Hydric Soil List - All Components

This table lists the map unit components and their hydric status in the survey area. This list can help in planning land uses; however, onsite investigation is recommended to determine the hydric soils on a specific site (National Research Council, 1995; Hurt and others, 2002).

The three essential characteristics of wetlands are hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology (Cowardin and others, 1979; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1987; National Research Council, 1995; Tiner, 1985). Criteria for all of the characteristics must be met for areas to be identified as wetlands. Undrained hydric soils that have natural vegetation should support a dominant population of ecological wetland plant species. Hydric soils that have been converted to other uses should be capable of being restored to wetlands.

Hydric soils are defined by the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils (NTCHS) as soils that formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part (Federal Register, 1994). These soils, under natural conditions, are either saturated or inundated long enough during the growing season to support the growth and reproduction of hydrophytic vegetation.

The NTCHS definition identifies general soil properties that are associated with wetness. In order to determine whether a specific soil is a hydric soil or nonhydric soil, however, more specific information, such as information about the depth and duration of the water table, is needed. Thus, criteria that identify those estimated soil properties unique to hydric soils have been established (Federal Register, 2002). These criteria are used to identify map unit components that normally are associated with wetlands. The criteria used are selected estimated soil properties that are described in "Soil Taxonomy" (Soil Survey Staff, 1999) and "Keys to Soil Taxonomy" (Soil Survey Staff, 1993).

If soils are wet enough for a long enough period of time to be considered hydric, they should exhibit certain properties that can be easily observed in the field. These visible properties are indicators of hydric soils. The indicators used to make onsite determinations of hydric soils are specified in "Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States" (Hurt and Vasilas, 2006).

Hydric soils are identified by examining and describing the soil to a depth of about 20 inches. This depth may be greater if determination of an appropriate indicator so requires. It is always recommended that soils be excavated and described to the depth necessary for an understanding of the redoximorphic processes. Then, using the completed soil descriptions, soil scientists can compare the soil features required by each indicator and specify which indicators have been matched with the conditions observed in the soil. The soil can be identified as a hydric soil if at least one of the approved indicators is present.

Map units that are dominantly made up of hydric soils may have small areas, or inclusions, of nonhydric soils in the higher positions on the landform, and map units dominantly made up of nonhydric soils may have inclusions of hydric soils in the lower positions on the landform.

The criteria for hydric soils are represented by codes in the table (for example, 2). Definitions for the codes are as follows:

- 1. All Histels except for Folistels, and Histosols except for Folists.
- 2. Soils in Aquic suborders, great groups, or subgroups, Albolls suborder, Historthels great group, Histoturbels great group, Pachic subgroups, or Cumulic subgroups that:
 - A. Based on the range of characteristics for the soil series, will at least in part meet one or more Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, or
 - B. Show evidence that the soil meets the definition of a hydric soil;
- 3. Soils that are frequently ponded for long or very long duration during the growing season.
 - A. Based on the range of characteristics for the soil series, will at least in part meet one or more Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, or
 - B. Show evidence that the soil meets the definition of a hydric soil;
- 4. Map unit components that are frequently flooded for long duration or very long duration during the growing season that:
 - A. Based on the range of characteristics for the soil series, will at least in part meet one or more Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, or
 - B. Show evidence that the soil meets the definition of a hydric soil;

Hydric Condition: Food Security Act information regarding the ability to grow a commodity crop without removing woody vegetation or manipulating hydrology.

References:

- Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.Federal Register. Doc. 2012-4733 Filed 2-28-12. February, 28, 2012. Hydric soils of the United States.
- Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18.
- Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436.
- Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.
- Vasilas, L.M., G.W. Hurt, and C.V. Noble, editors. Version 7.0, 2010. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.

JSDA

Report—Hydric Soil List - All Components

Hydric Soil List - All Components–IN019-Clark County, Indiana						
Map symbol and map unit name	Component/Local Phase	Comp. pct.	Landform	Hydric status	Hydric criteria met (code)	
Uaa: Udorthents, cut and filled	Udorthents, cut and filled	60-100	—	Unranked	—	
	Urban land	0-15	—	Unranked	—	
	Very deep, poorly and somewhat poorly drained aquents	0-15	Depressions	Unranked	_	
	Rock outcrop	0-10	Free faces	No	—	
UaoAK: Udifluvents, cut and filled- Urban land complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes, occasionally flooded, brief duration	Udifluvents, cut and filled	25-85	Flood plains	Unranked	_	
	Urban land	15-50	Flood plains	Unranked	—	
	Huntington	0-15	Natural levees,flood plains	No	—	
	McAdoo	0-5	Flood plains,natural levees	No	—	
	Lindside	0-5	Flood plains	No	—	
	Newark	0-5	Flood plains	No	—	
UndAY: Urban land-Udifluvents complex, leveed, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Urban land	45-90	Flood plains	Unranked	—	
	Udifluvents	15-50	Flood plains	Unranked	—	
	Huntington	0-15	Natural levees,flood plains	No	_	
	Lindside	0-5	Flood plains	No	—	
	Newark	0-5	Flood plains	No	_	
W: Water	Water	100-100	-	No	-	

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: Clark County, Indiana Survey Area Data: Version 21, Sep 5, 2018



Riverside Drive Improvements (Des No. 1700725) - Clarksville, Clark Co., IN **Photo Orientation Map A** F-23



Author: Alexandra Zelles, 12/28/2018



1. View west along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



2. View east along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



3. View west along Riverside Drive under US 31. 09/18/2018



4. View southeast towards Riverside Drive and US 31 bridge. 09/18/2018



5. View west towards Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



6. View east along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



7. View west along W. Market Street towards Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



8. View east along W. Market Street. 09/18/2018



9. View northwest along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



10. View southwest across Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



11. View southeast across Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



12. View southeast from Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



13. View southwest from Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



14. View west along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018





15. View southeast along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



16. View west along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



17. View northeast. 09/18/2018



18. View south from Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



19. View southeast along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



20. View west along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



21. View southeast. 09/18/2018



22. View southeast. 09/18/2018





24. View southeast. 09/18/2018

23. View east along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



25. View southwest. 09/18/2018



26. View northwest. 09/18/2018



27. View northwest along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



28. View southeast along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



29. View southeast along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



30. View northwest along Riverside Drive. 09/18/2018



Riverside Drive Improvements (Des No. 1700725) - Clarksville, Clark Co., IN Waters of the United States (WOTUS) Resources Photo Orientation Map B

Author: Alexandra Zelles, 12/28/2018

Crawford, Murphy & Tilly



31. View of Wetland A, with the shovel located at wetland data point A1, looking northeast. 09/18/2018



32. View of Wetland A looking east. 09/18/2018

Waters of the United States (WOTUS) Resources Photographic Log B





33. View of Wetland A vegetation at wetland data point A1. 09/18/2018



34. View from within Wetland A looking out towards surrounding terrain, looking southeast. 09/18/2018

F-41





35. View from within Wetland A looking out towards surrounding terrain, looking southwest. 09/18/2018



36. Wetland data point A1 soil profile and close-up of hydric features. 09/18/2018

Waters of the United States (WOTUS) Resources Photographic Log B





37. Upland data point A2 soil profile. 09/18/2018



38. View of upland vegetation, with the shovel located at upland data point B1, looking north. 09/18/2018

F-43



39. Upland data point B1 soil profile. 09/18/2018



40. View downstream of plunge pool at outlet of existing culvert and headwater of UNT1. 09/18/2018

F-44



41. View upstream at outlet of existing culvert and headwater of UNT1. 09/18/2018



42. View of UNT1 looking north (upstream) toward outlet of existing culvert. 09/18/2018

Waters of the United States (WOTUS) Resources Photographic Log B



43. View of UNT1 looking southwest (downstream). 09/18/2018



44. View of UNT1 looking northeast (upstream). 09/18/2018





45. View of UNT1 looking southwest (downstream). 09/18/2018

Reset Form

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Riverside Dr. Improvements (Des. 1700725)	City/County: Clarksville/Clark Co.		Sampling Date: <u>9/18/2018</u>		
Applicant/Owner: INDOT		_ State: IN	_ Sampling Point: <u>A1</u>		
Investigator(s): Marion Wells, Heather Lacey	_ Section, Township, Range:	Clark Co. Grant, Se	ection 1		
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): flat	Local relief (con	Local relief (concave, convex, none): none			
Slope (%): 0 Lat: <u>38.269927</u>	_ Long: <u>-85.754782</u>		Datum: NAD83		
Soil Map Unit Name: UaoAK - Udifluvents, cut & filled-Urban land co	omplex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	NWI or WWI o	classification: PSSIA		
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes X No (If no, explain in Remarks.)					
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significant	tly disturbed? Are "Norr	nal Circumstances"	present? Yes X No		
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally p	problematic? (If needed	d, explain any answe	ers in Remarks.)		
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showin	ng sampling point loca	tions, transects	s, important features, etc.		
× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes X No Yes X No Yes X No	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes <u>X</u> No
Remarks:			

Wetland A extends beyond the study area and is abutting the Ohio River.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>3</u> (A)
2				Total Number of Dominant
3				Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)
4.				
5				Percent of Dominant Species
···		- Total Cov		$\begin{array}{c} \text{That Are OBL, FACW, of FAC.} \\ \hline 75.00 \\ \hline \end{array} (A/B) \end{array}$
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)		- 10101 001		Prevalence Index worksheet:
1. Gleditsia triacanthos	10	Y	FACU	Total % Cover of:Multiply by:
2. Platanus occidentalis	5	Y	FACW	OBL species 15 x 1 = 15
3				FACW species $70 \times 2 = 140$
۵ ۸				FAC species $0 \times 3 = 0$
T	·			FACIL species $20 \times 4 = 80$
5	15	Total Car		$\frac{1}{100} \text{ species} \qquad 0 \qquad x = 0$
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)	15		er	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Or } \textbf{L} \text{ species} & \underline{\textbf{U}} \\ \text{Column Tatolog} & 105 \\ Column Tatolog & 105 \\ \text{Column Ta$
1 Echinochloa crus-galli	30	Y	FACW	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Column rotals.} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 105 \\ (A) \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 235 \\ (B) \\ \end{array} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} (B) \\ \end{array} \end{array}$
2 Agrostis gigantea	20	Y	FACW	Prevalence Index = $B/A = 2.24$
2 Persicaria pensvlvanica	10	 N	FACW	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
A Dichanthelium snn	10	N		X Dominance Test is >50%
4. <u>Dichanticiani 3pp.</u>	10	N		\mathbf{X} Prevalence Index is <3.0 ¹
5. <u>Gleditsia triacantrios</u>	10	N		Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting
		N		data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
7. Cyperus esculentus	5	<u> </u>	FACW	Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
8. Lythrum salicaria	5	<u>N</u>	OBL	
9				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
10				be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
	100	= Total Cov	rer	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:)				
1				Hydrophytic
2				Present? Yes X No
	. <u> </u>	= Total Cov	rer	
Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate s	sheet.)			1
Emergent				

SOIL

Profile Des	cription: (Describe to	o the dept	n needed to docu	ment the i	indicator	or confirm	n the absence of in	dicators.)
Depth (inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	<u>x Feature</u> %	s Tvpe ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks
0-18	10YR 4/1	90	7.5YR 4/6	10	С	M, PL	clay w/ silt	
		·			·			
			Reduced Matrix C				rains ² Location	PI-Pore Lining M-Matrix
Hydric Soil	Indicators:			0-001010			Indicators for P	Problematic Hydric Soils ³ :
Histoso Histic E Black H Hydroge Stratifie 2 cm M Deplete Thick D Sandy I 5 cm M	I (A1) pipedon (A2) istic (A3) en Sulfide (A4) d Layers (A5) uck (A10) d Below Dark Surface ark Surface (A12) Mucky Mineral (S1) ucky Peat or Peat (S3)	(A11)	 Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) Sandy Redox (S5) Stripped Matrix (S6) Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) Depleted Matrix (F3) Redox Dark Surface (F6) Depleted Dark Surface (F7) Redox Depressions (F8) 			,	Coast Prairi Iron-Manga Other (Expla ³ Indicators of hy wetland hyd unless distu	e Redox (A16) nese Masses (F12) ain in Remarks) ydrophytic vegetation and rology must be present, urbed or problematic.
Type:	Layer (if observed):							
Depth (in	iches):						Hydric Soil Pres	ent? Yes <u>X</u> No
Remarks:								

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:		
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required;	check all that apply)	Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)
 Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) Sediment Deposits (B2) Drift Deposits (B3) Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Iron Deposits (B5) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) 	 Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Aquatic Fauna (B13) True Aquatic Plants (B14) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) X Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Gauge or Well Data (D9) Other (Explain in Remarks) 	 Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Drainage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) Geomorphic Position (D2) FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Field Observations: Surface Water Present? Yes No Water Table Present? Yes No Saturation Present? Yes No (includes capillary fringe) Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitor)	X Depth (inches):	Hydrology Present? Yes X No
Remarks: Abutting the Ohio River		

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Riverside Dr. Improvements (Des. 1700725)	City/County: Clarksville/Clark	Co.	Sampling Date: 9/18/2018
Applicant/Owner: INDOT	<u> </u>	State: IN	Sampling Point: A2
Investigator(s): Marion Wells, Heather Lacey	Section, Township, Range: C	lark Co. Grant, Sec	ction 1
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): hillslope	Local relief (conca	ve, convex, none):	none
Slope (%): <u>30</u> Lat: <u>38.270022</u>	Long: <u>-85.754867</u>		Datum: NAD83
Soil Map Unit Name: UaoAK - Udifluvents, cut & filled-Urban land con	nplex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	NWI or WWI cla	assification: none
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of ye	ear? Yes X No	(If no, explain in Re	emarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly	disturbed? Are "Norma	l Circumstances" p	resent? Yes X No
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally pr	oblematic? (If needed,	explain any answer	rs in Remarks.)
CLIMMADY OF FINDINCS Attach site man abouting	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		immentent footunes ato

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes No X Yes No X Yes No X	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No <u>×</u>
Remarks:				

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:
Tree Stratum (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species
1				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)
2	<u> </u>			Total Number of Dominant
3.				Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)
4				
5				Percent of Dominant Species
		Tatal Cau		That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>20.00</u> (A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			er	Prevalence Index worksheet:
1 Lonicera maackii	20	Y	NI	Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
2 Gleditsia triacanthos	10	Y	FACU	OBL species $0 \times 1 = 0$
		<u>.</u>		$EACW species \qquad 0 \qquad x^2 = 0$
3				$\Gamma ACW species $
4				FAC species 13 $x_3 = 43$
5				FACU species 35 x 4 = 140
Hart Oracleum (Distains E'rodius)	30	= Total Cov	er	UPL species $0 x 5 = 0$
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5 radius)	40			Column Totals: <u>50</u> (A) <u>185</u> (B)
1. Lonicera maackii	40	<u> </u>	<u></u> NI	Developed Index D/A 2 70
2. <u>Calystegia sepium</u>	15	Y	FAC	Prevalence index = B/A =
3. Xanthium sp.	10	N	NI	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
4. Plantago lanceolata	10	N	FACU	Dominance Test is >50%
5. Gleditsia triacanthos	10	N	FACU	Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹
6. Allium canadense	5	Ν	FACU	Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting
7. Ambrosia sp.	5	N	NI	data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
8				Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)
0				
3				¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must
10				be present, unless disturbed or problematic.
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	95	= Total Cov	er	
1 Vitis sp	10	V	NI	Hydrophytic
1. <u>1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1</u>	10	<u> </u>	. 11	Vegetation
2				Present? Yes <u>No X</u>
	10	= I otal Cov	er	
Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate s	sheet.)			1

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe t	o the depth	n needed to docum	nent the i	ndicator	or confirm	n the absence of i	ndicators.)		
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	S					
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Rema	arks	
0-18	10YR 4/4	100	clay w/ sand							
				·						
·				. <u></u>			·		<u> </u>	
							. <u> </u>			
·		<u> </u>		·			·			
				·						
¹ Type: C=Co	oncentration, D=Deple	etion, RM=F	Reduced Matrix, CS	S=Covered	d or Coate	d Sand G	rains. ² Locatio	n: PL=Pore Lini	ng, M=Matrix.	
Hydric Soil	ndicators:						Indicators for	Problematic Hy	dric Soils ³ :	
Histosol	(A1)		Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)			Coast Prairie Redox (A16)				
Histic Ep	pipedon (A2)		Sandy Redox (S5)				Iron-Manga	anese Masses (F	-12)	
Black Histic (A3)		Stripped	I Matrix (S	6)		Other (Exp	lain in Remarks)			
Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)			Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)							
Stratified	Layers (A5)		Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)							
2 cm Mu	ick (A10)		Deplete	d Matrix (I	F3)					
Depleted	Below Dark Surface	(A11)	Redox [Dark Surfa	ice (F6)		3			
Thick Da	ark Surface (A12)		Depleted Dark Surface (F7)				Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and			
Sandy M	lucky Mineral (S1)	`	Redox Depressions (F8)				wetland hydrology must be present,			
5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)							uniess aist	urbed or problem	natic.	
Restrictive I	-ayer (il observed):									
Туре:										
Depth (ind	ches):						Hydric Soil Pre	sent? Yes	No <u>×</u>	
Remarks:										

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:				
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)	Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)			
Surface Water (A1) Water-Stained Leaves (B9)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)			
High Water Table (A2) Aquatic Fauna (B13)	Drainage Patterns (B10)			
Saturation (A3) True Aquatic Plants (B14)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)			
Water Marks (B1) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)			
Sediment Deposits (B2) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Liv	ring Roots (C3) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)			
Drift Deposits (B3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C	4) Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)			
Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tille	d Soils (C6) Geomorphic Position (D2)			
Iron Deposits (B5) Thin Muck Surface (C7)	FAC-Neutral Test (D5)			
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Gauge or Well Data (D9)	Gauge or Well Data (D9)			
Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) Other (Explain in Remarks)				
Field Observations:				
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches):				
Water Table Present? Yes No X Depth (inches):	_			
Saturation Present? Yes <u>No X</u> Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe)	Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No			
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous in	pections), if available:			
Remarks:				

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Midwest Region

Project/Site: Riverside Dr. Improvements (Des. 1700725)	City/County: Clarksville/Clar	k Co.	Sampling Date: 9/18/2018	
Applicant/Owner: INDOT		State: IN	Sampling Point: <u>B1</u>	
Investigator(s): Marion Wells, Heather Lacey	Section, Township, Range:	Clark Co. Grant, Se	ction 1	
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): flat	Local relief (conc	ave, convex, none):	none	
Slope (%): <u>5</u> Lat: <u>38.269555</u>	Long: <u>-85.753751</u>		Datum: NAD83	
Soil Map Unit Name: UaoAK - Udifluvents, cut & filled-Urban land com	nplex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	NWI or WWI cl	assification: PFOIA	
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of ye	ear? Yes X No	(If no, explain in R	emarks.)	
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly	disturbed? Are "Norm	al Circumstances" p	resent? Yes X No	
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally pre-	oblematic? (If needed	, explain any answe	rs in Remarks.)	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing	sampling point locat	ions, transects	, important features, etc.	

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes Yes Yes	No X No X No X	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No <u>×</u>
Remarks:					

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute	Dominant	Indicator	Dominance Test worksheet:		
<u>Tree Stratum</u> (Plot size: <u>30' radius</u>)	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of Dominant Species		
1. Populus deltoides	20	Y	FAC	That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A)		
2				Tatal New Long (Developed		
3				I otal Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)		
۸	·					
	·			Percent of Dominant Species		
5				That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 50.00 (A/B)		
Conling (Chryh Stratym (Distaize) 15' radius	20	= Total Cov	er	Provalence Index worksheet:		
<u>Saphilig/Siliub Silatum</u> (Plot size. <u>13 latitus</u>)	05	V	FAOL			
1. Gieditsia triacantnos	25	<u> </u>	FACU			
2				OBL species x 1 =		
3				FACW species X 2 =70		
4				FAC species x 3 =75		
5.				FACU species 40 x 4 =160		
	25	= Total Cov	er	UPL species 0 x 5 = 0		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				Column Totals: 100 (A) 305 (B)		
1. Xanthium sp.	30	Y	NI			
2. Verbesina alternifolia	30	Y	FACW	Prevalence Index = B/A =3.05		
3. Phytolacca americana	10	N	FACU	Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:		
4. Agrostis gigantea	5	N	FACW	Dominance Test is >50%		
5. Passiflora incarnata	5	N	NI	Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹		
6. Ambrosia trifida	5	N	FAC	Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting		
7. Gleditsia triacanthos	5	N	FACU	data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)		
8	·			Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation ¹ (Explain)		
0						
9	·			¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must		
10			·	be present, unless disturbed or problematic.		
Weedy Vine Stratum (Plat size)	90	= Total Cov	er			
(FIOLSIZE)				Hudrophytic		
1	·		·	Vegetation		
2	·		. <u> </u>	Present? Yes No X		
		= Total Cov	er			
Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate s	sheet.)					

Profile Desc	ription: (Describe t	o the dept	h needed to docun	nent the	indicator	or confir	m the absence of i	indicators.)	
Depth	Matrix		Redo	x Feature	S				
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remar	ks
0-18	10YR 4/2	100					loamy clay		
							· ·		
·					·		· ·		
							·		
					·		· ·		
				·	·		·		
				·					
¹ Type: C=C	oncentration, D=Depl	etion, RM=	Reduced Matrix, CS	S=Covere	d or Coate	d Sand G	Frains. ² Location	on: PL=Pore Linin	g, M=Matrix.
Hydric Soil	Indicators:						Indicators for	Problematic Hyd	Iric Soils ³ :
Histosol (A1)			Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)			Coast Pra	iirie Redox (A16)		
Histic Epipedon (A2)			Sandy F	Redox (S5	5)		Iron-Mang	ganese Masses (F	12)
Black Histic (A3)			Stripped	Matrix (S	56)		Other (Exp	plain in Remarks)	
Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)			Loamy I	Mucky Mi	neral (F1)				
Stratified	d Layers (A5)		Loamy (leyed M	atrix (F2)				
2 cm ML	ICK (A1U) d Dalaus Daris Curtana	(114)	Deplete	d Matrix (F3)				
Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)				d Dork Sulla	ace (F0) urfaco (E7)		³ Indicators of	hydrophytic yogot	ation and
Thick Da	Ark Sunace (A12) Aucky Mineral (S1)		Redox Depressions (F8)			wetland bydrology must be present			
5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)							unless disturbed or problematic.		
Restrictive	Laver (if observed):	7							
Type:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,								
Depth (inches):							Hydric Soil Pre	acont? Vac	No X
Remarks:									

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:	
Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)	Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)
Surface Water (A1) Water-Stained Leaves (B9)	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
High Water Table (A2) Aquatic Fauna (B13)	Drainage Patterns (B10)
Saturation (A3) True Aquatic Plants (B14)	Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
Water Marks (B1) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)	Crayfish Burrows (C8)
Sediment Deposits (B2) Oxidized Rhizospheres on Livir	g Roots (C3) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
Drift Deposits (B3) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)	Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
Algal Mat or Crust (B4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled	Soils (C6) Geomorphic Position (D2)
Iron Deposits (B5) Thin Muck Surface (C7)	FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Gauge or Well Data (D9)	
Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8) Other (Explain in Remarks)	
Field Observations:	
Surface Water Present? Yes No X Depth (inches):	_
Water Table Present? Yes <u>No X</u> Depth (inches):	_
Saturation Present? Yes No X Depth (inches): (includes capillary fringe)	_ Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No X
Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous insp	ections), if available:
Remarks:	

ChieEPA Primary Headwater Habitat Evaluation Form HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1, 2, 3):

2	_
U	
-	-

SITE NAME/LOCATION Riverside Dr. Improvements (Des. 1700725)	
SITE NUMBER UNT1 RIVER BASIN Ohio River DRAINAGE AREA (mi²) 0	13
LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft) 77 LAT. LONG. RIVER CODE NA RIVER MILE	Α
DATE 09/18/18 SCORER MEW/HDL COMMENTS	
NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instr	uctions
	OVERY
MODIFICATIONS:	-
1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check ONLY two predominant substrate TYPE boxes	
(Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.	HHEI
TYPE PERCENT TYPE PERCENT BLDR SLABS [16 pts] 0% SILT [3 pt] 25%	Points
BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	Substrate
$\square \square $	Max = 40
GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts] 10% MUCK [0 pts] 0%	12
SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts] 10% ARTIFICIAL [3 pts] 30%	12
Total of Percentages of 10.00% (A) 100% (B)	A + B
SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 6 TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES: 6	
2. Maximum Pool Depth (Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft) evaluation reach at the time of	Pool Depth
evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check ONLY one box):	Max = 30
> 30 centimeters [20 pts] > 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts] > 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts] < 5 cm [5 pts]	
> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	25
COMMENTS MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH (centimeters): 20	
3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) (Check ONLY one box):	Bankfull
> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts] > 3.0 m + 0.m (> 9', 7" + 13') [25 pts] > 4.0 m (> 9', 7" + 13') [25 pts]	Width Max=30
> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]	
COMMENTS AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH (meters): 6.00	30
This information <u>must</u> also be completed	
RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆ RIPARIAN WIDTH FLOODPLAIN QUALITY	
L R (Per Bank) L R (Most Predominant per Bank) L R	
Wide >10m L Mature Forest, Wetland L Conservation Tillage	
Field Field Orban or Industrial	
Narrow <5m Residential, Park, New Field Open Pasture, Row Cro	þ
None Fenced Pasture Mining or Construction COMMENTS	
FLOW REGIME (At Time of Evaluation) (Check ONLY one box): Stream Flowing Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)	
Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial) Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)	
SINUCSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check ONLY one box): None 1.0 2.0 3.0	
□ 0.5 □ 1.5 □ 2.5 □ >3	
	0.40
	υ π)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):
QHEI PERFORMED? - Yes 🗸 No QHEI Score (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)
DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)
WWH Name: Distance from Evaluated Stream
CWH Name: Distance from Evaluated Stream
EWH Name: Distance from Evaluated Stream
MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION
USGS Quadrangle Name: New Albany, IN NRCS Soil Map Page: NRCS Soil Map Stream Order
County: Clark Township / City: Clarksville
MISCELLANEOUS
Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): Y Date of last precipitation: Quantity: 0.00
Photograph Information:
Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N):N Canopy (% open):15%
Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): _N (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number:
Field Measures: Temp (°C) Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) PH (S.U.) Conductivity (µmhos/cm)
Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) If not, please explain:
Additional comments/description of pollution impacts:
Performed? (Y/N): N (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual) Fish Observed? (Y/N) N Voucher? (Y/N) N Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) N Voucher? (Y/N)
DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This <u>must</u> be completed): Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location Forest Pool Pool Pool FLOW UNT 1 0 0 51H The stream's location Concrete Forest Forest Porest Por
DHWH Form Page 2

Save as pdf
PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD): February 22, 2019

B. NAME AND ADDRESS OF PERSON REQUESTING PRELIMINARY JD:

Alexandra Zelles & Marion Wells Crawford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc. 8790 Purdue Road Indianapolis, IN 46268

C. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: CENAP-OP-R-_____

D. PROJECT LOCATION(S) AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The proposed project (Des No. 1700725) involves the reconstruction of Riverside Drive from the Clarksville town limits to the second parking lot of Ashland Park, about 1,400 feet to the west in Clarksville, Clark County, Indiana. No bridgework is required. The project is located in Section 1 of the Clark County, IN Land Grant as shown on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5' New Albany, Indiana topographic quadrangle.

INDOT proposes to widen the roadway to the south to accommodate a new typical cross section consisting of two travel lanes, on-street parking on both sides of the roadway, curbs, sidewalk on both sides of the roadway, planting zones, and a twelve foot above-grade two-way cycle track within the right of way on the south side of the roadway. The project will also complete Clarksville's portion of the Ohio River Greenway, a multi-use trail, connecting Jeffersonville, Clarksville and New Albany. New right of way acquisition is anticipated. The surface water within the study area drains toward the Ohio River.

(USE THE ATTACHED TABLE TO DOCUMENT MULTIPLE WATERBODIES AT DIFFERENT SITES)

State: Indiana County: Clark City: Clarksville

Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 38.269656 ° N, Long. -85.754160 ° W

Universal Transverse Mercator: <u>608981.71</u> m Easting (x) <u>4236468.52</u> m Northing (y)

Name of nearest waterbody: <u>UNT 1 of the Ohio River (within the project area) and the</u> <u>Ohio River (136 feet to the south)</u> Identify (estimate) amount of waters in the review area: Non-wetland waters: <u>77</u> linear feet: <u>20</u> width (ft) and/or <u>acres</u>. Cowardin Class: <u>Riverine intermittent streambed intermittently exposed (R4SBG)</u> Stream Flow: <u>Intermittent; flowing</u> Wetlands: <u>0.09</u> acres. Cowardin Class: <u>Palustrine emergent persistent temporarily flooded wetland (PEM1A)</u>

Name of any water bodies on the site that have been identified as Section 10 waters:

Tidal: <u>N/A</u> Non-Tidal: <u>N/A</u>

E. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination.	Date:	
Field Determination.	Date(s):	

1. The Corps of Engineers believes that there may be jurisdictional waters of the United States on the subject site, and the permit applicant or other affected party who requested this preliminary JD is hereby advised of his or her option to request and obtain an approved jurisdictional determination (JD) for that site. Nevertheless, the permit applicant or other person who requested this preliminary JD has declined to exercise the option to obtain an approved JD in this instance and at this time.

2. In any circumstance where a permit applicant obtains an individual permit, or a Nationwide General Permit (NWP) or other general permit verification requiring "pre-construction notification" (PCN), or requests verification for a non-reporting NWP or other general permit, and the permit applicant has not requested an approved JD for the activity, the permit applicant is hereby made aware of the following: (1) the permit applicant has elected to seek a permit authorization based on a preliminary JD, which does not make an official determination of jurisdictional waters; (2) that the applicant has the option to request an approved JD before accepting the terms and conditions of the permit authorization, and that basing a permit authorization on an approved JD could possibly result in less compensatory mitigation being required or different special conditions; (3) that the applicant has the right to request an individual permit rather than accepting the terms and conditions of the NWP or other general permit authorization; (4) that the applicant can accept a permit authorization and thereby agree to comply with all the terms and conditions of that permit, including whatever mitigation requirements the Corps has determined to be necessary; (5) that undertaking any activity in reliance upon the subject permit authorization without requesting an approved JD constitutes the applicant's acceptance of the use of the preliminary JD, but that either form of JD will be processed as soon as is practicable; (6) accepting a permit authorization (e.g., signing a proffered individual permit) or undertaking any activity in reliance on any form of Corps permit authorization based on a preliminary JD constitutes agreement that all wetlands and other water bodies on the site affected in any way by that activity are jurisdictional waters of the United States, and precludes any challenge to such jurisdiction in any administrative or judicial compliance or enforcement action, or in any administrative appeal or in any Federal court; and (7) whether the applicant elects to use either an approved JD or a preliminary JD, that JD will be processed as soon as is practicable. Further, an approved JD, a proffered individual permit (and all terms and conditions contained therein), or individual permit denial can be administratively appealed pursuant to 33 C.F.R. Part 331, and that in any administrative appeal, jurisdictional issues can be raised (see 33 C.F.R. 331.5(a)(2)). If, during that administrative appeal, it becomes necessary to make an official determination whether CWA jurisdiction exists over a site, or to provide an official delineation of jurisdictional waters on the site, the Corps will provide an approved JD to accomplish that result, as soon as is practicable.

This preliminary JD finds that there *"may be"* waters of the United States on the subject project site, and identifies all aquatic features on the site that could be affected by the proposed activity, based on the following information:

SUPPORTING DATA: Data reviewed for preliminary JD (check all that apply - checked
items should be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately
reference sources below):
■ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant:
General location map, aerial photograph, USGS topographic map, picture key map, NRCS
Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant
Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
Corps navigable waters' study:
U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
USGS NHD data.
USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name: <u>1: 24,000, New Albany Quad,</u>
Indiana
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:
http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm
National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
FEMA/FIRM maps: <u>18019C0269E; Effective</u>
<u>4/16/2014</u> .
100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Indiana Aerial Photograph, 2017.
Uther (Name & Date): <u>Site Photographs, 9/18/2018</u> .
Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
Other information (please specify):

IMPORTANT NOTE: The information recorded on this form has not necessarily been verified by the Corps and should not be relied upon for later jurisdictional determinations.

Signature and date of Regulatory Project Manager (REQUIRED)

alexandra Zelle

2/22/2019

Signature and date of person requesting preliminary JD (REQUIRED, unless obtaining the signature is impracticable)

Site number	Latitude	Longitude	Cowardin Class	Estimated amount of aquatic resource in review area	Class of aquatic resource
1 (Wetland A)	38.269927°N	-85.754777°W	PEM1A	0.09 acre	Non-section 10 water; subject to 404 jurisdiction – wetland
2 (UNT1)	38.269550°N	-85.753456°W	R4SBG	77 linear feet	Non-section 10 water; subject to 404 jurisdiction – non- wetland waters



Indiana Floodplain Information Portal Report

Point of Interest	Map Legend
Approximate Address: 527 East RIVERSIDE DR CLARKSVILLE. IN 47129	 Point of Interest Nearest Point on Stream
Effective Flood Zone: AE Preliminary Flood Zone:	Best Available Flood Zone
N/A Best Available Flood Zone:	🗾 FEMA Zone AE Floodway
AE Approximate Flood Elevation:	DNR Detailed Floodway
449.7ft NAVD88	💹 DNR Approximate Floodway
Zone AE Profile Conversion	FEMA Zone A
Nearest Stream: OHIO RIVER	FEMA Zone AE
	DNR Detailed Fringe
	DNR Approximate Fringe
	Additional Floodplain Area
	FEMA Protected by Levee
	💹 FEMA Floodplain - Ponding (Depth)

FEMA Floodplain - Sheet Flow (Depth)

Site Map with Best Available Flood Zone



Approximate scale 1:12,000

Disclaimer

Generated on Friday April 5th 2019 at 10:30:59am

The data shown on this map represents FEMA floodplain data enhanced with additional studies that have been reviewed and approved by the Division of Water. While this data has not yet been submitted to FEMA for inclusion in the Flood Insurance Rate

Riverside Drive Improvements CE Level 4 APPENDIX G: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT





RE: Town of Clarksville Riverside Drive Improvements Designation No. 1700725

Notice of Entry for Survey or Investigation

August 16, 2018

Dear Property Owner,

Our information indicates that you own property near the above proposed transportation project. Representatives of the Town of Clarksville will be conducting environmental surveys of the project area in the near future. It may be necessary for them to enter onto your property to complete this work. This is permitted under Indiana Code§ 8-23-7-26. Anyone performing this type of work has been instructed to identify him or herself to you, if you are available, before they enter your property. If you no longer own this property or it is currently occupied by someone else, please let us know the name of the new owner or occupant so that we can contact them about the survey.

The survey work may include the identification and mapping of wetlands, archaeological investigations (which may involve the survey, testing, or excavation of identified archaeological sites), and various other environmental studies. The information we obtain from such studies is necessary for the proper planning and design of this highway project. It is our sincere desire to cause you as little inconvenience as possible during this survey.

If any problems do occur, please contact me at 317-298-4500 or nbatta@cmtengr.com.

It our sincere desire to cause as little inconvenience as possible during our work, and we thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

2M/Bath

Nick Batta Project Manager

Crawford, Murphy & Tilly

Centered in Value

G-1

July 9, 2020



Terry Summers, Project Manager Capital Program Management Indiana Department of Transportation – Seymour District 185 Agrico Lane Seymour, IN 47274

> Re: Request for Hearing Certification Riverside Drive Reconstruction Clark County, Indiana INDOT Des No.: 1700725

Dear Mr. Summers:

The public comment period for this project expired at 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020. We are submitting the materials listed below and request the Hearing Certification. Items listed with a "*" are not included with this memo but listed for reference.

- Advertising
 - o Publisher's Affidavit from the News & Tribune for the legal notice that ran on May 26th and June 2nd.
 - o Legal notice
 - Post cards sent to adjacent property owners (including the mailing list)
- Project Information (posted at <u>https://www.townofclarksville.com/project/indot-project-riverside-drive/</u> during the comment period)
 - o FAQ
 - o Renderings
 - Overview exhibit
 - Stage 2 design plans*
 - Draft NEPA document*
- Additional Information (also posted on-line at the address above)
 - o Comment form
 - FHWA land acquisition booklets*
- Public Comments
 - o Comments received
 - o Responses to comments

Sincerely, CRAWFORD, MURPHY & TILLY, INC.

M.Bath

Nick Batta, P.E. Project Manager

CC: Dylan Fisher, Town of Clarksville File

Crawford, Murphy & Tilly

Centered in Value

Proof of Publication

STATE OF INDIANA **COUNTY OF CLARK -SS**

Theresa Wheatbrook on oath says that she is bookkeeper of NEWS AND TRIBUNE and in the employ of the publisher of

NEWS AND TRIBUNE,

a daily newspaper of general circulation printed and published in the city of Jeffersonville, Clark County, State of Indiana, and further says that the annexed advertisement was published in said paper for #(2) time(s) to-wit: In issue of said NEWS AND TRIBUNE Dated: 5/26, 6/2 2020

(x) Cherisa / Waturk

STATE OF INDIANA **COUNTY OF CLARK**

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

day of 2020 (X)

Joann Galligan

JOANN GALLIGAN Notary Public - Seal State of Indiana Clark County My Commission Expires Aug 27, 2022

Notary Public, Clark County, Indiana (My Commission Expires August 27, 2022 **Commission Number 655965**

ID # 04-3314494

Publication \$ 397.12 Fee

1643543

INDIANA MEDIA GROUP PO BOX 607 GREENSBURG IN 47240-0607 (877)253-7755 Fax (765)648-4229

ORDER CONFIRMATION (CONTINUED)

Salesperson: JEANNE VARBLE

Printed at 06/03/20 12:40 by jgall

Acct #: 235195

Ad #: 1643543

Status: A

1000 11. 100100

LEGAL NOTICE OF PLANNED IMPROVEMENT

The Town of Clarksville, with funding through the Indiana Department of Transportation, is developing plans for the proposed Riverside Drive improvements from Ashland Park to the Clarksville/Jeffersonville corporation limits in Clark County.

The purpose of this project is to improve pedestrian mobility and correct the deficient stormwater conveyance system. The need for the project is due to lack of continuity of the Ohio River Greenway, ADA non-compliant sidewalks, and lack of storm sewer inlets.

The project proposes to reconstruct about 1,700' of Riverside Drive with new pavement, curbs, sidewalks and storm sewer systems. A multi-use path will be added along the south side. Other enhancements include landscaping, street lighting, and signage.

The proposed construction of this project will require 1.78 acre of new permanent right-of-way and 0.17 acre of temporary right-of-way.

The maintenance of traffic plan proposes to close Riverside Drive to through traffic and detour using Sherwood Avenue, Montgomery Avenue, Clark Boulevard, Woerner Avenue, Court Avenue, Missouri Avenue, and Market Street. Access to all properties will be maintained throughout construction. School corporations and emergency services will be notified of closures prior to construction. The proposed start of construction is 2023 and anticipated to be completed in the fall of 2024.

The cost associated with this project is approximately \$6,790,000 which includes preliminary engineering, right-of-way, construction with both federal and state funds anticipated to be used. The Federal Highway Administration and INDOT have agreed this project falls within the guidelines of a Categorical Exclusion (CE) Level 4.

Preliminary design plans, the CE document, project renderings, and a comment form are available for review at the Town of Clarksville's website: <u>https://www.townofclarksville.com/</u>. Project documents may be mailed upon request (see contact information below).

All interested persons may request a public hearing be held and/or express their concerns by submitting comments to the attention of:

Nick Batta Crawford, Murphy & Tilly 8790 Purdue Road Indianapolis, IN 46268 NBatta@cmtengr.com

The comment period will end at 5PM EDT on Friday, June 26, 2020.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), persons and/or groups requiring project information be made available in alternative formats are encouraged to contact Nick Batta at the email or mailing address listed above. In accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, persons and/or groups requiring project information be made available in another language are encouraged to contact Nick Batta at the email or mailing address above.

This notice is published in compliance with: 1) Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Section 771 (CFR 771.111(h)(1) stating, "Each State must have procedures approved by the FHWA to carry out a public involvement/public hearing program."; 2) 23 CFR 450.210(a)(1)(ix) stating, "Provide for the periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all interested parties and revise the procedures, as approved and 3) The INDOT Public Involvement Policies and Procedures approved by the Federal Highway Administration on August 16, 2012.

Town of Clarksville

Riverside Drive Improvements PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

In compliance with Federal and State laws, the Town of Clarksville is opening a formal comment period to review the preliminary plans, renderings, and environmental studies to reconstruct Riverside Drive from Ashland Park to the Clarksville/Jeffersonville corporation limits. The formal comment period will end at 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020.

You are welcome to view project documents at the Town's website: <u>https://www.townofclarksville.com/</u>.

Formal comments may be submitted to Nick Batta (with Crawford, Murphy & Tilly) at 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or to <u>NBatta@cmtengr.com</u>.

Town of Clarksville

Riverside Drive Improvements PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

In compliance with Federal and State laws, the Town of Clarksville is opening a formal comment period to review the preliminary plans, renderings, and environmental studies to reconstruct Riverside Drive from Ashland Park to the Clarksville/Jeffersonville corporation limits. The formal comment period will end at 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020.

You are welcome to view project documents at the Town's website: <u>https://www.townofclarksville.com/</u>.

Formal comments may be submitted to Nick Batta (with Crawford, Murphy & Tilly) at 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or to <u>NBatta@cmtengr.com</u>.

Town of Clarksville

Riverside Drive Improvements PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

In compliance with Federal and State laws, the Town of Clarksville is opening a formal comment period to review the preliminary plans, renderings, and environmental studies to reconstruct Riverside Drive from Ashland Park to the Clarksville/Jeffersonville corporation limits. The formal comment period will end at 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020.

You are welcome to view project documents at the Town's website: https://www.townofclarksville.com/.

Formal comments may be submitted to Nick Batta (with Crawford, Murphy & Tilly) at 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or to <u>NBatta@cmtengr.com</u>.

Town of Clarksville

Riverside Drive Improvements PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

In compliance with Federal and State laws, the Town of Clarksville is opening a formal comment period to review the preliminary plans, renderings, and environmental studies to reconstruct Riverside Drive from Ashland Park to the Clarksville/Jeffersonville corporation limits. The formal comment period will end at 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020.

You are welcome to view project documents at the Town's website: https://www.townofclarksville.com/.

Formal comments may be submitted to Nick Batta (with Crawford, Murphy & Tilly) at 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or to <u>NBatta@cmtengr.com</u>.

Map							
Point	Owner Name	Owner Address	Owner City	Owner State	Owner Zip	Parcel Number	Note
12	Car Works I Llc	1220 Woerner Ave	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-101-670.000-012	1220-1510 Woerner Ave
18	Carman Industries Inc	1005 Riverside Drive, West	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-19-00-100-344.000-009	
13	Carman Industries Inc	601 Riverside Drive, East	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-103-169.000-011	
16	Clarks Landing Enterprise Investments Atto: Subas Gandhi	1410 S Clark Blud Ste 2100	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-101-709 000-012	Google: Suhas Gandhi, 1410 S Clark Blvd, Ste 2100, Clarksville, IN 47129
15	Commercial Logistics Corp	200 Missouri Ave	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-101-672 000-012	200-350 Missouri Ave
- 15	Gregory D & Michael W Joh	501 F Riverside Drive	Clarksville	IN	47123	10-14-00-101-072.000-012	200 330 101330011 AVC
4	Kristie Lee Moe	421 Riverside Drive, Fast	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-103-128 000-012	421-423 Riverside Dr. Fast
1	Marathon Ashland Petrole	214 Center St.	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-101-702.000-012	
20	RDRA LLC	1004 Riverside Drive, West	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-19-00-100-348.000-009	
11	Robert McIntosh	1511 Woerner Ave	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-103-133.000-012	
10	Robert McIntosh	711 Meyers Grove Circke	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-103-134.000-012	whitespages.com 711 Meyers Grove Circle, Clarksville, IN 47129
21	Rocky's Realty LLC	1000 Block Market St	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-19-00-100-337.000-009	parcel above this one on map has same owner, address is 1000 Block Market St, ok to use for mailing?
7	Sharon R Handy	509 Riverside Drive, East	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-103-166.000-011	
8	Sharon R Handy	519 Riverside Drive, East	Clarksville	IN	47129	10-14-00-103-167.000-011	
9	Sharon K Handy	527 RIVERSIDE DRIVE, East	ClarksVIIIe	IN	4/129	10-14-00-103-168.000-011	
3	WIGOWS WAIK LLC	415 Riverside Drive, West	Clarksville	IN	4/129	10-14-00-103-153.000-012	
5	William R & Betty J Hansfol	427 Riverside Drive, East	Clarksville	IN	4/129	10-14-00-103-165.000-011	





Below is a listing of FAQ's regarding Clarksville's improvement of Riverside Drive. Most of this information is included in the draft environmental document and design plans but listed here for ease of reference. Additional questions to the project team are welcome.

- What is a basic summary of the project?
 - The project will complete a reconstruction and widening of Riverside Drive between the eastern-most parking lot of Ashland Park and the Clarksville/Jeffersonville corporation limits (a distance of about 1,400'). The new roadway will have one lane in each direction plus on-street parallel parking on both sides. Sidewalks will be constructed along both sides of Riverside Drive. In addition to the sidewalks, a cycle-track will be constructed off the south side to act as the continuation of the Ohio River Greenway. The project will also involve drainage improvements by adding a new storm sewer system. Aesthetic enhancements include special signage, street lighting, and landscaping.
- What are Clarksville's goals with this project?
 - This project will complete a needed segment of the Ohio River Greenway, improve the sidewalk accessibility, and provide an improved drainage plan. The Town wants to continue the redevelopment efforts in the South Clarksville area.
- How much will this project cost?
 - The construction cost estimate is \$4.2 million. Federal transportation dollars will fund a portion of this project. Therefore, the project must conform to INDOT's and FHWA's standards and procedures.
- What is the schedule for construction?
 - Construction should be begin in Summer 2023 and end in Fall 2024. Utility relocations may start to occur earlier.
- Will the Town need to acquire land for this project?
 - Clarksville will need to acquire new rights of way for this project. This is shown in the exhibits posted to the website. There are two forms of land acquisition:
 - Permanent right of way is land that the Town will seek to acquire as fee simple from property owners
 - Temporary right of way is land the Town will seek to acquire only for the duration of construction. Upon the project's completion, the land will revert back to the land-owner. Prior to that reversion, the contractor is required to restore the property per the plans and specifications.
- "Looking at the exhibits, it appears the Town will seek to acquire land from me. What do I need to do next?"
 - Property owners along Riverside Drive are encouraged to download the FHWA's booklet on land acquisition, which is also posted on the Town's website. This booklet is a good summary of your legal rights along with the process the Town will follow.
 - Clarksville has hired appraisers to determine the value of the areas seeking to be acquired. That is scheduled to start later this summer and be completed by end of 2020.
 - Clarksville has also hired real estate agents (certified buyers with experience in public agency rights of way acquisition) to extend offers to land owners and address questions. Offers are scheduled be to sent out in early 2021.

- What will happen to the trees and viewshed?
 - The design has tried to minimize impacts to trees as much as practical, but some tree removals will be needed. Since the project is within a floodway, Clarksville is required by state law to replant replacement trees. We expect the Department of Natural Resources to require a replacement ratio of 5:1, meaning for every tree removed. The design team understands the viewshed is critically important to the South Clarksville area. We will endeavor to find areas to plant replacement trees where other trees already exist to avoid creating new viewshed obstacles.
- What will happen to utilities?
 - Given the need to widen the roadway and install new, underground storm sewers, impacts to utility infrastructure is expected. Coordination with the utility companies has been on-going and will continue to do so until construction is complete.
- How will traffic be impacted during construction?
 - Since the existing roadway is relatively narrow, the safest option is to close Riverside Drive during construction. This is also much more efficient during construction. A detour route will be posted for both vehicular traffic and users of the Ohio River Greenway. The contractor is required to provide access to property owners along Riverside Drive, which is typically done by adding temporary pavement or stone. The exact duration of this closure is not yet known, but will likely be during the spring, summer and fall months of 2024.

Find what you were looking for? If not, please email your question to nbatta@cmtengr.com to receive more information on this project.

PERSPECTIVE VIEW LOCATION









2 WEIV EVITSE VIEW 4











STREET SECTION





PROJECT	DESIGNATION
1700725	1700725
CONTRACT	
R-40289	

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

REAR THE PARTY OF THE PARTY OF

ROAD PLANS

ROUTE: RIVERSIDE DRIVE

PROJECT NO.1700725P.E.1700725R/W1700725CONST.

Project Description:

Pavement improvements on Riverside Drive, Located in the Town of Clarksville, From Ashland Park to US 31, in Section 1, T-99, R-99, Jeffersonville Township, Clark County, Indiana.

Gross Length: 0.342 Miles Net Length: 0.342 Miles Maximum Grade: 1.38%



TRAFFIC DATA		RIVERSIDE DR.
A.A.D.T.	(2017)	990 V.P.D.
A.A.D.T.	(2044)	1,350 V.P.D.
D.H.V	(2044)	160 V.P.H.
DIRECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION		50/50
TRUCKS		15 % A.A.D.T.
		8 % D.H.V.
DESIGN DAT	A	RIVERSIDE DR.
		WEST LIMIT TO MARKET ST.
DESIGN SPEED		30 M.P.H.
PROJECT DESIGN CRITERIA		RECONSTRUCTION (4R), NON-INTERSTATE
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION		MINOR ARTERIAL
RURAL/URBAN		URBAN
TERRAIN		LEVEL
ACCESS CONTROL		NONE
DESIGN DAT	A	RIVERSIDE DR. MARKET ST. TO EAST LIMIT
DESIGN SPEED		30 M.P.H.
PROJECT DESIGN CRITERIA		RECONSTRUCTION (4R), NON-INTERSTATE
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION		LOCAL STREET
RURAL/URBAN	URBAN	
TERRAIN		LEVEL
ACCESS CONTROL		NONE



HUC12 No.: 051401010904

STAGE 2 04/01/2020

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS DATED 2020 TO BE USED WITH THESE PLANS

		BRI	DGE F	ILE
17) 208-4500			N/A	
PHONE NUMBER		DESI	IGNAT	ION
		1	70072	5
04/01/2020	SURVEY BOOK	S	HEET	S
DATE	N/A	1	of	83
	CONTRACT	PF	ROJEC	т
DATE	R-40289	1	70072	5

Indiana Department of Transportation

Clark

County

Route Riverside Drive

Des. No. 1700725

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

Road No./County:	Riverside Drive/Clark County	
Designation Number:	1700725	
Project Description/Termini: Riverside Drive Improvements from the Town limits to Ashland Park		
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)		

 X
 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

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.

2011 Signature	Date	ES Signature	Date
	FHWA Signature	Date	
Release for Public Involvem	ient		
N/A		BDM IN REB	5/15/2020
ESM Initials	Date	ES Initials	Date
Note: Do not approve until after	Section 106 public involvement	ent and all other environmenta	l requirements have been satisfied.
Note: Do not approve until after INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature:	Section 106 public involveme	ent and all other environmenta	l requirements have been satisfied.
Note: Do not approve until after INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: Name and Organization of CE/EA Pr	Section 106 public involveme reparer:Jennifer Miller, Craw	ent and all other environmenta Date: ford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	l requirements have been satisfied.
Note: Do not approve until after INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: Name and Organization of CE/EA Pr	Section 106 public involveme reparer: <u>Jennifer Miller, Craw</u>	ent and all other environmenta Date: ford, Murphy & Tilly, Inc.	l requirements have been satisfied.







Thank you for taking the time to provide formal comments regarding the Town of Clarksville's Riverside Drive project (INDOT Designation Number 1700725).

COMMENTS DUE DATE: Must be received by 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020

Submit comments to Nick Batta (Crawford, Murphy, & Tilly) 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or NBatta@cmtengr.com





ACQUISITION

ACQUIRING REAL PROPERTY FOR FEDERAL AND FEDERAL-AID PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS



Nick Batta

From:	Connie Bell <connielynnbell@hotmail.com></connielynnbell@hotmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, June 26, 2020 3:50 PM
То:	Nick Batta
Subject:	Current Plans for Riverside Drive in Clarksville

External Message: This email was sent from someone outside of CMT. Please use caution with links and attachments from unknown senders or receiving unexpected emails. Happy Friday Mr. Batta!

My name is Connie Bell and I am the current resident of 501 East Riverside Drive in Clarksville as a tenant of Sharon Handy.

I have recently reviewed your current plans for the beautiful project you have planned in front of my house. I am very excited to see the improvements...goodness knows that its currently a bit of an eyesore to an otherwise million dollar view.

Your proposed drawings show the vacant 30ft strip just west of my house as belonging to the Hansfords. It is my understanding that it is a part of my lot due to a street partial closing of Smyser Ave years ago. I currently occupy and use that part of my yard, and the current GIS shows that it is part of 501 also, so you may want to update your drawing to show that it belongs to Miss Handy.

Also, will you require the town to revise the plans to include and retain a curb cut in front of the vacant strip just mentioned? Miss Handy has expressed a willingness to construct a driveway once the street improvements are made and the curb cut preservation is confirmed. I would feel safer not having my vehicle, or my guests vehicles parked on city streets overnight. I would appreciate this exception to your plans. It is also my understanding that this 501 is zoned for mix use. Should it become a cute bistro or other business down the road, then this curb cut would still need to be preserved to allow access to the rear of the lot for service vehicles and deliveries. It just seems to make more sense to put it in now while everything else is happening.

Can you look at the street lights again in front of my home? Maybe better positioning and shading or removal of the street light directly in front of my house and deck? It appears it would partially and unnecessarily block my view. Can you email me additional perspective views (1) from my side deck and (2) from the middle of my front window as those are the 2 places from which my guests and I most commonly enjoy my spectacular panoramic view of the 2nd street bridge and Louisville downtown skyline. I think it would be nice for the town to work with all of the property owners west of Woerner Ave individually to optimally place street lights. The proposal current positioning seems rigid. There are only 4 or 5 private property owners in the entire project area, so meeting with them individually and planning the best street light positioning would not be difficult or time consuming. I would also like to see the street lights shaded so as to prevent interference with nighttime views.

I am glad to see that the proposed plans do not include adding any trees to the area. As a Girl Scout for more than 12 years, I can tell you that I absolutely love and appreciate trees, but would rather they be in my side yard and not blocking the Louisville skyline. It would probably help with park upkeep expenses as well to not have trees.

Thank you for all of your continued hard work on this project. I hope you will consider some of the thoughts and concerns that my neighbors and I share.

Sincerely,

Connie Bell







Thank you for taking the time to provide formal comments regarding the Town of Clarksville's Riverside Drive project (INDOT Designation Number 1700725).

COMMENTS DUE DATE: Must be received by 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020

Submit comments to Nick Batta (Crawford, Murphy, & Tilly) 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or NBatta@cmtengr.com

Dear Mr. Batta,

Sorry for the late submission! My wife and I have a concern regarding this project, although we

understand that it may be too late. Regardless, there is a four-unit apartment building at the corner

of E. Riverside Drive and Woerner Ave. The driveway for this property wraps around the back of

the building and exits on Woerner Ave. The current plans show a large curb and a large sidewalk

in place of this exit. This would hinder the tenants of the building and their ability to safely park all

of their vehicles on the property. We humbly request that this portion of the plan for Woerner Ave

be reconsidered.

Thank you for your consideration,

www.in.gov/dot/ An Equal Opportunity Employer

Nick Batta

From:	Sharon R. Handy <handy@derbycitylaw.com></handy@derbycitylaw.com>
Sent:	Friday, June 26, 2020 5:01 PM
То:	Nick Batta
Subject:	Comments to proposed Riverside Drive Improvements, Clarksville Indiana

External Message: This email was sent from someone outside of CMT. Please use caution with links and attachments from unknown senders or receiving unexpected emails.

As one of the 4 private property owners on the north side of Riverside Drive west of Woerner Ave in Clarksville Indiana, I offer the following comments to the proposed Riverside Drive Improvements Project and would welcome the opportunity to discuss them with you further.

1. <u>The plans list the Eastern 1/2 of the vacated Smyser Ave right of way (east of the trailer and west of the Johnson house) as belonging to the Hansfords while the Clark county auditor, surveyor, and recorder's offices all show the Johnsons' predecessor in title acquired this eastern 1/2 of the vacated street. I would like to see copies of instruments on which the improvement plans rely and to work with you to resolve this and get the correct property owner listed on the plansbwhich I believe to currently be me.</u>

2. The Johnson property (including the afotesaid side lot) was sold to me on May 12, 2020. Please have the plans corrected accordingly to reflect that I am the current owner. I can send you copies of deeds etc for reference and discussion.

3. <u>The steps near the sidewalk at 519 and 527 E.Riverside Dr have solid limestone caps and need to be preserved.</u> Please mark these Do Not Disturb "DND" on the plans.

4. <u>Please confirm there is no permanent taking of any portion of my properties (the addresses are 501, 509, 519, and 527 East Riverside Drive). The</u> drawings are unclear as they show some sort of unlabeled lines that follow but are in addition to the temporary right of way lines that encroach upon my properties. My lots are small due to prior partial takings for the flood wall and with historical buildings and trees close to the existing right of way, I can ill afford additional permanent encroachments. I saw no justification expressed for any such permanent taking in the plans or narrative, and there is adequate room on the south side of Riverside Drive (already owned by or under contract to the Town) for any needed expansion of the right of way that would not be injurious to historical assets.

5. <u>The street light placement needs adjustment and the fixtures need shading to avoid unnecessary interference with views</u>. The key views of the Louisville skyline and river sunsets from my properties are not from the front doors of the buildings but from the west facing decks of 527 and 519 East Riverside Drive, and from the east facing deck and front window of 501 East Riverside Drive. I ask that these views be preserved and enhanced if at all possible, for current and future use of tenants and the public as patrons of future busibesses or restaurants to be located here rather than further obstructed. Thus I ask that the proposed street light that obstructs the view from the east facing deck of 501 E Riverside be removed from the plan and that the one in front of 519 be moved from the east side to the west side of the driveway. In all cases the lights should be shaded to minimize glare and light pollution.

6. <u>All overhead utility lines should be buried.</u> These poles and lines are unsightly industrial and detract significantly from the aesthetic and historic appeal of the area. They should be buried starting no later than at the first pole the lines reach after crossing the floodwall. This is especially true for 519 whose historic setting is impaired by the overhead lines that run unnecessarily along it's borders.

7. The existing curb cuts for my properties (on Woerner Ave for 527 e riverside drive, and just west of the house at 501 east riverside drive) are preexisting uses which should be grandfathered and maintained as a condition of INDOT approval of the proposed plan. These are critical to the utility of the properties they serve and to the ability of the owner to provide adequate and safe off street parking as required by town ordinances. 527 is a 4-plex and loss of this preexisting curb cut will harm my ability to rent all 4 units and provide adequate parking if I have to provide turnaround space for each unit rather than a pull through drive. For 501, the existing curb cut is 1/2 of the vacated portion of Smyser Ave which my predecessors in title acquired by deed and so is also a preexisting use that should be grandfathered. It is needed to provide off-street parking for residential tenants and air b&b patrons, or service and delivery trucks if this becomes a restaurant or commercial property.

8. <u>Future trees and other obstructions should be prohibited that would block views from the north side of Riverside drive west of Woerner Ave and both 8' landscape buffers in the right of way should be eliminated as unnecessary. No trees or man made obstruction other than streetlights are shown in the streetscape plan for this area but there are substantial undesignated unnecessary buffers on both sides of the street and prior drawings for the park showed plans for installation of many trees and several shelters that would substantially impair invaluable panoramic views from the north side of Riverside drive west of Woerner Ave instead turnijg them into a hand full of minimal 30° views. Happy to see these are not included in these plans but do not believe the Town's ultimate intentions in this regard are reflected in the current proposal.</u>

9. View Easement. Riverside drive is part of the Ohio River Scenic Byway and so part of the Indiana Byway Program which is designed to preserve, protect, enhance and recognize transportation corridors of unique character. These corridors are notable examples of our nation's beauty, history, culture and recreational experience. Some byway routes are designated nationally as is this onem. Having unchallenged panoramic views of the river and Louisville skyline and the unique historic properties along Riverside Drive are the most imporant assets and the economic engine of this area. These views matter and currently are stunning and panoramic for a number of the properties on Riverside drive. In addition to the national register eligible rare residence at 519 East Riverside drive, 527 is reported to this commenter as eligible once 1st floor window are returned to their original height and 501 has within beneath it's vinyl siding a civil war barracks that was moved to this sight from Fort Joe Holt at the end of the civil war. To be fair and equitable to those property owners and their patrons, to get full value for the enjoyment of the public and as a economic catalyst for this project and our region, the panoramic views to amd from the north side of Riverside Drive should be protected, preserved and where possible their historic nature enhanced. That's why I believe and request that INDOT require the Town of Clarksville provide a permanent view easement to protect and preserve the current views of as well as from these properties as a condition of it's grant of funding for the street improvements for Riverside Drive. This project should take steps to preserve, protect and enhance the rare panoramic riverfront views I'd these assets whether for Thunder over Louisville, or the rest of the year for the viewing public from restaurants and cafes on the north side the rest of the year.

I look forward to discussing this with you further







Thank you for taking the time to provide formal comments regarding the Town of Clarksville's Riverside Drive project (INDOT Designation Number 1700725).

COMMENTS DUE DATE: Must be received by 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020

Submit comments to Nick Batta (Crawford, Murphy, & Tilly) 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or NBatta@cmtengr.com

I live at 527 East Riverside Drive. I'm quite concerned about your plans with respect to my ability to drive in and out of my property. It appears you are putting a curb over the entrance to my driveway off of Woener Ave. Please do not do this.

Dr. Mark E Keeney 914 671 1090

> www.in.gov/dot/ An Equal Opportunity Employer
Nick Batta

From:	Linda Knox <feelthebreeze54@gmail.com></feelthebreeze54@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, June 26, 2020 9:41 AM
То:	Nick Batta
Subject:	INDOT Designation Number 1700725

External Message: This email was sent from someone outside of CMT. Please use caution with links and attachments from unknown senders or receiving unexpected emails.

As a frequent visitor to my sisters at 527 E Riverside Dr I have used the Woerner Ave entrance/exit from this property many times.

When I was shown the new plans and drawings I could not help but notice that the entrance/exit has been removed which I feel is a major oversight. This entrance/exit is very much needed for the tenants at this address as there is not enough room to turn around and park.

With the existing entrance/exit the drive which circles behind the building makes it easy for everyone to easily access their separate apartment entrances without inconveniencing the others.

I also feel the trees that block the views of the river should be removed and not replaced as the panoramic view is the big draw here.

Thank you for your time

Linda Knox

Nick Batta

From:	Dylan Fisher <dfisher@townofclarksville.com></dfisher@townofclarksville.com>
Sent:	Monday, July 6, 2020 7:59 AM
То:	Nick Batta
Cc:	Kevin Baity
Subject:	Fwd: Riverside devindot designation #1700725

External Message: This email was sent from someone outside of CMT. Please use caution with links and attachments from unknown senders or receiving unexpected emails.

Nick,

Kevin forwarded this email to my from the Town's website this morning. I believe you recieved an email from this person as well. If not, please add it to the list of comments to review tomorrow afternoon.

Thank you.

From: Kevin Baity <kbaity@townofclarksville.com> on behalf of Town Of Clarksville - Info <info@townofclarksville.com> Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020, 7:54 AM To: Dylan Fisher Subject: FW: Riverside dev...indot designation #1700725

Fyi...

From: nilesmaggie <nilesmaggie@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 26, 2020 1:28 PM
To: Town Of Clarksville - Info <info@townofclarksville.com>
Subject: Riverside dev...indot designation #1700725

A burns etal....

Hello, As a former designer, builder and business owner of the widows walk, I would like to comment on the exciting riverfront project plans that I reviewed:

1) light post on the plan.....absolutely are not in the character of the building on the block...there are many styles of the same cost available that are not so sterile and modern...I would be happy to suggest some

2) the existing buildings on the north of Riverside should have full view of the river...present and future projects depend on that view to draw people..lighting, posts and signs should not obstruct any view.

3) protect the area with underground utilities so unsightly poles, etc are not seen....

This is a quaint area, please keep it in the character of the neighborhood as clarksville is not known for its beauty.....

Sincerely, B j mcroy. 501 417 5282

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Nick Batta

From:	nilesmaggie <nilesmaggie@gmail.com></nilesmaggie@gmail.com>
Sent:	Friday, June 26, 2020 8:12 AM
То:	Nick Batta
Subject:	Riverside Drive project

External Message: This email was sent from someone outside of CMT. Please use caution with links and attachments from unknown senders or receiving unexpected emails.

Indot designation # 1700725

Hello,...

As the former owner, builder, designer and occupant of the widows walk in clarksville, I would like to comment on the Riverwalk project.

I've review the plans and they seem exciting and fresh.

A few suggestions;

The street lights.....they absolutely do not fit into the design of the existing buildings....too sterile and modern....there are some beautiful designs that I would like to share...can be fitted with flower baskets if needed....also need to be placed not to impede any view of the residents.

Residential view....trees and lights should not obstruct the view from the north side...currently, they are friends and neighbors of the widows walk and perhaps in time will be valuable for the public enjoyment..

Please keep the river frontage quaint and free from view obstruction as this is the only special place in clarksvilleit can be a beautiful view of the past and a big draw for the town.

Sincerely, b j mcroy 502 4175282 Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Nick Batta

From:	Vivian Knox-Thompson <photovkt@gmail.com< th=""></photovkt@gmail.com<>
Sent:	Friday, June 26, 2020 7:57 AM
То:	Nick Batta
Subject:	Subject:Riverside Drive improvements

External Message: This email was sent from someone outside of CMT. Please use caution with links and attachments from unknown senders or receiving unexpected emails.

>

As a former Resident and Business owner at 527 E. Riverside Drive, and frequent visitor to other spots on E. Riverside Drive, including The Widow's Walk and Ashland Park, I have been interested in this area and watched its development closely for almost 25 years, since before there was a Widow's Walk.

I would love to see both the Riverside Drive improvements and the ultimate park design fully take advantage of the spectacular views which are available from the homes and businesses on the northside of Riverside Drive. Those views are what make this area a one of a kind place to live, work and visit.

Because of that, I believe the Town of Clarksville should be prohibited from adding any new obstructions to the views from the private properties West of Woerner and should take steps to remove existing view obstructions wherever possible. I was glad to see that the proposed Riverside Drive plans I'm commenting on do not include adding any trees to the area West of Woerner Avenue and I think you should make that a condition or requirement of the Town...that in order to get INDOT money...they must agree to NOT do anything that would unnecessarily obstruct views from the properties on the northside of Riverside Drive, whether with INDOT money or other funds.

For the same reason it is important for the town to work with the property owners west of Woerner Ave individually to optimally place street lights so as to not interfere with skyline views of downtown Louisville from each property's most typical viewing spot which is seldom their front door. The current positioning seems robotic and mechanical rather than the result of discussions with individual property owners. There are only 4 or 5 private property owners in the entire project area, so requiring the town to meet with them individually and workout the best street light positioning would not be difficult or time consuming. The street lights also need to be shaded so as to prevent interference with nighttime views.

Also, since the flood wall has already chopped down the size of these lots so severely, none of the existing curb cuts or other access points to the properties on the north side of Riverside drive should be taken by INDOT or the Town, and similarly, there should be no further permanent right of way expansion or other taking from these properties on the north side of Riverside Drive or West side of Woerner Avenue. As an example, the pull through drive at 527 E Riverside Dr, with entrances on both E Riverside Dr and on Woerner is critical to the users of that property. The lot is just too small to provide adequate parking for 4 units (at 2 spaces per unit) which the town requires, plus enough space for all 8 of those vehicles to turn around and exit the same way other vehicles may be entering. It's unsafe and lends itself to accidents. Many people are not skilled at backing up and maneuvering in such tight spaces. So, the 2 entrances and the pull through drive are critical for the proper functioning of this property as a 4-plex, but do not show on the plans, even though it was something I used every day and I feel sure most of the current residents do too.

Thank you for considering my comments and if you have any questions please feel free to email me.

Sincerely, Vivian Knox-Thompspn





T BEGINS HERE

Thank you for taking the time to provide formal comments regarding the Town of Clarksville's Riverside Drive project (INDOT Designation Number 1700725).

COMMENTS DUE DATE: Must be received by 5PM EDT on June 26, 2020

Submit comments to Nick Batta (Crawford, Murphy, & Tilly) 8790 Purdue Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268 or NBatta@cmtengr.com

There seems to be no need for the new bike lane if the end result will still be to dump them back onto Riverside Drive in a shared lane through Jeffersonville._____

The walking path will also not really be connected to anything comparable in Jeffersonville until past I-65.

The only drainage improvements that would appear to be necessary would be to connect the storm water drains from Woerner Ave to the Ohio River. No changes to Riverside Drive are "needed" to solve any existing problems._____

Over all, there seems to be no justification for this project or its considerable expense.

www.in.gov/dot/ An Equal Opportunity Employer

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

What is the purpose and need for this project?

The purpose of the project is to improve pedestrian mobility and system linkage and to correct facility deficiencies in the project corridor by reconstructing Riverside Drive to:

- Create continuity for the pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the Ohio River Greenway between Ashland Park in the Town of Clarksville and trail facilities in the Town of Jeffersonville entertainment venue
- Separate pedestrian and bicycle traffic from motor vehicles along Riverside Drive west of West Market Street where it is classified as a minor arterial roadway
- Correct the deficient stormwater conveyance system within the project area to meet the Town of Clarksville's requirements, including managing a 10-year (5-minute intensity) storm event

The need for the project is evidenced by the lack of continuity of the Ohio River Greenway as a multi-use path separated from the roadway, absence of other pedestrian accommodations, and a deficient stormwater conveyance system.

What is driving the location and type of street lighting shown?

The streetlights are included in the project to provide adequate illumination for all users of traffic along the corridor, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles. The location and spacing of the streetlights meet criteria in order to provide the safe illumination desired. Although there is flexibility to shift their locations a few feet, there is not the ability to avoid wide viewsheds and still meet the applicable standards. To the extent possible, the streetlights have been located near property lines to avoid their installation immediately in front of houses.

The lighting style has been determined through years of planning and public involvement as part of the greater South Clarksville area. It will be consistent with the lighting provided as part of other improvements in the area.

Will there be trees planted in the project area that will block viewsheds?

Existing trees within the Ohio River floodway are protected by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Any trees removed will require a permit from DNR and must be replaced by planting additional trees within the floodway. The project has minimized the removal of existing trees to the extent practical, but certain trees must be removed to construct the improvements. When determining locations for replacement trees, placement will be prioritized in areas where trees currently exist to avoid blocking the views from nearby homes and businesses.

Why are landscaped buffers being included in the project?

The decision to include landscape buffers has been determined through years of planning and public involvement as part of the greater South Clarksville area. These landscaped buffers will be consistent with other corridor improvements in the area.

How will the access to 527 Riverside Drive be maintained?

The existing driveway off Riverside Drive that serves this property will be reconstructed to the right-ofway line at the same location and width as it exists today. The existing driveway off Woerner Avenue is outside of the limits of this project.

Were the impacts to the viewshed of the historic properties along the project corridor considered as part of the project?

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. The State Historic Preservation Office determined that while the setting of the residence at 519 Riverside Drive would be altered slightly by the addition of street lighting and the adjacent sidewalk and roadway improvements, these changes would not adversely affect the significance of the House as a rare, intact example of the late nineteenth century homes that once lined Riverside Drive. The project will not be obtaining a view easement.

Will the project include relocating utilities underground?

The project is coordinating with the utility companies on where and how they can relocate their facilities. The decision about whether existing overhead utilities can be installed underground is an ongoing discussion and commitments cannot be made at this time.

Comment Responses by Submitter

- 1. Connie Bell (6/26/20) See FAQ along with the additional responses
 - a. Thank you for pointing out the error in the design plans about the ownership of the eastern one-half of the Smyser Avenue vacated land. The designer will update the plans to reflect that one-half to be owned by Sharon Handy.
 - b. A drive approach within this eastern one-half will be added to the project's design. The drive will be constructed to INDOT standards and terminate at the right-of-way line.
- 2. M & K Galloway (6/28/20) See FAQ
- 3. Sharon Handy (6/26/20) See FAQ along with the additional responses
 - a. Thank you for pointing out the error in the design plans about the ownership of the eastern one-half of the Smyser Avenue vacated land. The designer will update the plans to reflect that one-half to be owned by Sharon Handy.
 - b. Thank you for pointing out the error in the design plans about the ownership of the former Johnson property. The designer will update the plans to reflect this to be owned by Sharon Handy.
 - c. The steps at 519 and 527 Riverside Drive are outside of the project limits. A "Do Not Disturb" note will be added to the plans.
 - d. There will not be any permanent right-of-way acquisition from the properties owned by Sharon Handy at 501, 509, 519, and 527 Riverside Drive. There will be temporary right-of-way acquired from these properties in order to complete the construction.
 - e. A drive approach within the eastern one-half of the former Smyser Avenue vacated land will be added to the project's design. The drive will be constructed to INDOT standards and terminate at the right-of-way line.
- 4. Dr. Mark Keeney (6/24/20) See FAQ
- 5. Linda Knox (6/26/20) See FAQ
- 6. B J McRoy (5/26/20) See FAQ
- 7. Vivian Knox-Thompson (6/26/20) See FAQ along with the additional responses
 - a. There will not be any permanent right-of-way acquisition from the properties at 501, 509, 519, and 527 Riverside Drive. There will be temporary right-of-way acquired from these properties in order to complete the construction.
- 8. Name Not Provided (6/24/20) See FAQ

Riverside Drive Improvements CE Level 4 APPENDIX H: AIR QUALITY



KIPDA 5 Year Plan of Projects - Indiana FY 2018 - FY 2021 June 2017

Federal Funds Only

								FY 2018			F	Y 2019			F	Y 2020		FY 2021		Future			
Project	Project Description	KIPDA ID	DES Number	Project Sponsor	Funding Program	Phase	Federal Dollars	Allocation Funds	PYB Funds	Phase	Federal Dollars	Allocation Funds	PYB Funds	Phase	Federal Dollars	Allocation Funds	PYB Funds	Phase	Federal Dollars	Allocation Funds	PYB Funds	Phase	Federal Dollars
Tiojout	Improvements to Blackiston Mill Road from just																						
	north of the Kroger entrance to Blackiston View Drive, including the addition of siedewalks, a new																						
Blackiston Mill Phase 2	turn lane into Peddler's Mall entrance, improved site lines, and improved access control and drainage improvements.		1700724	Clarksville	STP									c	\$1,168,860	\$1,168,860							
THOSE 2	second a net of second		1/00/24											c	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000							
																						R	\$360,000
																						U	\$40,000
Bridge 51	Replace Bridge 51 on Blackiston Mill Dr. over Silver Creek.			Floyd County	STP									PE	\$404,420	\$404,420						с	\$3,319,008
																						R	\$165,120
	Reconstruction of Charlestown Road from																					U	\$40,000
Charlestown Rd.	includes construction of curb and gutter, sidewalk		1700727	New Albany	STP									PE	\$298,400	\$298,400						с	\$1,529,979
	Reconstruct Grantline Rd. from McDonald Ln																						
Grantline Rd.	south to Beechwood Ave. for a distance of 1.6 miles	1586	0901276	New Albany	STP	с	\$2,081,904	\$1,516,539	\$565,365														
	Construction of a new 2 lane road from the Port																						
	of Indiana to I-265, and construction of a 3 lane road from the I-265/Old Salem Road interchange through River Ridge to IN 63. The project will also																						
Heavy Haul Rd.	identify a direct railroad route from the Port of Indiana to River Ridge.	2119	1382612	INDOT	STP					с	\$2,140,152	\$2,140,152											
																						U	\$24,800
E. Main St.	Sth Street, including sidewalk improvements and bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements.		1700730	New Albany	STP					PE	\$173.600	\$173.600										с	\$1,753,400
McDonald In	Reconstruct 2 lane road from Grantline Rd. to	0E	0200770	Now Albany	STD	Add'l C	6429 526	6428 526															
MCDONAId En.	chanestown ku.	35	0300779	New Albany	316	Additic	\$428,550	\$426,550															
Mt. Tabor	Reconstruct 2 lane road from Grantline Rd. to Charlestown Rd.	309	0710808	New Albany	STP	Add'l R	\$3,624,380	\$375,030	\$3,624,380														
	Reconstruct Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park, including parking on both sides																						
Riverside Dr.	of roadway and an elevated cycle track on the south side of roadway.		1700725	Clarksville	STP									PE	\$346,916	\$346,916		R	\$1,643,520	\$1,643,520		c	\$4,293,080
Ticket to Ride	Regional Rideshare Program	56		KIPDA	STP	1401656	\$127,000	\$127,000		1401654	\$127,000	\$127,000			\$127,000	\$127,000			\$127,000	\$127,000		x	\$762,000
Charlestown Road Corridor Complete	Construction of sidewalks along Charlestown						4450.000		4450.000														
Streets	Road from Sunset Drive to County Line Road.	2128	1400550	Floyd County	CMAQ	R	\$150,000		\$150,000														
Kentuckiana Air	Kentuckiana Air Education (KAIRE): Ozone																						
Education	prevention and awareness program	370		APCD	CMAQ	1401655	\$200,000	\$200,000			\$200,000	\$200,000			\$200,000	\$200,000			\$200,000	\$200,000			\$1,200,000
Grantline Rd.	Construction of pedestrian bicycle path and sidewalks along Grant Line Road from Beechwood Avenue to Cherokee Drive where it connects with																						
Pedway	existing pedway and sidewalk.	1432	0710810	New Albany	CMAQ	с	\$965,000	\$808,461	\$156,539														
	Implementation of 2 routes to improve cross river mobility over the Kennedy/Lincoln bridges and																						
Connectors	the Lewis and Clark Bridge to provide access to jobs between Kentucky and Southern Indiana.			TARC	CMAQ					Operating	\$800,000	\$800,000		Operating	\$800,000	\$800,000		Operating	\$800,000	\$800,000			
	Purchase and installation of 7 benches, 8 boarding pads, 8 trash receptacles, 1 bus shelter																						
Bus Stop & Access Improvements -	and over 1,700 feet of new sidewalk within the public right of way on Spring Street and Eastern						40.00 0.00	4005.005															
spring street	bivo in Jettersonville.	2224		I ARC	TAP	с	\$226,805	\$226,805															
	Reconstruction and improvement of																						
Blackiston Mill	just north of Lewis & Clark Parkway. Included in the improvements are the installation of turn																						
коаd Improvements,	lanes into and out of Kroger Drive, the addition of a raised center curb, improvement of sight lines						A	AC 10 011	A														
Phase 1	anu orainage improvements.	2187	1401350	clarksville	HSIP	с	\$818,938	\$649,011	\$169,927					<u> </u>	+	1		+					

Project Description:

Reconstruct Riverside Drive from the town limits to Ashland Park, including sidewalks and parking on both sides of roadway, and an elevated cycle track on the south side of roadway. 0.25 miles.

Project Purpose:

Reconstruction of the existing roadway, improving the safety of the corridor and improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Contact Agency: Clarksville PW County/Counties: Clark Project Cost: \$7,854,394 Estimated Open to Public Year: 2022 Project Has Phases Beyond TIP Years: ✓ Funding Other: Bicycle Facility: Project will include bike lanes

Bicycle Facility: Project will include bike lanes and other amenities Pedestrian Facility: Project will include sidewalks State ID #: 1700725 Parent Project ID: Regional Priority: ✓ Included in AQ Analysis / Regionally Significant: □ Supports ITS Architecture: □ Title VI Area: □



Year	Phase	Federal	Other	Total	Federal Funding Category
2020	PE	\$346,916	\$86,729	\$433,645	STP-U
2021	ROW	\$1,643,520	\$410,880	\$2,054,400	STP-U
	Total:	\$1,990,436	\$497,609	\$2,488,045	

KIPDA

FY 2015-2021 Transportation Improvement Program: Indiana Project List

Project Name	2nd Name	Description	State ID	KIPDA ID	County	Contact	Year	Phase	Federal	Other	Total	Funding
Riverside Drive		Reconstruct Riverside Drive from the town limits to Ashland Park, including sidewalks and parking on both sides of roadway, and an elevated cycle track on the south side of roadway. 0.25 miles.	<mark>(1700725</mark>)	2393	Clark	Clarksville PW						
							2020	PE	\$346,916	\$86,729	\$433,645	STP-U
						ĺ	2021	ROW	\$1,643,520	\$410,880	\$2,054,400	STP-U
							Т	otal	\$1,990,436	\$497,609	\$2,488,045	
Salem-Nobel Road		Reconstruct Salem-Nobel Road as a 2 lane (no additional lanes) road from IN 62 to IN 403.	0400935	539	Clark	Clark Co.						
							2015	PE	\$139.000	\$34,750	\$173 750	STP-11
							2013	C	\$0	\$400.000	\$400.000	Local
	I		I	1 1		I.	Т	otal	\$139,000	\$434,750	\$573,750	
Salem-Noble Road		Reconstruct bridge on Salem-Noble Road. Part of roadway reconstruction from IN 62 to IN 403.	0500173	1549	Clark	Clark Co.						
							2019	С	\$0	\$79,125	\$79,125	Local
				İ			2021	С	\$0	\$316,500	\$316,500	Local
							Т	otal	\$0	\$395,625	\$395,625	
Section 130 Highway Rail Safety Upgrades	Railroad Protection	n Install train activated warning devices at Highway Rail Crossing IR 1001, Corydon Pike (old SR 62) at NS south of New Albany.	1400615	2195	Floyd	INDOT						
							2016	PF	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	Rail Safety
							2017	C	\$320.000	\$0 \$0	\$320,000	HSIP-State
	I		I	1 1			т	otal	\$340,000	\$0	\$340,000	
Section 130 Highway Rail Safety Upgrades	Railroad Protection	n Install train activated warning devices at Highway Rail Crossing SR 111, SR 111 at NS south of New Albany.	1400616	2196	Floyd	INDOT						
							2016	PE	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	Rail Safety
						Ì	2017	С	\$320,000	\$0	\$320,000	HSIP-State
							Т	otal	\$340,000	\$0	\$340,000	
Section 130 Highway Rail Safety Upgrades	Railroad Protection	n Install train activated warning devices at Highway Rail Crossing IR 1001, Corydon Pike (old SR 62) at NS south of New Albany (crossing No. 2).	1400617	2197	Floyd	INDOT						
							2016	PE	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	Rail Safety
			ĺ	İ		ĺ	2017	С	\$320,000	\$0	\$320,000	HSIP-State
							т	otal	\$340,000	\$0	\$340,000	

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) PROJECTS

Technology is increasingly utilized to manage traffic, inform travelers, respond to roadway emergencies, and gather data to drive investment decisions. The TPC adopted an <u>ITS Architecture</u> that describes how emerging technology should be coordinated.

Figure 15 includes a list of projects from the TIP that support the ITS Architecture.

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) PROJECTS

The <u>Congestion Management Process (CMP)</u> provides a means for both contributing to congestion mitigation on a defined network and analyzing the effect of strategies toward enhancing transportation system efficiency. Implementation of Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) strategies, such as technology, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit investments, often introduces an efficient means of reducing or managing congestion.

During the project evaluation process, projects were reviewed for elements that included TSMO strategies such as transit, pedestrian, bicycle, or other similar strategies where they do not already exist and on or within a half mile of the CMP roadway network. See Figure 16 for a list of CMP projects in Kentucky and Figure 17 for projects in Indiana.

Figure 15: Projects Supporting ITS Architecture

State	Project Name	kipda Id	State ID	Project Sponsor	County
	Battery Backups	2650	1900013	INDOT	Clark & Floyd
	East Main Street	2392	1700730	New Albany	Floyd
Indiana	Grantline Road	1586	901276	New Albany	Floyd
	Mount Tabor Road	309	7180808	New Albany	Floyd
	Traffic Signals on US 31	2716	1902011	INDOT	Clark
Kentucky	Connection 21 - Signal System Upgrade and Research	2669	NA	Louisville Metro	Jefferson

Figure 17: Indiana CMP Projects

Project Name	KIPDA ID	State ID	Project Sponsor	County
Blackiston Mill Road Phase I	2187	1401350	Clarksville	Clark
Blackiston Mill Road Phase II	2389	1700724	Clarksville	Clark
Charlestown Rd. (from Hedden Ct. to Genung Dr.)	2390	1700727	New Albany	Floyd
Charlestown Road Corridor Complete Streets	2128	1400550, 1800900	Floyd County	Floyd
East Main St. (from State St. to E. 5th St.)	2392	1700730	New Albany	Floyd
Heavy Haul Transportation Corridor	2119	1382612	INDOT	Clark
I- 65 Road Reconstruction	2616	1700135	INDOT	Clark
Jeffersonville 9th street / Clarksville Montgomery Ave intermodal Connection	2541	801597	Clarksville	Clark
Mount Tabor Road	309	710808	New Albany	Floyd
Riverside Drive	2393	1700725	Clarksville	Clark
TARC Cross River Connectors	2408	1801625	TARC	Clark, Floyd & Jefferson

ANNUAL LISTING OF OBLIGATED PROJECTS

KIPDA publishes an annual listing of projects obligated in the preceding year. This list is developed cooperatively by the states, public transportation operator, and the MPO. The Annual Listing of Obligated Projects is published as a separate document and made available for public review in accordance with the Participation Plan. The most recent Annual Listing of Obligated Projects can be found <u>here</u>.



PROJECT LISTINGS

Project Name	Secondary Identifier	Description	Project Purpose	Primary Contact Agency	
Replacement of Bridge 51*		Replacement of Bridge 51 over Silver Creek and reconstruction of approaches on Blackiston Mill Road. Total project length is approximately 0.312 miles.	The proposed replacement bridge will be approximately 250 feet long, with 700 foot approaches. Bridge 51 carries Blackiston Mill Road over Silver Creek and currently serves as a critical link between the City of New Albany and the Town of Clarksville. The bridge structure itself is the responsibility of Floyd County, with the northern approach being in the City of New Albany and the southern approach in the Town of Clarksville and Clark County. In our 2018 Bridge Inspection Report, Bridge 51 scored a 39.2 Sufficiency Rating.	Floyd Co.	
Riverside Drive		Reconstruct Riverside Drive from the town limits to Ashland Park, including sidewalks and parking on both sides of roadway, and an elevated cycle track on the south side of roadway. 0.25 miles.	Reconstruction of the existing roadway, improving the safety of the corridor and improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	Clarksville	
Salem-Nobel Road		Reconstruct Salem-Nobel Road as a 2 lane (no additional lanes) road from IN 62 to IN 403.	Road improvements to make road safe; horizontal and vertical alignment. The area is rural in nature with residentail and commercial subdivisions springing up along the route. The terrain is rolling to steep in some areas with trees lining the road, which creates a safety hazard for the traveling public. There is also a sharp "S" curve within the project limits with very limited visibilty and substandard geometry.	Clark Co.	
Salem-Noble Road		Reconstruct bridge on Salem-Noble Road. Part of roadway reconstruction from IN 62 to IN 403.	Road improvements to make road safe; horizontal and vertical alignment. The area is rural in nature with residentail and commercial subdivisions springing up along the route. The terrain is rolling to steep in some areas with trees lining the road, which creates a safety hazard for the traveling public. There is also a sharp "S" curve within the project limits with very limited visibilty and substandard geometry.	Clark Co.	

PROJECT LISTINGS

KIPDA ID #	State ID #	Parent Project	Group ID	Phase	Year	Federal	Other	Total	Federal Funding Category	Estimated Completion
1558	1700788		2676	PE	2020	\$404,420	\$101,105	\$505,525	STBG- MPO	2023
				ROW	2021	\$850,000	\$170,000	\$1,020,000	stbg- Mpo	
				С	2023	\$3,500,000	\$700,000	\$4,200,000	STBG- MPO	
						\$4,754,420	\$971,105	\$5,725,525		
2393	1700725			ROW	2021	\$2,310,366	\$577,592	\$2,887,958	STBG- MPO	2024
				C	2024	\$1,733,231	\$2,191,676	\$3,924,907	STBG- MPO	
						\$4,043,597	\$2,769,268	\$6,812,865		
539	0400935			С	2021	\$O	\$400,000	\$400,000	Local	2021
						\$O	\$400,000	\$400,000		
1549	0500173	539		С	2021	\$0	\$316,500	\$316,500	Local	2021
						\$O	\$316,500	\$316,500		

Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)

State	Preservation	and Local	Initiated	Projects	FY	2018 - 3	2021
Jaie	1 16361Valion		millaleu	TIUJECIS		2010-4	2021

	LEAD DES	NAME						CATEGORY	Cost left to Complete Project*					2018
Indiana Department of Transportation	39888 / 1600679	Init.	SR 60	Box Culvert Replacement	0.87 mile E of SR 111	Seymour	0	STP		Bridge ROW	RW	\$24,000.00	\$6,000.00	
	1		I						1	Bridge Construction	CN	\$349,124.00	\$87,281.00	
										Bridge Construction	PE	\$72,000.00	\$18,000.00	
										Bridge Consulting	PE	\$60,000.00	\$15,000.00	
Indiana Department of Transportation	40059 / 1602144	Init.	US 31	Concrete Pavement Restoration (CPR)	4.12 miles S of SR 265 (Stansif er Ave) to 1.68 miles S of SR 265 (Lewis & Clark)	Seymour	2.807	NHPP		Road Construction	CN	\$617,200.80	\$154,300.20	
		1							1	Road Consulting	PE	\$12,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$15,000.0
Indiana Department of Transportation	40084 / 1700143	Init.	VA VARI	Traffic Signals, New Or Modernized	Four locations in Clark County on US 31, SR 3, and SR 60.	Seymour	0	STP		Safety Construction	CN	\$384,000.00	\$96,000.00	
Indiana Department of Transportation	40084 / 1700143	A 08	VA VARI	Traffic Signals, New Or Modernized	Four locations in Clark County on US 31, SR 3, and SR 60.	Seymour	0	STP	\$490,000.00	Safety Construction	PE	\$8,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$10,000.0
Comments:Amend RR	R/PE in FY 2	018 and 0	CN in FY 20	18 to current STIP per F	IPDA Administrative Modification 4 da	ated 9/28/17.								
Clarksville	40288 / 1700724	M 18	VA VARI	Access Control	Blackiston Mill Road from north of the Kroger entrance to Blackiston View	Seymour	0	STPBG	\$419,905.00	100% Local Funds	RW	\$0.00	-\$17,497.00	
		•	•							Louisville MPO	RW	-\$1.00	\$0.00	
Comments:Reduce RV	N funding ir	FY 2020	and move	to FY 2019 per KIPDA's	Administrative Modification 16 dated	7/26/18.				•	1	1	K	
Clarksville	40288 / 1700724	A 07	VA VARI	Access Control	Blackiston Mill Road from north of the Kroger entrance to Blackiston View	Seymour	0	STP		100% Local Funds	CN	\$0.00	\$292,215.00	
	1	1								Louisville MPO	CN	\$1,168,860.00	\$0.00	
Comments:KIPDA TIP											1			
Clarksville	40288 / 1700724	A 10	VA VARI	Access Control	Blackiston Mill Road from north of the Kroger entrance to Blackiston View	Seymour	0	STP	\$2,923,000.00	Louisville MPO	RW	\$349,922.00	\$0.00	
		•	•							100% Local Funds	CN	\$0.00	-\$1,168,860.00	
										Louisville MPO	CN	-\$292,215.00	\$0.00	
										100% Local Funds	RW	\$0.00	\$87,481.00	
Comments:Remove F	Y20 CN fun	ding. Add	d FY20 R/W	funding. Amendment a	pproved through KIPDA TIP Modificat	tion dated 10/30/2017.				·		·		
Clarksville	<mark>40289 /</mark> 1 <mark>700725</mark>	<mark>M 13</mark>	VA VARI	Access Control	Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park	Seymour	0	STP	<mark>\$2,500,000.00</mark>	100% Local Funds	PE	\$0.00	<mark>-\$180,175.00</mark>	(\$283,645.00

Page 74 of 837 Report Created:3/25/2019 2:27:58PM

	2019	2020	2021
		\$30,000.00	
			\$436,405.00
			\$90,000.00
			\$75,000.00
		\$771,501.00	
00.00			
	\$480,000.00		
00.00			
	\$14,100.00	(\$31,597.00)	
	\$70,500.00	(\$70,501.00)	
		\$292,215.00	
		\$1,168,860.00	
		\$349,922.00	
		(\$1,168,860.00)	
		(\$292,215.00)	
		\$87,481.00	
<mark>.5.00)</mark>	\$103,470.00		

Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)

State Preservation and Local Initiated Projects FY 2018 - 2021

SPONSOR	CONTR ACT # / LEAD DES	STIP NAME	ROUTE	WORK TYPE	LOCATION	DISTRICT	MILES	FEDERAL CATEGORY	Estimated Cost left to Complete Project*	PROGRAM	PHASE	FEDERAL	МАТСН	2018
Clarksville)	40289 / 1700725	(<mark>M 13</mark>)	(VA VARI)	Access Control	Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park	<mark>Seymour</mark>)	C	STP)	<mark>\$2,500,000.00</mark>	Louisville MPO	PE	<mark>\$263,880.00</mark>	<mark>(\$0.00</mark>)	<mark>(\$150,000</mark>
Comments:Remove	FY18 PE fun	ding. Ad	ding PE fun	iding in FY19. KIPDA FY	18-21 TIP Administrative Modification	n #16 dated 7/26/2018.)	•						
<u>Clarksville</u>	40289 / 1700725	<mark>A 07</mark>	VA VARI	Access Control	Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park	Seymour	C	STP)		100% Local Funds	RW	\$0.00	<mark>\$410,880.00</mark>	
		1								Louisville MPO	PE	<mark>\$346,916.00</mark>	<mark>(\$0.00</mark>)	
										Louisville MPO	RW	\$1,643,520.00	<mark>(\$0.00</mark>)	
										100% Local Funds	PE	(<mark>\$0.00</mark>)	<mark>\$86,729.00</mark>	
Comments:KIPDA T	ÎP											1		
Clarksville	40289 / 1700725	<mark>A 18</mark>	VA VARI	Access Control	Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park	Seymour	0	STP)	<mark>\$2,300,000.00</mark>	0 100% Local Funds	PE	<mark>(\$0.00</mark>)	<mark>\$196,916.00</mark>	<mark>\$283,64</mark>
										Louisville MPO	PE	<mark>-\$196,916.00</mark>	<mark>(\$0.00</mark>)	\$150,00
Comments:Move PE	E to FY18 and	l reduce f	unding. Kli	PDA FY18-21 TIP Modific	ation #7 dated 2/22/2018.									
Indiana Department of Transportation	40317 / 1500310	Init.	SR 3	Bridge Deck Overlay	at Pleasant Run	Seymour	0	STP		Bridge Construction	CN	\$451,624.00	\$112,906.00	
		I	<u> </u>	•		1		l		Bridge Consulting	PE	\$145,600.00	\$36,400.00	
Indiana Department of Transportation	40317 / 1500310	M 05	SR 3	Bridge Deck Overlay	at Pleasant Run	Seymour	C	STP	\$1,113,409.00	D Bridge Construction	CN	\$293,503.20	\$73,375.80	
Comments:Increase	in CN phase	for FY 20) 19 per KIP	DA Administrative Modifie	cation 6 dated 11/21/17.									
Indiana Department of Transportation	40346 / 1701094	A 08	1 65	Bridge Deck Replacement	I-265 EB Ramp over I-65	Seymour	0	NHPP	\$1,384,278.00	Bridge Construction	CN	\$1,088,350.20	\$120,927.80	
										Bridge Consulting	PE	\$157,500.00	\$17,500.00	\$175,000
Commonto: Amond F	PE phase in F	V 2019	and CN in E	V 2020 to ourrant STID n	or KIDDA Administrativo Modification	4 datad 0/29/17								
Indiana Department of Transportation	40387 / 1592995	A 37	SR 62	HMA Overlay, Preventive	From SR 265 to 0.15 miles N of SR 3	Seymour	6.441	STPBG	\$4,389,995.00	Road Construction	CN	\$3,511,996.00	\$877,999.00	
Comments:Amend C	CN phase in F	 FY 2020 te	o current S	TIP. Amended to KIPDA's	TIP per Administrative Modification	26 dated 1/24/19.								
Indiana Department	40387 /	A 08	SR 62	HMA Overlay,	From SR 265 to 0.15 miles N of	Seymour	6.441	STP	\$4,261,215.00	Road Consulting	PE	\$156,000.00	\$39,000.00	\$195,00
of Transportation	1592995			Preventive Maintenance	SR 3									
Comments:Amend F	PE phase to the	he curren	t STIP in F	Y 2018 per KIPDA Admini	strative Modification 4 dated 9/28/17		1		AE 505 000 0		55		<u> </u>	
Indiana Department of Transportation	40412 / 1700111	A 08	US 31	Pavement Replacement, Small Town	1.53 miles N of SR 60 (Foothill Rd) to 3.28 miles N of SR 60	Seymour	1.74	STP	\$5,525,836.00	Road Consulting	PE	\$384,000.00	\$96,000.00	\$480,00
	•	-					-		-	Road ROW	RW	\$240,000.00	\$60,000.00	
Page 75 of 837		Report	Created:3/	/25/2019 2:27:58PM							1			

	2019	2020	2021
0.00)	<mark>\$413,880.00</mark>		
			<mark>\$410,880.00</mark>
		<mark>\$346,916.00</mark>	
			\$1,643,520.00
		\$86,729.00	
<mark>45.00</mark>	(\$86,729.00)		
00.00	<mark>(\$346,916.00)</mark>		
	\$564,530.00		
	\$182,000.00		
	\$366,879.00		
		\$1,209,278.00	
00.00			
		\$4,389,995.00	
00.00			
00.00			
00.00			
			\$300,000.00

Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)

State Preservation and Local Initiated Projects FY 2020 - 2024

SPONSOR	CONTR ACT # / LEAD DES	STIP	ROUTE	WORK TYPE	LOCATION	DISTRICT	MILES	FEDERAL CATEGORY	Estimated Cost left to Complete Project*	PROGRAM	PHASE	FEDERAL	МАТСН	2020
Clarksville	40289 / 1700725	Init.	VA VARI	Access Control	Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park	Seymour	0	STPBG		Local Funds	RW	<mark>\$0.00</mark>	\$410,880.00	
	- I	1	1			1			•	Louisville MPO	RW	<mark>\$1,643,520.00</mark>	\$0.00	
Clarksville	40289 / 1700725	M 07	VA VARI	Access Control	Riverside Drive from the Town limits to Ashland Park	Seymour	0	STBG	\$6,780,302.00	Local Funds	RW	<mark>\$0.00</mark>	\$166,712.00	
	•	1								Louisville MPO	RW	\$666,846.00	\$0.00	
Comments:Adding R	W funds to F	Y 2021 ir	the amoun	t of \$833,558 per the TIP	dated 2/27/2020. AQC Exempt 3/3/2	020								
Indiana Department of Transportation	40387 / 1592995	Init.	SR 62	HMA Overlay, Preventive Maintenance	From SR 265 to 0.15 miles N of SR 3	Seymour	6.441	STPBG		Road Construction	CN	\$3,511,996.00	\$877,999.00	\$4,389,99
Indiana Department of Transportation	40412 / 1700111	Init.	US 31	Pavement Replacement, Small Town	1.53 miles N of SR 60 (Foothill Rd) to 3.28 miles N of SR 60	Seymour	1.84	STPBG		Road Construction	CN	\$3,989,621.60	\$997,405.40	
	•	1	1				1			Road ROW	RW	\$240,000.00	\$60,000.00	
Indiana Department of Transportation	40799 / 1600679	Init.	SR 60	Small Structure Pipe Lining	0.87 mile E of SR 111	Seymour	0	STPBG		Bridge Construction	CN	\$434,276.80	\$108,569.20	
	•	1	1			1	1			Bridge ROW	RW	\$24,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$30,00
Clark County	40812 / 1702787	Init.	IR 1024	Road Rehabilitation (3 R/4R Standards)	Bethany Road Phase 2- 1.33 miles Northwest of SR62 to Old SR403 in Clark County	Seymour	1.46	STPBG		Group IV Program	CN	\$5,680,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,680,00
	•	1	1			1	1			Local Funds	CN	\$0.00	\$1,110,115.18	\$1,110,11
										Route Transfer/rel inquishment	CN	\$309,884.82	\$0.00	\$309,88
Clark County	40812 / 1702787	M 02	IR 1024	Road Rehabilitation (3 R/4R Standards)	Bethany Road Phase 2- 1.33 miles Northwest of SR62 to Old SR403 in Clark County	Seymour	1.46	STBG	\$7,100,000.00	Group IV Program	CN	-\$1,680,000.00	\$0.00	(\$1,680,000
		1	1	1		1		L		Local Funds	CN	\$0.00	-\$420,000.00	(\$420,000
Comments:CN Phase	e for -(\$2,10	0,000) FY	2020. No N	ЛРО										
Clark County	40812 / 1702787	M 03	IR 1024	Road Rehabilitation (3 R/4R Standards)	Bethany Road Phase 2- 1.33 miles Northwest of SR62 to Old SR403 in Clark County	Seymour	1.46	STBG	\$7,100,000.00	Local Funds	CN	\$0.00	\$154,942.41	\$154,94
		1	1		Letter in event obeing	1	1	I	1	Group IV Program	CN	\$1,680,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,680,00
Comments:Adding C	N Phase \$1,	834,942.4	41 FY 2020.	. Per Kipda TIP dated 9/5/	2019					I		I		
Clark County	40812 / 1702787	M 04	IR 1024	Road Rehabilitation (3 R/4R Standards)	Bethany Road Phase 2- 1.33 miles Northwest of SR62 to Old SR403 in Clark County	Seymour	1.46	STBG	\$7,100,000.00	Local Funds	CN	\$0.00	\$419,681.67	\$419,68
Comments:Adding C	E local funds	s for FY 2	020 in the a	mount of \$419,681.67. No	MPO						_			

Page 59 of 547 Report Created:9/2/2020 9:36:01AM

2021	2022	2023	2024
\$410,880.00			
\$1,643,520.00			
<mark>\$166,712.00</mark>			
\$666,846.00			

95.00			
		\$4,987,027.00	
	\$300,000.00		
	\$542,846.00		
00.00			
00.00			
15.18			
34.82			
0.00)			
0.00)			
42.41			
00.00			
	·		
31.67			

Riverside Drive Improvements CE Level 4 APPENDIX I: ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS





Des. No. 1700725

Legend:

Your Selections

2017 boundaries were used to map 'Your Selections'

Selection Results

2010 boundaries were used to map 'Selection Results'

2017 Boundaries

- Census Tract
- Block Group
- Project Area



U.S. Census Bureau



B03002

HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN BY RACE

Universe: Total population 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Technical Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

	Jeffersonville township, Clark County, Indiana		Census Tract 501 India	Census Tract 504.01, Clark County, Indiana	
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate
Total:	60,564	+/-35	1,219	+/-248	2,800
Not Hispanic or Latino:	56,763	+/-558	1,140	+/-218	2,726
White alone	47,114	+/-739	832	+/-185	2,512
Black or African American alone	6,645	+/-417	246	+/-82	45
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	70	+/-59	0	+/-11	31
Asian alone	510	+/-213	0	+/-11	0
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	15	+/-25	0	+/-11	0
Some other race alone	53	+/-74	0	+/-11	0
Two or more races:	2,356	+/-435	62	+/-73	138
Two races including Some other race	17	+/-19	5	+/-8	0
Two races excluding Some other race, and three or more races	2,339	+/-434	57	+/-72	138
Hispanic or Latino:	3,801	+/-552	79	+/-97	74
White alone	3,355	+/-521	78	+/-97	63
Black or African American alone	40	+/-44	1	+/-2	0
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	40	+/-52	0	+/-11	0
Asian alone	22	+/-28	0	+/-11	0
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	+/-27	0	+/-11	0
Some other race alone	254	+/-134	0	+/-11	0
Two or more races:	90	+/-66	0	+/-11	11
Two races including Some other race	38	+/-36	0	+/-11	11
Two races excluding Some other race, and three or more races	52	+/-58	0	+/-11	0

	Census Tract 504.01, Clark County, Indiana
	Margin of Error
Total:	+/-353
Not Hispanic or Latino:	+/-349
White alone	+/-344
Black or African American alone	+/-44
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	+/-45
Asian alone	+/-11
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	+/-11
Some other race alone	+/-11
Two or more races:	+/-129
Two races including Some other race	+/-11
Two races excluding Some other race, and three or more races	+/-129
Hispanic or Latino:	+/-86
White alone	+/-84
Black or African American alone	+/-11
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	+/-11
Asian alone	+/-11
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	+/-11
Some other race alone	+/-11
Two or more races:	+/-19
Two races including Some other race	+/-19
Two races excluding Some other race, and three or more races	+/-11

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

While the 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the February 2013 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2010 data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '**' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.

2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.

4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.

6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.

7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.



B17001

POVERTY STATUS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS BY SEX BY AGE Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Technical Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

	Jeffersonville township, Clark County, Indiana		Census Tract 501 India	Census Tract 501, Clark County, Indiana		
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	
Total:	59,439	+/-275	1,214	+/-249	2,788	
Income in the past 12 months below poverty level:	7,006	+/-836	148	+/-73	291	
Male:	3,034	+/-499	78	+/-46	130	
Under 5 years	435	+/-193	0	+/-11	22	
5 years	34	+/-31	0	+/-11	0	
6 to 11 years	392	+/-156	5	+/-8	0	
12 to 14 years	182	+/-90	0	+/-11	0	
15 years	50	+/-43	0	+/-11	0	
16 and 17 years	136	+/-85	0	+/-11	0	
18 to 24 years	288	+/-125	0	+/-11	9	
25 to 34 years	370	+/-140	23	+/-32	22	
35 to 44 years	358	+/-116	5	+/-8	40	
45 to 54 years	294	+/-109	27	+/-25	11	
55 to 64 years	243	+/-78	6	+/-8	10	
65 to 74 years	107	+/-58	12	+/-12	16	
75 years and over	145	+/-69	0	+/-11	0	
Female:	3,972	+/-488	70	+/-52	161	
Under 5 years	408	+/-134	5	+/-9	50	
5 years	58	+/-46	5	+/-7	15	
6 to 11 years	244	+/-100	5	+/-8	0	
12 to 14 years	184	+/-84	4	+/-8	0	
15 years	32	+/-41	0	+/-11	0	
16 and 17 years	106	+/-49	0	+/-11	0	
18 to 24 years	408	+/-170	0	+/-11	39	
25 to 34 years	612	+/-187	7	+/-9	10	
35 to 44 years	328	+/-146	5	+/-7	17	
45 to 54 years	501	+/-138	23	+/-25	0	
55 to 64 years	560	+/-142	4	+/-6	0	
65 to 74 years	284	+/-97	12	+/-21	7	
75 years and over	247	+/-113	0	+/-11	23	
Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level:	52,433	+/-837	1,066	+/-242	2,497	
Male:	25,263	+/-673	515	+/-122	1,174	

	Jeffersonville township, Clark County, Indiana		Census Tract 501 India	Census Tract 504.01, Clark County, Indiana	
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate
Under 5 years	1,621	+/-256	16	+/-19	36
5 years	265	+/-117	0	+/-11	0
6 to 11 years	1,748	+/-339	17	+/-14	22
12 to 14 years	825	+/-203	5	+/-8	64
15 years	216	+/-92	17	+/-27	0
16 and 17 years	560	+/-127	5	+/-8	22
18 to 24 years	2,173	+/-206	73	+/-58	162
25 to 34 years	3,783	+/-337	50	+/-39	152
35 to 44 years	3,451	+/-212	59	+/-43	167
45 to 54 years	3,270	+/-267	120	+/-46	253
55 to 64 years	3,713	+/-210	70	+/-34	158
65 to 74 years	2,325	+/-172	52	+/-23	119
75 years and over	1,313	+/-124	31	+/-24	19
Female:	27,170	+/-660	551	+/-169	1,323
Under 5 years	1,427	+/-245	46	+/-72	52
5 years	372	+/-143	17	+/-28	0
6 to 11 years	1,368	+/-209	20	+/-35	137
12 to 14 years	897	+/-230	0	+/-11	42
15 years	301	+/-93	0	+/-11	22
16 and 17 years	597	+/-145	0	+/-11	61
18 to 24 years	2,351	+/-253	108	+/-96	75
25 to 34 years	3,896	+/-337	33	+/-21	127
35 to 44 years	3,604	+/-284	112	+/-59	215
45 to 54 years	3,216	+/-252	53	+/-26	223
55 to 64 years	4,004	+/-285	68	+/-37	165
65 to 74 years	2,953	+/-189	63	+/-29	142
75 years and over	2,184	+/-237	31	+/-18	62

	Census Tract 504.01, Clark County, Indiana
Total:	
Income in the past 12 menths below poverty level:	+/-352
Male:	+/-162
linder 5 years	+/-82
5 years	+/-34
S years	+/-11
	+/-11
	+/-11
15 years	+/-11
16 and 17 years	+/-11
	+/-14
25 to 34 years	+/-19
35 to 44 years	+/-46
	+/-19
	+/-17
65 to 74 years	+/-23
75 years and over	+/-11
Female:	+/-126
Under 5 years	+/-56
5 years	+/-23
6 to 11 years	+/-11
12 to 14 years	+/-11
15 years	+/-11
16 and 17 years	+/-11
18 to 24 years	+/-54
25 to 34 years	+/-14
35 to 44 years	+/-25
45 to 54 years	+/-11
55 to 64 years	+/-11
65 to 74 years	+/-11
75 years and over	+/-28
Income in the past 12 months at or above poverty level:	+/-347
Male:	+/-207
Under 5 years	+/-26
5 years	+/-11
6 to 11 years	+/-26
12 to 14 years	+/-50
15 years	+/-11
16 and 17 years	+/-28
18 to 24 years	+/-91
25 to 34 years	+/-86
35 to 44 years	+/-67
45 to 54 years	+/-94
55 to 64 years	+/-62
65 to 74 years	+/-56
75 years and over	+/-21
Female:	+/-240
Under 5 years	+/-47
5 years	+/-11
6 to 11 years	+/-73
12 to 14 years	+/-51
15 years	+/-26
16 and 17 years	+/-50
18 to 24 years	+/-58
25 to 34 years	+/-73
35 to 44 years	+/-72
45 to 54 years	+/-71
55 to 64 years	+/-60
65 to 74 years	+/-55

	Census Tract
	504.01, Clark
	County, Indiana
	Margin of Error
75 years and over	+/-42

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

While the 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the February 2013 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural populations, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2010 data. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '**' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.

2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.

4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.

An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
 An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

EJ Analysis of Jeffersonville Township and Census Tract 501 & 504.1 in Clark County, Indiana (Des. No. 1700725)

		COC	AC1	AC2
Census Table		Jeffersonville Township, Indiana	Census Tract 501, Clark County, Indiana	Census Tract 504.1, Clark County, Indiana
	LOW INCOME			
	Population for whom poverty status is determined:			
B17001	Total	59,439	1,214	2,788
B17001	Income in the past 12 months below poverty level:	7,006	148	291
	Percent Low Income	11.8%	12.2%	10.4%
	AC > 50%?		No	No
	125 Percent of COC	14.7%	AC < 125% COC	AC < 125% COC
	Potential Low-income EJ Impact? (AC > 125% COC?)		No	No
	MINORITY			
B03002	Total Population:			
B03002	Total	60,564	1,219	2,800
B03002	Not Hispanic or Latino:	56,763	1,140	2,726
B03002	White alone	47,114	832	2,512
B03002	Black or African American alone	6,645	246	45
B03002	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	70	0	31
B03002	Asian alone	510	0	0
B03002	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	15	0	0
B03002	Some other race alone	53	0	0
B03002	Two or more races:	2,356	62	138
B03002	Hispanic or Latino:	3,801	79	74
B03002	White alone	3,355	78	63
B03002	Black or African American alone	40	1	0
B03002	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	40	0	0
B03002	Asian alone	22	0	0
B03002	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	0	0
B03002	Some other race alone	254	0	0
B03002	Two or more races:	90	0	11
	Number non-white/minority	13,450	387	288
	Percent non-white/minority	22.2%	31.7%	10.3%
	AC > 50%?		No	No
	125 Percent of COC	27.8%	AC >125% COC	AC < 125% COC
	Potential Minority EJ Impact? (AC > 125% COC?)		Yes	No



Corporate Profile

You are here: Home / Corporate Profile

Corporate Profile

Officers

C. James Hyslop, President William Wetherton, Vice President, Engineering Jack Ising

Address

Carman Industries, Inc. 1005 W. Riverside Drive Jeffersonville, IN 47130

Financial

Duns #: 006373963 D&B Rating: 3A1

Banking Reference:

Commonwealth Bank & Trust Company Louisville, KY Contact: Thomas Bannon Phone #: (502) 259-2467

Business History

Business Type: Corporation Date of Incorporation: August 22, 1961 (State of Kentucky) Business Classification: Small Business Concern Number of Employees: 44

Primary Product Lines:

Standard Industrial Code (SIC) #3535 Vibratory Bin Dischargers QUICK LINKS

Corporate Profile Facility Information Product Testing Field Service Company Directory Map/Directions Contact Us



© 2018 Carman Industries - All Rights Reserved

Alexandra Zelles

From:	Nick Batta
Sent:	Tuesday, September 3, 2019 10:48 AM
То:	Alexandra Zelles
Subject:	FW: Environmental Justice

Is this sufficient?

NICK BATTA | Crawford, Murphy & Tilly | w 317.492.9162 | m 317.409.0665 Project Manager

From: Dylan Fisher <DFisher@townofclarksville.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2019 11:01 AM
To: Nick Batta <nbatta@cmtengr.com>
Cc: Brittany Montgomery <bamontgomery@townofclarksville.com>
Subject: Re: Environmental Justice

Nick,

I do not believe Carman Industries is minority owned. I have been told on multiple occasions that it's a subsidiary of the Carrier Corporation (formerly from Indianapolis). It's hard to say whether or not any of the employees live nearby. Having spoken with Bob McIntosh, owner/landlord of 85%+ of the homes in the neighborhood, he has never mentioned any of his residents working at Carman.

Dylan W. Fisher Redevelopment Director Town of Clarksville

This message was sent from my mobile device. Please excuse any typos.

On Tue, Sep 3, 2019 at 9:54 AM -0400, "Nick Batta" <<u>nbatta@cmtengr.com</u>> wrote:

Dylan,

As part of our NEPA document, we need to assess the potential for negative project impacts to minority populations. Is Carman Industries minority owned? Also, do you happen to have an idea if the nearby neighborhood supplies workers there? I realize that is somewhat anecdotal, but needed to ask.

NICK BATTA | Project Manager



Crawford, Murphy & Tilly | Engineers & Consultants 8790 Purdue Road | Indianapolis, IN 46268

> 1 I-11

w 317.492.9162 | m 317.409.0665 | f 317.298.4503 | <u>nbatta@cmtengr.com</u>

in 🖪 🗹 Centered in Value

Riverside Drive Improvements CE Level 4 APPENDIX J: ADDITIONAL STUDIES



VCF Federal Pro	jects State LWC	CF by County Co	unty LWCF Project Li	st		
Options 🔻	Filter by map ext	ent Q Zoom to	X Clear selection	C Refresh		
State	County	Grant ID Element	Туре	Grant Element Title	Grant Sponsor	Fiscal Yea
Indiana	CLARK	29	A	JEFFERSONVILLE SCHOOL PARK	JEFFERSONVILLE SCHOOL BOARD	1968
Indiana	Clark	154	D	DEAM LAKE BOAT RENTAL BUILDING	DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES	1973
Indiana	CLARK	216	D	RIVER CITY PARK	JEFFERSONVILLE PARK BOARD	1975
Indiana	CLARK	342	с	LAPPING PARK EXPANSION	CLARKSVILLE PARK BOARD	1979
Indiana	Clark	165	D	DEAM LAKE SERVICE BUILDINGS	DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES	1975
Indiana	CLARK	205	D	LAPPING MEMORIAL PARK	CLARKSVILLE PARK BOARD	1975
Indiana	Clark	446	R	CLARK STATE FOREST DAMS	DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES	1985
Indiana	CLARK	14	A	PARK BOARD LAND ACQ.	JEFFERSONVILLE PARK BOARD	1967
Indiana	CLARK	41	C:	MOSHER PARK	CLARKSVILLE SCHOOL BOARD	1968
Indiana	CLARK	53	A	ASH ESTATES	JEFFERSONVILLE PARK BOARD	1969
Indiana	Clark	75	D	SPRING HILL PARK SWIMMING POOL	JEFFERSONVILLE PARK BOARD	1971
Indiana	Clark.	(23	D	DEAM LAKE CAMPGROUND	DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES	1972
Indiana	CLARK	248	D	SPRING HILL PARK DEV	JEFFERSONVILLE PARK BOARD	1976
Indiana	CLARK	124	A	LAPPING MEMORIAL	CLARKSVILLE PARK BOARD	1973

