condition. That
helps get us to where we're at today where we want
to address those as well. As I mentioned earlier,
this will provide a better defined east-west
corridor through the City of Hammond. You'll be
able to flow more freely through the corridor and
through the city itself.

I would like to talk a little bit about
preferred alternatives. When I talk about these
preferred alternatives, and we break them down into
segments, I do want to point out that these are
just individual segments where the typical section
of the roadway may be changing. The actual phases of construction, I will address later.

So the first segment we've outlined is between Gostlin Street at the state line east of Sheffield Avenue. The preferred alignment will actually be offline and to the south, and we'll have a roundabout to be constructed at Sheffield Avenue. The typical section of the roadway will be two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction with a 15-foot center concrete median. There will also be a five-foot sidewalk that will be constructed on the north side of the road. So that's the preferred alternate for segment one.

For segment two, which extends from the roundabout at Sheffield south to Hohman Avenue will contain a roundabout that will be constructed at Hohman Avenue. Between there and north along what is existing Sheffield will be one 12-foot travel lane in each direction with a 14-foot what we call a two-way left-turn lane in the middle, the area where you can pull off and wait for a gap in traffic to turn left. That will also contain a 10-foot pathway on one side of the road and a 5-foot sidewalk on the other side.

So moving on to segment three. Segment three
is on Chicago Street from Hohman Avenue to Baltimore Avenue or just short of Calumet -- or Calumet Avenue to the west. We'll be widening the roadway slightly and improving the curvature of the roadway, two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction with five to six-foot sidewalks on both sides of the roadway.

The final segment, segment four, will include Chicago Street east of White Oak -- from Calumet to White Oak Avenue. It's a reconstruction of the existing roadway on existing alignment. Two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction with some strategic on-street parking constructed as well, with a six-foot sidewalk on each side of the road.

So as I stated, those are the preferred alternates for the project. Through this -- through the project, several alternatives were analyzed through these different segments, so I would just like to touch on those briefly. As you can see, up here above on the exhibits that are there, we looked at, in segment one, an alternate where we were on alignment, but we shifted more to the north with a roundabout at Sheffield. We were on alignment and shifted to the north and then to the south with a roundabout at Sheffield, and then
also alignment with a signal and a free-flow turn at Sheffield Avenue. I will go through these and I will explain a little bit about the selection of these segments.

For segment two, we looked at additional turn lanes at Chicago Street and Sheffield, as well as a free-flow curve with a traffic signal at Hohman instead of a roundabout. Segment three, another alternate we looked at was just to widen along the existing. As I mentioned before, we are improving the radii along there and smoothing out some of the turns on that segment. Segment four, we did look at doing what we call preventative maintenance, which is just milling off the top of the pavement and coming back with a resurface.

Outside of these four segments, we did look at alternate corridors, so maybe using other roadways to meet our purpose and need for that free-flow east-west traffic through the City of Hammond. We did also look at a bridge alternative as well.

I know this is probably pretty difficult to read. What this is is a table that we put together that's included in our environmental document that lays out what I would say are the pros and cons for all these alternates. Alternatives along each
segment, those are -- the ones highlighted in green are the ones that are preferred alternatives.

Like I said, it's probably difficult to see, but there are some red-ins in there that indicate that no. So the reasons say for segment one, alternates one, two and three were not selected is that they did not meet the purpose and need of the project. We talked about the purpose and the need before. So whether they did not -- they didn't address appropriately the pedestrian movements, the mobility of the trucks, various reasons that those weren't selected.

Project cost and schedule. As we stand today, the total project cost is just over 21.6 million dollars. Of that, just shy of 2 million is allocated for preliminary engineering, almost 8 million dollars in right-of-way, 11.8 million in construction. And that does include both local funds as well as federal funds.

Project schedule. As you can see -- I'm sorry. We've talked about the four different segments. Well, now I want to talk about the project, and it will be broken into three different segments for construction, three different phases for construction.
Right-of-way acquisition is anticipated to start this fall with the first segment going to construction in the fall of the following year. So there's a limit -- or the limits spelled out for the three phases. What we're calling phase one will extend from the state line down to Marble Street, which is just north of Chicago Street on Sheffield. The second phase will extend from Marble Street east to Calumet Avenue. The third phase will extend from Calumet Avenue to White Oak Avenue. And as you can see noted there, it is anticipated that the first phase will go to construction, which I mentioned is next fall, will be this phase three section.

Here's a table indicating the amount of anticipated right-of-way that will be required for the project. As you can see, it ranges from residential to commercial to industrial to some small park property. In total, permanent right-of-way is anticipated to be just less than seven and a half acres, and temporary right-of-way in the amount of 2.34 acres.

As many of you came here early today and walked around and looked at the exhibits that are here, I know that many of you probably seen the red
X's. Those do indicate anticipated relocations as part of the project. Currently, the number there is 43. You can see that that's broken down into 35 residential, 7 commercial and 1 industrial property.

As Mr. Murphy mentioned, we do have some right-of-way specialists here that will be here to answer any additional questions after the meeting. But I just want to touch on briefly the right-of-way acquisition process. There are pamphlets that are available at their table that talk about not only the acquisition process, but then there's another pamphlet that talked about the relocation process. So if you are anticipated to be one of those 43 parcels, make sure you get one of those pamphlets, and feel free to talk to our relocation specialist.

As we go through the land acquisition process, since federal funds are being used in the project, we are required to follow the Uniform Act of 1970. Actually, all federal, state and local governments must comply with that. And what that Uniform Act does is it requires anyone impacted by acquisition, that they are justly compensated for that property.

After we leave here tonight and take the
comments and address those, once the environmental
document is approved, our next step will be to
begin that right-of-way process, which the first
step of that is to be -- is the appraisal process.
After your land is appraised, there's a review
appraiser that reviews the initial appraisal. At
that time, they come to the terms on a value that
would be assessed for the land that is required.
At that point, we begin to bind or what is commonly
referred to as negotiations.

Through the acquisition process, the amount of
compensation cannot be less than the fair market
value, and that's what the appraisers will look at.
They'll determine what is the fair market value of
the surrounding land and your property. If there's
partial acquisition where if you're outside of the
43 anticipated total acquisitions, that's referred
to as partial acquisition. The agency will state
the amount to be paid for the part of the land
that's going to be required.

Now, there are impacts that can occur to a
property outside just the land. So the next point
talks about a separate amount will be stated for
damages to the portion that's to be retained. That
could be in several different avenues for that --
for those damages. It could be in terms of a setback damage to your property, damages to your property. If the remainder of the land has little or no value, the agency will consider purchasing the entire property.

Once the appraisal is done, there's an agreement that's prepared. When an agreement is reached, the owner will be asked to sign an option to buy, purchase agreement, easement or deed. If no agreement can be reached between the property owner and the buying agent, the options are mediation or to go to condemnation on that property.

At this time, I would like to turn the presentation over to Amy Marlatt.

MS. MARLATT: Thanks, Eric. So I'm here to talk about the environmental impacts of the project. Since this project is federally funded, all federal requirements must be met. One of those requirements is National Environmental Policy Act documentation, or NEPA for short.

Various studies were undertaken to evaluate the project's potential impact to the natural and human environment. There are different levels of need for documentation. For this project, an
environmental assessment, or EA, was prepared. An EA is prepared because the significance of the environmental impacts could not clearly be established without further investigation.

As mentioned previously, the EA assesses a wide range of impacts, including cultural, environmental, economic, et cetera. Being the basis for -- the EA is the basis for determining if an environmental impact statement should be prepared.

The EA has been reviewed by both INDOT and Federal Highway Administration and has been released for public comment. Following the public comment period, all substantial comments will be addressed, and the EA will be updated, if necessary, because the project is a major action. But no significant impacts were identified in the EA. A finding of no significant impact is anticipated for the project.

Throughout NEPA, public involvement has been a key focus. We've coordinated with over 50 federal, state and local agencies. In addition, we formed a community advisory committee in order to engage local stakeholders in the project. We've had one meeting so far with the community advisory
committee to gather input on the development of our preferred alternative.

A second community advisory committee meeting is planned later in the design process as we get down into more detailed portions of that. We also had two public information meetings, one during the day and one in the evening to accommodate different work schedules. We've done significant outreach, such as public notices in the newspaper, public notice mailings, our GoChicagoStreet.com website and associated email address, flyers, yard signs, and we've also tried to translate as many materials to Spanish as possible. The public hearing tonight and the public comment period to follow are your next opportunity to provide us with your comments, concerns and suggestions for the project.

Now I would like to touch on the key findings of the EA. For a more detailed explanation of potential impacts, please review the EA. We have two copies here tonight over here to my right. There's another copy at the Hammond Public Library, which will be there until May 7th. And you can also review the document online any time at GoChicagoStreet.com.

So one of the studies we did was for cultural
resources. So under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, there are special protections for resources eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Property, Historic Places. So we searched the area for any potential affect for any archeological sites or historic resources that would be eligible for listing. There were no resources identified eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, a finding of no historic properties affected was issued for the project.

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act protects publically owned parks, recreational areas, wildlife refuges and historical sites from use for transportation projects, unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. This project requires the acquisition of .001 acre of land from Irving Park, a Section 4(f) resource, and this is in order to construct a sidewalk. In coordination with the park, it's been determined that the project will not affect the recreational activities, features and attributes of the park that qualify it as a Section 4(f) resource. A de minimis evaluation was prepared documenting this
finding and can be found in the EA.

A traffic noise study was also completed. This was completed to identify potential impacts and whether there are feasible and reasonable ways to mitigate those noise impacts. The corridor currently experiences traffic noise levels above desirable levels and will continue to experience those high noise levels with or without the construction of the project.

Noise barriers were evaluated as mitigation for traffic noise. However, the noise barriers require long, uninterrupted segments to be effective. This was not feasible because of the frequent gaps that would be needed along the corridor for driveway access and roadways. In addition, the noise generated by I90 and the NICTD commuter rail line would not be reduced by the noise barriers. Therefore, no noise mitigation is reasonable and feasible for the project.

As I mentioned before, community outreach and engagement were a key focus throughout project planning. At the public information meetings and community advisory committee meetings, several positive and negative impacts to the community were identified. Positive impacts include better and
safer sidewalks, better truck mobility. We heard about some people who had trucks riding up into their yard and causing property damage, because they cannot make the turns. Safer and more efficient driving conditions for all users, improvements in deteriorating infrastructure, and an attractive entrance to the city and the state from the west.

Negative impacts include, of course, property acquisition, increased traffic and traffic noise, loss of trees and inconveniences during construction of the project. However, overall, it was determined that the project would be a net benefit for the community.

The surrounding neighborhoods contain environmental justice groups such as low income and minority populations. We've also analyzed the positive and negative effects of the project to make sure that there are no disproportionate high and adverse effects to these low income and minority populations.

We also conducted records reviews and site visits to identify potential hazardous materials along the project corridor. There were 17 sites identified as recognized environmental conditions.
Additional investigations are recommended and will be conducted before construction begins.

Because there are no wetlands or streams located within the project area, the only environmental permit required for this project is a Rule 5 erosion control permit from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management.

This concludes a summary of the project's environmental impacts. Please feel free to ask any questions you have afterwards. And now, I will turn it over to Briana Hope for the public comment portion.

MS. HOPE: Thank you. Okay. So that concludes our presentation. I'm going to open it up for public comment, but I want to go over the ways that you can provide your comments, again, if you choose not to come up and make a public comment tonight. So you can mail them to American Structurepoint, attention to myself, Briana Hope. You can email them to ChicagoStreet@Structurepoint.com, Go Chicago Street. You can fax them. And again, we ask that those comments be received by May 7th or postmarked by May 7th if you're going to put them in the mail.

All comments that we collect will be reviewed
and evaluated and given full consideration during the decisionmaking process.

RANDOM MEETING-GOER: Does that include comments, questions?

MS. HOPE: Comments, questions, anything of that sort, yes. So I want to go through -- we didn't have anybody sign up on the speaker log. So if you do -- if there is anybody that does want to make a public comment, I'm going to ask that you come up to the podium, say your name and your address, and speak clearly into the microphone so it's easier to transcribe.

Again, we are not going to respond to comments verbally if you do come up and make a comment or have a question. We will be doing that in writing. We also ask that you keep your comments, questions, concerns to two to three minutes to give everybody an opportunity to speak that would like to speak and be respectful of other people's time. Just to let you know, we also have a Spanish translator here if you would be more comfortable speaking with him.

So is there anybody that would like to come up and make a public comment? Come on up, sir. If you can say your name and your address.
MR. ERHART: Sure. My name is Chuck Erhart. I live at 36 Brunswick Street. That's the street just south of Gostlin. One of the things I can quote you guys on is you're calling this an attractive entrance to the city, but I'm hearing of a 17-foot concrete median and then two lanes of traffic on either side. That makes like 75 feet of concrete as attractive? I would be much happier if that median could be turned into something more environmentally friendly. Trees, plantings that require low maintenance, or no maintenance would be even better. So that's my comment. Thanks.

MS. HOPE: Thanks very much.

MR. ERHART: Uh-huh.

MS. HOPE: Is there anybody else that would like to make a public comment? Okay. Well, this concludes the formal public hearing. Again, if anybody has any questions or comments that they would like to talk to the engineers or representatives off the public record, we will be around after the hearing. And thank you everybody for coming out tonight.

(The meeting concluded at 6:45 p.m.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Name / Organization / Comment Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chuck Erhart 36 Brunswick Street Hammond, IN 46327 April 22, 2015 (verbal comment) &amp; April 23, 2015 (letter)</td>
<td><strong>Verbal Comment</strong> - One of the things I can quote you guys on is you’re calling this an attractive entrance to the city, but I’m hearing of a 17-foot concrete median and then two lanes of traffic on either side. That makes like 75 feet of concrete as attractive? I would be much happier if that median could be turned into something more environmentally friendly. Trees, plantings that require low maintenance or no maintenance would be even better. <strong>Letter</strong> – I would like to expand on my comments mad at the public hearing for the Chicago Street project (Des. 1297017) on April 22, 2015, regarding the section between the state line and Sheffield Avenue with proposed seventeen foot concrete medians. It really sticks in my craw that this is being called, “an attractive entrance to the city,” when it is anything buy attractive. Concrete medians are not only unattractive but they collect debris such as gravel, dirt, and trash that no one ever cleans up. Within only a few years the median will only become an eyesore. It is an old fashioned type of construction and I am very disappointed at the prospect of such an ugly thing. Environmentally, there should be less concrete rather than more for our city streets. Hammond has an international award winning golf course built on old slag heaps, so this concrete median does not even fit with the progressive ideals of creating more green space in the city an improving the quality of life for the residents. I can only hope that there is serious consideration made for my suggestion that the concrete median be replaced with green space to truly make an attractive entrance to the city. There are many low maintenance and salt tolerant options of plantings that could be used. Trees The proposed 15 foot wide median will include a 6 inch rolled curb with 2 feet of decorative concrete (possibly stamped) on either side with a 10 foot center section to incorporate vegetation. The specific species of vegetation have not been finalized and will be a topic of discussion during the second Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting. Both the areas immediately north and south of new Chicago Street from the Indiana/Illinois state line to Sheffield will be converted to landscaped green space. In addition, the area north of new Chicago Street and Gostlin Street will also include a multi-use/shared-use path.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such as the locust and chokecherry, shrubs such as daylilies, phlox, black eyed susan, ornamental grasses, and bulb plantings of daffodils and scilla are all fine examples of roadway improvements that do well in that type of environment. Not only do green spaces look good but they also help improve air quality and reduce noise.

Some fine examples of median green spaces are the section of Indianapolis Boulevard near the state line in Hammond, Irving Park Road between Pulaski and Ashland in Chicago, and Lake Shore Drive in Chicago.

I would also hope roundabouts are attractively landscaped. Something that would be a fine addition to the city would be a sculpture centering the roundabout at the intersection of Sheffield and Gostlin. I would like to suggest a steel abstract sculpture that would rust naturally representing the powerful industrial past of the area.

There was no mention of what is to be done with the newly created areas both to the immediate north and south of the roadway. This is a fine opportunity to add more finely landscaped green space to the city of Hammond.

The entire project has great potential to create a beautiful park-like setting rather than just another ugly industrial corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Name / Organization / Comment Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John Kolondzic 1525 &amp; 1547 Chicago Street Hammond, IN 46327 April 22, 2015 (comment sheet)</td>
<td>Concerned about access to properties. If curbs are built will have to cut curb and pour new entrance. Needs two entrances to 1525 Chicago Street lot and one entrance to 1547 Chicago Street.</td>
<td>Property access and drive reconstruction are provided as part of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Silverio Malagon 110 Gostlin Street Hammond, IN 46327</td>
<td>My question is how many months I can be living here and when is the time for me to start looking for a new home?</td>
<td>It is currently anticipated that right-of-way appraising and acquisition will begin as early as Fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction (Des. 1297017)
## Public Hearing Comments Summary
### April 22, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Name / Organization / Comment Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 2015 (email)</td>
<td></td>
<td>All right-of-way will be acquired in accordance with applicable federal and state procedures. Those procedures include specific requirements for appraisals, review appraisals, negotiations, and relocation benefits. Compliance with these procedures will assure the fair and equitable treatment of affected residents and businesses. The acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with 49 CFR 24 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended. Acquisition and relocation information can also be viewed at <a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | Frank Madeka  
4312 Wabash Avenue  
Hammond, IN 46327  
April 30, 2015 (email) | Here are the issues/concerns/questions/comments I have so far relative to the ‘Go Chicago Street’ project as presented on 22 April 2015 at Washington Irving Middle School:  

**Voting**  
Don’s Pub, 250 Gostlin Street, is a polling place ([https://www.lakecountyin.org/portal/mediatype/html/group/voters/page/default.psml/js_pane/P-13b9cba7c46-107e7](https://www.lakecountyin.org/portal/mediatype/html/group/voters/page/default.psml/js_pane/P-13b9cba7c46-107e7)) The current plan shows Don’s Pub as paved over. Where will the people vote in the future?  

**Bicycling**  
Sheffield Avenue, Hohman Avenue, and Gostlin Street are the de facto bicycling routes bridging bike traffic from the Burnham Greenway Trail (via Brainard Avenue to/from Gostlin Street and via 136th /134th Street to/from Sheffield Avenue) and new Wolf Lake Trails (via Sheffield Avenue to Hohman Avenue) to the Erie-Lackawanna and Monon Trails. An example is the annual ‘Le Tour de Shore’ route ([http://www.letourdeshore.com](http://www.letourdeshore.com)). What bicycling features (e.g. bike lanes, protect and/or separated bike lanes, combined sidewalk/bike paths) are incorporated into this project to accommodate and make safer this... |

**Voting** – A new polling location will be established by the City/County.  
**Bicycling** – Riders will still be able to use these routes. multi-use/shared-use paths are proposed in the following locations as part of the project:  
- From the Indiana/Illinois state line to Sheffield Avenue and multi-use/shared path will be located along the north side of new Chicago Street.  
- From the intersection with existing Gostlin south to the proposed location where Sheffield Avenue will connect with proposed Chicago Street near the roundabout intersection at Hohman Avenue.  

The scope of the project did not include creating a dedicated bicycle route to connect existing trails in the area. A bicycle lane was investigated as part of the project during the initial design stage, but was eliminated due to the safety concerns presented by the high volume of truck traffic that is and will be present along the corridor.  

A number of factors were considered when proposing the alignment for the Chicago Street corridor.  
- To reduce cost and provide access to the existing residents and businesses, the corridor reused existing...
Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Name / Organization / Comment Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>growing means of transportation and recreation?</td>
<td>More direct Brainard Avenue to existing Sheffield Avenue/Chicago Avenue intersection route. The existing and proposed routes connect Brainard Avenue east/west using Gostlin Street to Sheffield Avenue and Sheffield Avenue south/north to Chicago Avenue. Extrapolating Brainard Avenue either directly or as a reversed ‘S’ is a shorter hypotenuses than the combined legs of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue. Why wasn’t an at-grade level, more direct route taken from Brainard Avenue to Chicago Avenue?</td>
<td>alignments and infrastructure where possible. - To maintain safety, the existing at-grade highway-rail crossings were maintained and no additional crossings were proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Shore Extension</td>
<td>The U.S. Congressional Representative for the First District has growing support for an ‘extension’ of the South Shore Line as part of the Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District (NICTD). Does the proposed plan address this extension? If not, why not?</td>
<td>South Shore Extension - As seen on the study map, the proposed extension would not directly impact the project: <a href="http://www.nictdwestlake.com/pdf/study-map.pdf">http://www.nictdwestlake.com/pdf/study-map.pdf</a> However, the project sponsor will continue to coordinate with all railroads within the project area and will address their comments as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing metropolitan heat island effects and climate change adaptation</td>
<td>The DOT (e.g., <a href="http://www.fta.dot.gov/12347_14013.html">http://www.fta.dot.gov/12347_14013.html</a>) and the City of Chicago (<a href="http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/cdot/Construction%20Guidelines/SUIGPpresentation.pdf">http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/cdot/Construction%20Guidelines/SUIGPpresentation.pdf</a>) have identified and adopted features; light colored pavements, landscape plants, etc. to be incorporated into projects to mitigate these growing heat effects. Does this project mimic these practices to synergize the benefits with the greater Chicago and Calumet regions?</td>
<td>Presently the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) does not have requirements regarding metropolitan heat island effects and climate change adaptation. The currently policy on pavement design is centered around the life cycle cost of the pavement material and how/when the pavement will no longer be functional. The project is proposing landscaping in the form of residential sodding and possible landscaping (bushes, shrubs, etc.) within certain median locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>During rush hour commutes (late afternoon) when South Shore commuters disembark, Chicago Ford Assembly Plant shift change, and other similar activities coupled with road traffic stoppages due to rail train movement creates significant commuter congestion. Today, this</td>
<td>Traffic congestion - The impact of stopped trains on the traffic flow/capacity was analyzed as part of the project development process. At the existing Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue intersection, a right turn bypass lane for the eastbound to southbound movements has been provided and at the intersection of Hohman Avenue and Chicago Street a right turn bypass lane for westbound to northbound movements has been provided. This bypass lane will allow for traffic to continue flowing through the intersections if the southbound/northbound movements are blocked by a train. Secondly, roadway users will still have access to Hoffman Street from Sheffield Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Name / Organization / Comment Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Antonio Cornejo 4648 Torrence Avenue Hammond, IN 46327 April 30, 2015 (email)</td>
<td>Chaos is partially tempered by east and south bound traffic proceeding south to Hoffman Avenue on Sheffield Avenue. The proposed rotary at Hohman Avenue and Chicago Avenue appears to funnel all this traffic into one rotary. Creating a single chokepoint, a potential bottleneck. Is there enough capacity with the proposed rotary to accommodate this routine surge of traffic and to allow emergency vehicle moment (e.g. ambulance)?</td>
<td>A bridge option was investigated; however the proposed improvements were determined to be cost prohibitive. All right-of-way will be acquired in accordance with applicable federal and state procedures. Those procedures include specific requirements for appraisals, review appraisals, negotiations, and relocation benefits. Compliance with these procedures will assure the fair and equitable treatment of affected residents and businesses. The acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with 49 CFR 24 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 as amended. Acquisition and relocation information can also be viewed at <a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/real_estate/</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Name / Organization / Comment Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project doesn't make sense. Hammond needs the money elsewhere not to widen Chicago Ave. Think about all of the families that are affected by this. Relocating is an expense that many can not afford or do not want to make. If this project is approved my yard and driveway is not for sale. I'm prepared to take legal actions if necessary. Would you allow someone to devalue your home? Didn't think so! I have an 8 year old daughter and a dog, we need our yard! I come from a large family 3 brothers and 4 sisters, 20 nieces and nephews. When I have family over I need my yard as everyone else does.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. ERHART: Sure. My name is Chuck Erhart. I live at 36 Brunswick Street. That's the street just south of Gostlin. One of the things I can quote you guys on is you're calling this an attractive entrance to the city, but I'm hearing of a 17-foot concrete median and then two lanes of traffic on either side. That makes like 75 feet of concrete as attractive? I would be much happier if that median could be turned into something more environmentally friendly. Trees, plantings that require low maintenance, or no maintenance would be even better. So that's my comment. Thanks.

MS. HOPE: Thanks very much.

MR. ERHART: Uh-huh.

MS. HOPE: Is there anybody else that would like to make a public comment? Okay. Well, this concludes the formal public hearing. Again, if anybody has any questions or comments that they would like to talk to the engineers or representatives off the public record, we will be around after the hearing. And thank you everybody for coming out tonight.

(The meeting concluded at 6:45 p.m.)
Chuck Erhart
36 Brunswick St.
Hammond, IN 46327
219-852-5217
siennaursamajor@hotmail.com
April, 23, 2015

Briana Hope
American Structurepoint, Inc.
7260 Shadeland Station
Indianapolis, IN 46256

Dear Ms. Hope,

I would like to expand on my comments made at the public hearing for the Chicago Street project (Des.1297017) on April 22, 2015, regarding the section between the state line and Sheffield Avenue with proposed seventeen foot concrete medians. It really sticks in my craw that this is being called, "an attractive entrance to the city," when it is anything but attractive.

Concrete medians are not only unattractive but they collect debris such as gravel, dirt, and trash that no one ever cleans up. Within only a few years the median will only become an eyesore. It is an old fashioned type of construction and I am very
disappointed at the prospect of such an ugly thing. Environmentally, there should be less concrete rather than more for our city streets. Hammond has an international award winning golf course built on old slag heaps, so this concrete median does not even fit with the progressive ideals of creating more green space in the city and improving the quality of life for the residents.

I can only hope that there is serious consideration made for my suggestion that the concrete median be replaced with green space to truly make an attractive entrance to the city. There are many low maintainence and salt tolerant options of plantings that could be used. Trees such as the locust and chokecherry, shrubs such as rugosa roses and spirea japonica, plants such at daylilies, phlox, black eyed susan, ornamental grasses, and bulb plantings of daffodils and scilla are all fine examples of roadway improvements that do well in this type of environment. Not only do green spaces look good but they also help improve air quality and reduce noise.

Some fine examples of median green spaces are the section of Indianapolis Boulevard near the state line in Hammond, Irving Park Road between Pulaski and Ashland in Chicago, and Lake Shore Drive in Chicago.

I would also hope that the roundabouts are attractively landscaped. Something that would be a fine addition to the city would be a sculpture
centering the roundabout at the intersection of Sheffield and Gostlin. I would like to suggest a steel abstract sculpture that would rust naturally representing the powerful industrial past of the area.

There was no mention of what is to be done with the newly created areas both to the immediate north and south of the roadway. This is a fine opportunity to add more finely landscaped green space to the city of Hammond.

The entire project has great potential to create a beautiful parklike setting rather than just another ugly industrial corridor.

Sincerely,

Chuck Erhart
Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments, concerns, and/or suggestions regarding the proposed Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction project. Your comments are important to us, and we sincerely appreciate your time and participation during the public involvement process. Please submit comments by **Thursday, May 7, 2015**. Comments may be mailed, faxed, or submitted via email to the contact below.

Briana Hope  
American Structurepoint, Inc.  
7260 Shadeland Station  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46256-3957  
Fax: (317) 543-0270  
Email: GoChicagoStreet@structurepoint.com

**Meeting Date:** Wednesday, April 22, 2015  
**Project:** Chicago Street Widening and Reconstruction Project (Des. 1297017)

**Name:** (Please print)  
**Address:** 1525 & 1547 Chicago Ave, (Vacant Land)

**COMMENTS:**  
If curbs are built, we have to gut curve  
- Pour new entrance to the 525 lot  
- Need true entrance to the 1547 lot

**SIGNATURE:**  

2011.00320
Hi, my name is SILVERIO MALAGON owner of 110 GOSTLIN ST. HAMMOND IN. 46327. My question is how many months I can be living here and when is the time for start looking a new home?

Thank you so much. Silverio Malgon
Ms. Hope, et al,

Here are the issues/concerns/questions/comments I have so far relative to the ‘Go Chicago Street’ project as presented on 22 April 2015 at Washington Irving Middle School:

Voting
Don’s Pub, 250 Gostlin Street, is a polling place (https://www.lakecountyin.org/portal/mediatype/html/group/voters/page/default.psml/js_pane/P-13b9cbe7c46-107e7) The current plan shows Don’s Pub as paved over. Where will the people vote in the future?

Bicycling
Sheffield Avenue, Hohman Avenue, and Gostlin Street are the de facto bicycling routes bridging bike traffic from the Burnham Greenway Trail (via Brainard Avenue to/from Gostlin Street and via 136th/134th Street to/from Sheffield Avenue) and new Wolf Lake Trails (via Sheffield Avenue to Hohman Avenue) to the Erie-Lackawanna and Monon Trails. An example is the annual ‘Le Tour de Shore’ route (http://www.letourdeshore.com). What bicycling features (e.g. bike lanes, protect and/or separated bike lanes, combined sidewalk/bike paths) are incorporated into this project to accommodate and make safer this growing means of transportation and recreation?

More direct Brainard Avenue to existing Sheffield Avenue/Chicago Avenue intersection route The existing and proposed routes connect Brainard Avenue east/west using Gostlin Street to Sheffield Avenue and Sheffield Avenue south/north to Chicago Avenue. Extrapolating Brainard Avenue either directly or as a reversed ‘S’ is a shorter hypotenuses than the combined legs of Gostlin Street and Sheffield Avenue. Why wasn’t an at-grade level, more direct route taken from Brainard Avenue to Chicago Avenue?

South Shore Extension
The U.S. Congressional Representative for the First District has growing support for an ‘extension’ of the South Shore Line as part of the Northern Indiana Commuter Transportation District (NICTD). Does the proposed plan address this extension? If not, why not?

Addressing metropolitan heat island effects and climate change adaptation The DOT (e.g., http://www.fta.dot.gov/12347_14013.html) and the City of Chicago (http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/cdot/Construction%20Guidelines/SUIGPpresentation.pdf) have identified and adopted features; light colored pavements, landscape plants, etc. to be incorporated into projects to mitigate these growing heat effects Does this project mimic these practices to synergize the benefit’s with the greater Chicago and Calumet regions?

Traffic congestion
During rush hour commutes (late afternoon) when South Shore commuters disembark, Chicago Ford Assembly Plant shift change, and other similar activities coupled with road traffic stoppages due to rail train movement creates significant commuter congestion. Today, this chaos is partially tempered by east and south bound traffic proceeding south to Hoffman Avenue on Sheffield Avenue. The proposed rotary at Hohman Avenue and Chicago Avenue appears to funnel all this traffic into one rotary. Creating a single chokepoint, a potential bottleneck. Is there enough capacity with the proposed rotary to accommodate this routine surge of traffic and to allow emergency vehicle moment (e.g. ambulance)?

Sincerely,

Frank Madeka
4312 Wabash Avenue
From: GRANITE ROCKS <granite_rocks1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2015 11:05 PM
To: GoChicagoStreet
Subject: Comment/Suggestion

Hello Briana,

Hope you're doing well! My name is Antonio Cornejo and I own the property located at 4648 Torrence Ave Hammond, IN. Corner of Chicago Ave & Torrence Ave. This property was purchased by my father Manuel Cornejo, we rehabbed entire home and he has now given to me. This is a 2 unit property and both have been rehabbed by my father, brothers, and I. The sentimental value of this property is very important to my family and I. We do not want to have our yard and driveway taken to build a road that we don't need. Yes it needs repairs but not what's planned. The city will not admit to this but 5-6 years ago repairs were done on Chicago Ave and the curbs & guardrails that were removed and not replaced have contributed to the safety issue The sewer drains that were removed and not replaced is a completely diff story. There is a lack of signs to direct traffic which also adds to the traffic and safety issues.

I do not approve of this project and will not allow a busy road like Chicago Ave moved closer to my home. I already have cars driving on the sidewalk almost into my yard and you plan on taking my yard and moving the street closer. Sorry but this makes no sense at all. The reasons for this project are supposedly to improve traffic flow and safety. I've lived in this area for over 25 years and Chicago Ave has no traffic problems at all, Calumet Ave does. The trains here in Hammond are the leading cause of traffic problems, a bridge over these annoying trains is what we need. Doesn't matter what time of day if you're driving north or south on Calumet you might be stuck for a while by a stopped or slow train. I've studied the plans very detailed and the more I see the more this project doesn't make sense. Hammond needs the money elsewhere not to widen Chicago Ave. Think about all of the families that are affected by this. Relocating is an expense that many can not afford or do not want to make. If this project is approved my yard and driveway is not for sale. I'm prepared to take legal actions if necessary. Would you allow someone to devalue your home? Didn't think so! I have an 8 year old daughter and a dog, we need our yard! I come from a large family 3 brothers and 4 sisters, 20 nieces and nephews. When I have family over I need my yard as everyone else does.

Thanks for your time and I'm sure you will be hearing from me more.

Kind Regards!
Tony Cornejo
219-427-9855
Attachment 5 (pages 1-2)
Project Commitments
Firm Commitments

1. If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, federal law and regulations (16 USC 470, et seq.; 36 CFR 800.11, et al) and State Law (IC 14-21-1) require that work must stop and that the discovery must be reported to the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology within 2 business days (IDNR).

2. If the scope of work or right of way amounts change, INDOT ES will be contacted immediately (INDOT).

3. If any potential hazardous materials are discovered during construction the IDEM Spill Line should be notified with details of the discovery within 24 hours. (IDEM)

4. IDEM recommends that appropriate structures and techniques be utilized both during the construction phase, and after completion of the project, to minimize the impacts associated with storm water runoff. (IDEM)

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

6. All facilities slated for renovation or demolition must be inspected by an Indiana-licensed asbestos inspector prior to renovation or demolition activities. If regulated asbestos-containing material (RACM) that may become airborne is found, demolition, renovation, or asbestos removal activities must be performed in accordance with notification and emission control requirements. (IDEM)

7. In all cases where a demolition activity will occur (even if no asbestos is found), the owner or operator must still notify IDEM 10 working days prior to the demolition. (IDEM)

8. IDEM encourages all efforts to minimize human exposure to lead-based paint chips and dust. (IDEM)

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

10. Wastes and unused building materials shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations. (IDEM)

11. Stabilize all disturbed areas upon completion of land disturbing activities. (IDEM)
12. Sediment-laden water which otherwise would flow from the project site shall be treated by erosion and sediment control measures appropriate to minimize sedimentation. (IDEM)

13. A stable construction site access shall be provided at all points of construction traffic ingress and egress to the project site. (IDEM)

14. Public or private roadways shall be kept cleared of accumulated sediment that is a result of runoff or tracking. (IDEM)

15. Phase II ISA’s will be conducted on those properties recommended for additional investigation after Stage II plans are submitted and the environmental document has been approved. (City of Hammond)

16. Prior to making any connection to existing mains, the contractor shall contact the appropriate representative of the owner to advise the owner as to the method of operations, materials and equipment available to successfully complete the work, and provide an estimate of completion time to allow proper scheduling of the existing water utility operations. (City of Hammond)

**FOR CONSIDERATION**

1. Mini-parks could be provided on remnant parcels that are only partially used for the roadway improvements, and tree and shrub plantings could be provided to screen remaining residential area from the widened roadway. (USFWS)

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

3. Minimize and contain within the project limits all tree and brush clearing. (IDNR)

4. Do not cut any trees suitable for Indiana bat roosting (greater than 3 inches dbh, living or dead, with loose hanging bark) from April 1 through September 30. (IDNR)

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

6. Plant five native trees, at least 2 inches in diameter-at-breast height, for each tree which is removed that is ten inches or greater in diameter-at-breast height. (IDNR)