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The following report is being submitted to the Indiana Historic Bridge Task Group (Task Group) per Stipulation IV.C of the Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding Management and Preservation of Indiana’s Historic Bridges (Historic Bridges PA). Stipulation IV.C states, in part, that “INDOT will prepare an annual report that will include a list of Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been processed during the previous calendar year pursuant to this Agreement and the scope of each project. INDOT will submit this report on or before January 31 of each year to the Task Group.”

The information in this report is divided into several categories as outlined below. Several new categories have been provided to better track and analyze the status of the historic bridge population overall.

Part I--List of Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been processed or for which actions came to light during 2018
Part II--List of all known Select Bridges that have been replaced
Part III--List of all known Non-Select Bridges that have been replaced
Part IV--List of all known Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been bypassed
Part V--List of all known Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been relocated
Part VI--List of all known Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been closed
Part VII--Tally of Extant Select and Non-Select Bridges

This document is a reflection of how INDOT-CRO understands items to stand through January 25, 2019. Please forward any comments or corrections to Mary Kennedy via email: mkennedy@indot.in.gov.
Part I
Part I. List of Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been processed or for which actions came to light during 2018

The following table lists the bridges for which the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) Cultural Resources Office (CRO) has knowledge of actions being processed from January 2018 through January 2019. Additionally some other entries are for actions that took place prior to 2018, but had not yet been captured in an annual report. There is often lag time between when locally funded projects are implemented and bridge inspections are performed and when that new information is incorporated into INDOT’s system. Support documents related to these actions are included in the Attachments portion of the report as appropriate.

It should be noted that most Section 106-related documents for projects receiving FHWA funding and/or being processed under the Historic Bridge PA can be found in INDOT’s public Section 106 document posting website: IN SCOPE. Therefore, less project document attachments are provided than in past years in order to streamline this report. The project designation number (des. no.) is the most efficient search term when utilizing IN SCOPE. IN SCOPE can be accessed at the following link: http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/. Readers with interest in projects listed in the report as having no environmental work initiated yet should check IN SCOPE periodically, as the project documents will be placed there when the work commences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Support Documentation</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 135-55-01522A (NBI No. 26700), SR 135 over Indian Creek, near Morgantown, Morgan County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 9/6/18 (See Attachment 1); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. Nos. 0800163 &amp; 1600025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 046-24-03124A (NBI No. 17430), SR 46 over Laughery Creek, Franklin County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 11/7/18 (See Attachment 2); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1296697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County Bridge No. 701 (NBI No. 1800193), Water St. over Halfway Creek, Albany, Delaware County</td>
<td>MOA executed for replacement of decorative railing on this Non-Select Bridge. Construction crews found 80-year-old note from original construction crew.</td>
<td>Fully executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) dated January 2018 (See Attachment 3) and News article dated 8/23/18 (See Attachment 4)</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers is lead agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew County Bridge No. 26 (NBI No. 300024), CR 850 E over Clifty Creek, Bartholomew County</td>
<td>Select Bridge relocated, rehabilitated &amp; opened for pedestrian use as part of People Trail in Columbus</td>
<td>News article dated 2/7/18 (See Attachment 5)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 9982690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 032-54-03342C (NBI No. 10490), SR 32 over Walnut Fork, Montgomery County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 5/21/18 (See Attachment 6); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1400240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 046-15-03032 (NBI No. 17460), SR 46 over E. Fork Tanners Creek, Dearborn County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 1/25/18 (See Attachment 7); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1383701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 3216L (NBI No. 4900315), Garfield Park Road (Pagoda Drive) over Pleasant Run, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 2/26/18 (See Attachment 8); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1401724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 032-54-03347A (NBI No. 10470), SR 32 over Sugar Creek, Montgomery County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 5/21/18 (See Attachment 9); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1298423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Support Documentation</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford County Bridge No. 42 (NBI No. 1300033), South Alton Rd. over Mill Creek, Crawford County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge concluded</td>
<td>Fully executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) dated 6/19/18 (See Attachment 10); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1400804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford County Bridge No. 43 (NBI No. 1300071), Beechwood Rd. over Little Blue River, Crawford County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge concluded</td>
<td>Fully executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) dated 8/15/18 (See Attachment 11); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1400825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. P000-07-07101B (NBI No. 60310), Park Road over North Fork Salt Creek, Brown County State Park, Brown County, Indiana</td>
<td>100% State-funded project was granted a Certificate of Approval for this Select Bridge under IC 14-21-1-18 &amp; 312 IAC 20-4-9</td>
<td>DNR-DHPA letter dated 7/19/18 (See Attachment 12); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1601821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 1501F (NBI No. 4900100), Dandy Trail over Eagle Creek, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 11/16/18 (See Attachment 13); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1401722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 040-30-03505 (NBI No. 13970), US 40 over Brandywine Creek, Hancock County</td>
<td>Preventative maintenance project for this Select Bridge exempt from Section 106 review under the Minor Projects Programmatic Agreement (MPPA) between the FHWA, SHPO &amp; INDOT—under Category A Item 13; Category B Items 6 &amp; 11; Also state-funded project review process completed for this Select Bridge under IC 14-21-1-18 &amp; 312 IAC 20-4-9</td>
<td>DNR-DHPA letter of clearance dated 10/31/18 (See Attachment 14); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. (421)39-12-01793C (NBI No. 32210), US 421 over Kilmore Creek, Clinton County</td>
<td>100% State-funded project review process completed for this Select Bridge under IC 14-21-1-18 &amp; 312 IAC 20-4-9</td>
<td>DNR-DHPA letter of clearance dated 10/19/18 (See Attachment 15); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1801691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Support Documentation</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells County Bridge No. 193 (NBI No. 9000144), CR 300W over Wabash River, Wells County</td>
<td>Select Bridge has been struck by vehicles several times</td>
<td>News article dated 5/8/18 (See Attachment 16)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells County Bridge No. 112 (NBI No. 9000084), CR 500W over Eightmile Creek, Wells County</td>
<td>100% State-funded project review process completed for this Select Bridge under IC 14-21-1-18 &amp; 312 IAC 20-4-9</td>
<td>DNR-DHPA letter of clearance dated 10/23/18 (See Attachment 17)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1802222 (Community Crossing Matchings Grant Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton County Bridge No. K2 (NBI No. 5600113), East Allen St. over Kent Ditch, Newton County</td>
<td>Non-Select Bridge proposed for replacement with local funds</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers letter dated 12-10-18 (See Attachment 18)</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers is lead agency INDOT Des. No. 1802117 (Community Crossings Matching Grant Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 1801F (NBI No. 4900140), 38th St. over Fall Creek, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Modifications proposed to this Select Bridge as part of the Fall Creek Greenway Extension Project and the IndyGo Purple Line Bus Rapid Transit Project (It is anticipated that both projects will result in a &quot;no adverse effect&quot; finding for the bridge)</td>
<td>SHPO review letter for Purple Line Project dated 11/13/18 (See Attachment 19); Project documents for Fall Creek Greenway Extension Project can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600986 (Fall Creek Greenway Extension Project) Federal Transit Administration, Region V is lead agency for Purple Line project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte County Bridge No. 505 (NBI No. 4600143), Franklin St. over Trail Creek, LaPorte County</td>
<td>Select Bridge repaired with local funds</td>
<td>News article dated 3/28/18 (See Attachment 20)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County Bridge No. 36 (Shawnee Bridge; NBI No. 8600029), CR 100 E over Wabash River, Warren-Fountain County line</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge concluded under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Public Involvement (Hearing) Certification dated 12/21/18 (See Attachment 21); Other project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1400805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medora Covered Bridge, Old SR 235 over E. Fork White River, Jackson County</td>
<td>Select Bridge has been recent subject of vandalism</td>
<td>News article dated 1/2/19 (See Attachment 22)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County Bridge No. 86 (Richland/Plummer Creek Covered Bridge; NBI No. 2800060), CR 25 E over Plummer Creek, Greene County</td>
<td>Select Bridge has damage to east portal siding due to impact from box truck. Damage to portal siding determined to only be superficial. During post-impact inspection, unrelated missing siding on north side of bridge also noted.</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report (1/9/2019) &amp; News article dated 1/8/19 (See Attachment 23)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Support Documentation</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen County Bridge No. 32 (NBI No. 0200022), Van Zile Road over St. Joseph River, Allen County</td>
<td>Select Bridge was closed late January - late May 2018 after being struck by vehicle. Re-opened in late May 2018 after locally funded repairs</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report (5/30/2018) &amp; News article dated 1/22/18 (See Attachment 24)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells County Bridge No. 66 (NBI No. 9000052), CR 1100 S over Salamonie River, Wells County</td>
<td>Select Bridge repaired with local funds; fire on deck after repairs complete; temporarily closed before reopening</td>
<td>Wells County Commissioners' Meeting Minutes dated 5-7-18, 5-21-18 and 9-4-18: <a href="https://wellscounty.org/commissioners-meeting-minutes/">https://wellscounty.org/commissioners-meeting-minutes/</a></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain County Bridge No. 142 (NBI No. 2300112), CR 230 E over Big Shawnee Creek, Fountain County</td>
<td>Non-Select Bridge re-opened on 7/19/18 after repairs made to lower chords, end posts, and connection plates (after closure for approximately 1 year).</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 2300112 (dated 7/20/2018)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain County Bridge No. 126 (NBI No. 2300099), CR 670 W over Mallory Branch, Fountain County</td>
<td>Non-Select Bridge replaced with local funds in 2018</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 2300167 (dated 11/5/2018)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County Bridge No. 110 (NBI No. 2800074), CR 150 E over Plummer Creek, Greene County</td>
<td>Non-Select bridge replaced with local funds in 2017</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 2800223 (dated 7/30/17)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence County Bridge No. 54 (NBI No. 4700029), Jasper McKeaigg Rd. over Guthrie Creek, Lawrence County</td>
<td>Non-Select bridge replaced with local funds in 2018</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 4700166 (dated 6/27/18)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence County Bridge No. 139 (NBI No. 4700106), Saddle Barn Rd. over Leatherwood Creek, Lawrence County</td>
<td>Select bridge closed in 2018</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 4700106 (dated 6/8/18)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence County Bridge No. 172 (NBI No. 4700114), Cement Plant Rd. over Leatherwood Creek, Lawrence County</td>
<td>Non-Select bridge closed in 2018</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 4700114 (dated 6/26/18)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County Bridge No. 913 (NBI No. 5300130), Business 37 over Bean Blossom Creek, Monroe County</td>
<td>Select Bridge had emergency repair of the east exterior stringers in April 2018</td>
<td>Information found in Fracture Critical Inspection Report, Bridge No. 913 (dated 8/21/18)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Support Documentation</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush County Bridge No. 112 (NBI No. 7000101), Offutt Bridge Rd. over Little Blue River, Rush County</td>
<td>Select Bridge closed 12/13/2018 due to damage</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 7000101 (dated 12/21/18)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen County Bridge No. 27 (NBI No. 6000025), CR 150 E over Mill Creek, Owen County</td>
<td>Non-Select Bridge replaced with local funds in 2015</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 6000157 (dated 3/8/17)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen County Bridge No. 188 (NBI No. 6000134), CR 225 S over Sand Lick Creek, Owen County</td>
<td>Non-Select Bridge replaced with local funds in 2015</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 6000162 (dated 3/1/17)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan County Bridge No. 103 (NBI No. 5500084), Briarhopper Rd. over Lambs Creek, Morgan County</td>
<td>Non-Select Bridge replaced with local funds in 2018</td>
<td>Information found in Bridge Inspection Report, NBI No. 5500197 (dated 1/23/19)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike County Bridge No. 54 (NBI No. 6300101), CR 650 E over Patoka River, Pike County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. Nos. 1383291 &amp; 1383292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 041-26-03917E (NBI No. 14560), US 41 over White River, Gibson County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1500704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton County Bridge No. 36 (NBI No. 1200042), CR 950 W over South Fork Wildcat Creek, Clinton County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 2527L (NBI No. 4900240), Senate Avenue over Fall Creek, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1401721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 3215L (NBI No. 4900314), Garfield Park Road (Conservatory Drive) over Pleasant Run, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 041-61-05864B (NBI No. 15120), US 41 over Roaring Creek, Parke County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1593274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historic Bridge PA - Annual Update - Actions Taken, Jan 2018 through Jan 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Support Documentation</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 105-35-05447A (NBI No. 25280), SR 105 over Salamonie River - Reservoir, Huntington County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1401751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Bridge No. 322 (NBI No. 8400211), 13th Street over Lost Creek, Terre Haute, Vigo County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on the INSCOPE website by searching under the des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 2517F (NBI No. 4900229), Commerce Drive over Pogues Run, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 040-67-01838B (NBI No. 13740), US 40 over Sallust Branch, Putnam County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1601094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 075-08-03653B (NBI No. 24970), SR 75 over Wildcat Creek, Carroll County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1601029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge Number (421)39-12-01792B (NBI No. 32200), US 421 over S. Fork Wildcat Creek, Clinton County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1593276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings County Bridge No. 76 (NBI No. 4000069), CR 800 S over Big Graham Creek, Jennings County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 1104F (NBI No. 4900071), Kessler Blvd. West Drive over White River, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 1705F (NBI No. 4900125), 30th St. over the White River, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Support Documentation</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 2414F (NBI No. 4900620), Washington St. over Big Eagle Creek, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Bridge No. 77 (NBI No. 8400056), French Drive over Prairie Creek, Vigo County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence County Bridge No. 150 (NBI No. 4700111), Mill Creek Rd. over CSX Railroad, Lawrence County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Select Bridge in progress; HBPA does not apply</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware County Bridge No. 161 (NBI No. 1800136), CR 170 S over the White River, Delaware County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 9680560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County Bridge No. 105 (NBI No. 8800071), Becks Mill Rd. over Mill Creek, Washington County</td>
<td>Section 106 process for project involving this Non-Select Bridge in progress under the HBPA procedures</td>
<td>Project documents can be found on INSCOPE website by searching by des. no. (<a href="http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/">http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/</a>)</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1173265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 040-67-01835A (NBI No. 13720), US 40 over Deer Creek, Putnam County</td>
<td>Thin bridge deck overlay project for this Select Bridge exempt from Section 106 review under the Minor Projects Programmatic Agreement (MPPA) between the FHWA, SHPO &amp; INDOT--under Category A Item 13</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1592829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 046-03-037828WBL (NBI No. 10340), SR 46 WBL over East Fork White River, Columbus, Bartholomew County</td>
<td>Thin bridge deck overlay &amp; railing repair project for this Non-Select Bridge expected to be exempt from Section 106 review under the Minor Projects Programmatic Agreement (MPPA) between the FHWA, SHPO &amp; INDOT--under Category A Item 6 and Category A Item 13</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1800724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Support Documentation</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells County Bridge No. 106 (NBI No. 9000080), CR 100 N over Rock Creek, Wells County</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1702735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam County Bridge No. 276 (NBI No. 6700217), CR 400 W over Conrail RR, Putnam County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1800245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County Bridge No. 154 (NBI No. 3600099), CR 300S over Rider Ditch, Jackson County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1703020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County Bridge No. 197 (NBI No. 3600132), CR 100S over McHargue Ditch, Jackson County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1703018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush County Bridge No. 94 (Smith Covered Bridge; NBI No. 7000084), CR 150 N over Flatrock River, Rush County</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1702753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. (421)39-08-01788A (NBI No. 32290), North Street over US 421, Delphi, Carroll County Indiana</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. (12)912-45-02352B (NBI No. 33080), US 12 &amp; SR 912 over EJ&amp;E Railroad, Gary Ave. &amp; Dr.</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 218-08-03279 (NBI No. 28910), SR 218 over Paint Creek, Carroll County</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1701151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 026-38-03430A (NBI No. 7040), SR 26 over Salamonie River, Jay County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic Bridge PA - Annual Update - Actions Taken, Jan 2018 through Jan 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Support Documentation</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boone County Bridge No. 41 (NBI No. 0600028), CR 200 E over Sugar Creek, Boone County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County Bridge No. 272 (NBI No. 2800176), CR 200 N over Indiana Railroad Company, Greene County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1600888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion County Bridge No. 0409F (NBI No. 4900491), Keystone Avenue over White River, Indianapolis, Marion County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1801439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderburgh County Bridge No. 620 (NBI No. 8200007), Franklin Street over Pigeon Creek, Evansville, Vanderburgh County</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1802048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigo County Bridge No. 37 (NBI No. 8400021), Farmersburg Street over Turman Creek, Vigo County</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1700437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 036-83-03492C (NBI No. 11480), US 36 over Wabash River, Vermillion County</td>
<td>Project established for this Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1800417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOT Bridge No. 912-45-06596B (NBI No. 33035), Ramp B over Ramp B, East Chicago, Lake County</td>
<td>Project established for this Non-Select Bridge within INDOT system; no environmental work initiated yet</td>
<td>Nothing of note to include with this report</td>
<td>INDOT Des. No. 1703012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II
Part II. Select Bridges that have been replaced

As outlined in the following table, INDOT-CRO has knowledge of twenty-one (21) Select Bridges that have been replaced.* These bridges have been demolished. This list does not include bypassed or relocated structures. Since those structures are still extant, they still retain their Select designation and are listed in other sections of this report.

Per Stipulation IV.G. of the Historic Bridge PA (below), when a Select Bridge is demolished with local funds, the bridge owner can no longer utilize the streamlining procedures of the Historic Bridge PA on other Select or Non-Select Bridge projects that utilize Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds. Rather, they must follow regular Section 106 procedures pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800 and would require execution of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to resolve any adverse effects.

Anticipatory Demolition – If FHWA or Indiana SHPO determine a bridge owner intentionally demolishes or otherwise diminishes the historic integrity of a Select Bridge under the bridge owner’s jurisdiction with non-Federal-aid funds, then FHWA will comply with 36 CFR Part 800 for any future federal-aid bridge project proposed by that bridge owner. After the next Bridge Survey update is completed in accordance with Stipulation II.C.2, FHWA may process federal-aid projects in accordance with this Agreement for that bridge owner.

While the following list is a list of all known Select Bridges that have been replaced, it does not automatically constitute a list of bridge owners that are no longer able to utilize the Historic Bridge PA per Stipulation IV.G. Before the environmental process is initiated for any proposed FHWA-funded projects for bridges owned by bridge owners on this list, FHWA and INDOT will need to make an assessment of whether it is appropriate to invoke Stipulation IV.G. and therefore comply with 36 CFR Part 800 instead of utilizing the Historic Bridge PA process.

*The table does not include the following bridges that are counted as losses since the original Select/Non-Select list: Shelby County Bridge No. 149, which was changed to Non-Select before it was demolished in 2013. INDOT Bridge No. (421)39-12-00930, which was changed to not NRHP-eligible in 2015 (and, thus, no longer Select). INDOT Bridge No. 046-24-03124A, which was changed to Non-Select in 2017.
## Select Bridges That Have Been Replaced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>00010</td>
<td>0400004</td>
<td>CR 500 W</td>
<td>Sugar Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>00018</td>
<td>0600011</td>
<td>CR 950 W</td>
<td>Goldsberry Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>00070</td>
<td>0600052</td>
<td>CR 600 E</td>
<td>Mounts Run</td>
<td>Proposed for Replacement</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Communication from the US Army Corps of Engineers in 2013 indicates the permit application for replacement was put on hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>00063</td>
<td>1000053</td>
<td>Elrod Rd.</td>
<td>Silver Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data states that new superstructure was built on old abutments &amp; original structure was moved to side and is resting on temporary wooden supports; current status unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>00123</td>
<td>1300067</td>
<td>Main St.</td>
<td>Blue River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>00138</td>
<td>1600114</td>
<td>CR 700 W</td>
<td>Branch Fall Fork Clifty Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2008-2010</td>
<td>NBI Data indicates this bridge was replaced with a culvert between 2008-2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>00134</td>
<td>1700135</td>
<td>CR 75</td>
<td>CSX Railroad</td>
<td>Removed; no new structure; may have been stored by County/CSX?</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data shows the bridge has been removed</td>
<td>1173242 (eliminated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>00402</td>
<td>2600283</td>
<td>Antioch Church Rd.</td>
<td>Black River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>00062</td>
<td>3800175</td>
<td>CR 850 E</td>
<td>Limberlost Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00020</td>
<td>4700122</td>
<td>Old SR 37</td>
<td>Gulletts Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>0201241 (eliminated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00080</td>
<td>4700053</td>
<td>Twin Bridges Rd.</td>
<td>Branch of Rock Lick Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>00087</td>
<td>4800077</td>
<td>CR 700 N</td>
<td>Little Killbuck Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>000K3</td>
<td>5600114</td>
<td>Kent St. (Old US 41)</td>
<td>Kent Ditch</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>00034</td>
<td>5900024</td>
<td>CR 350 W</td>
<td>Lick Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>00059</td>
<td>6000048</td>
<td>CR 450 E</td>
<td>McCormick's Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey</td>
<td>00163</td>
<td>6500238</td>
<td>Huey Rd</td>
<td>Branch of Big Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Select Bridges That Have Been Replaced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00097</td>
<td>7300088</td>
<td>Edinburgh Rd.</td>
<td>Branch of Big Blue River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00136</td>
<td>7300124</td>
<td>CR 200 E</td>
<td>S. Fork Lewis Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>00114</td>
<td>7400106</td>
<td>CR 1350 N</td>
<td>Middle Fork Crooked Creek</td>
<td>Replaced/Removal?</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Lack of inclusion in current NBI data indicates this bridge is no longer in service. Current status unknown.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>00009</td>
<td>8000009</td>
<td>CR 1050 W</td>
<td>Wilbert Crum Ditch</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td>00059</td>
<td>8000051</td>
<td>CR 400 E</td>
<td>Schlater Ditch</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>00074</td>
<td>9000058</td>
<td>CR 400 W</td>
<td>Rock Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>9382490; MOA executed in 1995 for the replacement of this bridge; not processed under Historic Bridge PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III
Part III. Non-Select Bridges that have been replaced

As outlined in the following table, INDOT-CRO has knowledge of eighty-six (86) Non-Select Bridges that have been replaced or are currently proposed for replacement. These bridges have been demolished or soon will be demolished. A bridge “proposed for replacement” is not added to this list until the public hearing for the proposed project has been held and certified, per the procedures of the Historic Bridges PA. Until that point, the preferred alternative has not yet been finalized. This list does not include bypassed or relocated structures. Since those structures are still extant, they still retain their Non-Select designation and are listed in other sections of this report.
### Non-Select Bridges That Have Been Replaced (including proposed replacements, as indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>00546</td>
<td>0200273</td>
<td>State Blvd.</td>
<td>Spy Run Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0400587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>00001</td>
<td>0300003</td>
<td>CR 500 S</td>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>00130</td>
<td>0300121</td>
<td>CR 1100 S</td>
<td>East Fork White Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>00165</td>
<td>300138</td>
<td>CR 600 W</td>
<td>Branch Wolf Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI Data indicates this bridge was replaced with a culvert in 2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>00042</td>
<td>0700031</td>
<td>Elkinsville Rd.</td>
<td>Gravel Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Section 106 documents &amp; NBI data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>00502</td>
<td>0800129</td>
<td>CR 750 N</td>
<td>Ryan Appleton Ditch</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>(25)24-09-04178A</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>SR 25/Market St.</td>
<td>Eel River</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1173393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>403-10-01941A</td>
<td>32000</td>
<td>SR 403</td>
<td>Silver Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0800072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>00122</td>
<td>1100100</td>
<td>CR 650 W</td>
<td>Big Slough Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>046-11-01313A</td>
<td>17020</td>
<td>SR 46</td>
<td>Birch Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0800838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>00011</td>
<td>1300008</td>
<td>Bacon Hollow Rd.</td>
<td>Whiskey Run</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>00043</td>
<td>1300071</td>
<td>Beechwood Rd.</td>
<td>Little Blue River</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1400825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>00129</td>
<td>1300069</td>
<td>Main St.</td>
<td>Southern Railroad</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents &amp; NBI data</td>
<td>0901105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Allen bridge 00546 Proposed for replacement 2018, Section 106 documents 0400587
- Bartholomew bridge 00130 Replaced 2009, NBI data N/A
- Bartholomew bridge 00165 Replaced 2014, NBI Data indicates this bridge was replaced with a culvert in 2014: 0100151; SHPO letter of 3/7/2002 states bridge is not NRHP eligible; finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" signed by FHWA 3/11/2002; SHPO concurrence letter dated 4/9/2002; not processed under Historic Bridge PA
- Carroll bridge 00502 Replaced 2011, NBI data N/A
- Cass bridge (25)24-09-04178A Proposed for replacement 2018, Section 106 documents 1173393
- Clark bridge 403-10-01941A Replaced 2017, Section 106 documents 0800072
- Clay bridge 00122 Replaced 2017, NBI data N/A
- Clay bridge 046-11-01313A Replaced 2014, Section 106 documents 0800838
- Crawford bridge 00011 Replaced 2008, NBI data N/A
- Crawford bridge 00043 Proposed for replacement 2019, Section 106 documents 1400825; not processed under Historic Bridge PA
- Crawford bridge 00129 Replaced 2016, Section 106 documents & NBI data 0901105; not processed under Historic Bridge PA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>00024</td>
<td>1500021</td>
<td>Cold Spring Rd.</td>
<td>Lee’s Branch/S. Hogan Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1006517/1383444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>00055</td>
<td>1500050</td>
<td>Collier Ridge Rd.</td>
<td>West Fork Tanners Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1005702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>00077</td>
<td>1500070</td>
<td>Wolluing Rd.</td>
<td>Taylor Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers MOA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn</td>
<td>050-15-00210A</td>
<td>18790</td>
<td>US 50</td>
<td>Tanners Creek and Service Rd.</td>
<td>Replaced superstructure</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0400285 and 0800029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>00002</td>
<td>1600002</td>
<td>CR 421 N</td>
<td>Clifty Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1005700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>00107</td>
<td>1800089</td>
<td>CR 700 N</td>
<td>Mississinewa River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>0301001 (eliminated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>00055</td>
<td>1900045</td>
<td>Cuzco Rd. W</td>
<td>Davis Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois</td>
<td>00114</td>
<td>1900080</td>
<td>Schnellville Rd.</td>
<td>Hall Creek</td>
<td>Rehabilitation included superstructure replacement with new spread box beams and concrete deck, encasement of concrete bents, new railing, new approach pavement, and new riprap</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart</td>
<td>33-20-3906A</td>
<td>10970</td>
<td>US 33</td>
<td>Elkhart River</td>
<td>Replaced superstructure</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0101525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>00023</td>
<td>2200022</td>
<td>John Pectol Rd.</td>
<td>Big Indian Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>8676620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>00097</td>
<td>2300075</td>
<td>CR 500 E</td>
<td>North Fork of Coal Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1005669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>00104</td>
<td>2300081</td>
<td>CR 200 E</td>
<td>North Fork of Coal Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bridge No.</td>
<td>NBI No.</td>
<td>Road Carried</td>
<td>Feature Crossed</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Des. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>00126</td>
<td>2300099</td>
<td>CR 670 W</td>
<td>Mallory Branch</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>046-24-03124A</td>
<td>17430</td>
<td>SR 46</td>
<td>Laughery Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2019** C</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1296697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00021</td>
<td>2800014</td>
<td>CR 270 E</td>
<td>Richland Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Section 106 documents &amp; NBI data</td>
<td>0200727; SHPO letter of 3/11/2003 states bridge is not NRHP eligible; finding of &quot;No Historic Properties Affected&quot; signed by FHWA 10/15/2003; not processed under Historic Bridge PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00024</td>
<td>2800016</td>
<td>CR 390 N</td>
<td>Richland Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00110</td>
<td>2800074</td>
<td>CR 150 E</td>
<td>Plummer Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00255</td>
<td>2800204</td>
<td>CR 1400 E</td>
<td>Indiana RR</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>057-28-00341C</td>
<td>20710</td>
<td>SR 57</td>
<td>White River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0400090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>057-28-03042D</td>
<td>20720</td>
<td>SR 57</td>
<td>White River Overflow</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0400091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>00106</td>
<td>3200078</td>
<td>CR 550 N</td>
<td>W. Fork Big Walnut Creek</td>
<td>Replacement in progress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1383451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>00272</td>
<td>3200214</td>
<td>CR 550 W</td>
<td>Conrail RR</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0800717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>00508</td>
<td>3400126</td>
<td>Park Ave.</td>
<td>Kokomo Creek</td>
<td>Replacement in progress</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1400994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-Select Bridges That Have Been Replaced (including proposed replacements, as indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>00006</td>
<td>3600005</td>
<td>Maumee Rd.</td>
<td>Combs Branch</td>
<td>Replaced/Removed?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Lack of inclusion in current NBI data indicates this bridge is no longer in service. Current status unknown.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>00195</td>
<td>3600130</td>
<td>CR 550 W</td>
<td>Muscatatuck River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1005701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>00008</td>
<td>4000008</td>
<td>CR 400 W</td>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>00015</td>
<td>4000015</td>
<td>CR 400 N</td>
<td>Mutton Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>00082</td>
<td>4000074</td>
<td>CR 600 S</td>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>00377</td>
<td>4200147</td>
<td>Overhead Rd.</td>
<td>CSX RR</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0088500; SHPO letter of 5/30/2003 states bridge is not NRHP eligible; finding of &quot;No Historic Properties Affected&quot; signed by FHWA 7/15/2003; not processed under Historic Bridge PA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>00245</td>
<td>4500137</td>
<td>Columbia Ave.</td>
<td>Little Calumet River</td>
<td>Reconstructed</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI Data (2016) indicates a local reconstruction project has removed the historic characteristics of the bridge</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>(12)912-45-02352D</td>
<td>33080</td>
<td>SR 912</td>
<td>Gary Avenue &amp; E.J.E. Railroad</td>
<td>Rehabilitated in 2015, but work was so extensive that it was considered a replacement in terms of historic status</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0201063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00054</td>
<td>4700029</td>
<td>Jasper McKeaigg Rd.</td>
<td>Guthrie Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00068</td>
<td>4700042</td>
<td>Henderson Creek Rd.</td>
<td>Little Salt Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00079</td>
<td>4700052</td>
<td>Twin Bridges Rd.</td>
<td>Branch of Rock Lick Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1501F</td>
<td>4900100</td>
<td>Dandy Trail</td>
<td>Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1401722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bridge No.</td>
<td>NBI No.</td>
<td>Road Carried</td>
<td>Feature Crossed</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Des. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1615F</td>
<td>4900116</td>
<td>Lafayette Rd.</td>
<td>Conrail Railroad</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1173064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1807F</td>
<td>4900146</td>
<td>Keystone Ave.</td>
<td>Fall Creek Overflow</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1173063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>3216L</td>
<td>4900315</td>
<td>Garfield Park Road (Pagoda Dr)</td>
<td>Pleasant Run</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1401724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>4101F</td>
<td>4900390</td>
<td>Franklin Rd</td>
<td>Miller Ditch</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2015**</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers &amp; SHPO communications</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>00022</td>
<td>5100006</td>
<td>Cale Rd. (Mt. Olive Rd.)</td>
<td>Sulphur Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>00073</td>
<td>5100040</td>
<td>Rusk Road</td>
<td>Lost River</td>
<td>Disassembled and moved to new location/use in Texas</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Discussion found on Bridge Hunter Website: <a href="http://bridgehunter.com/in/martin/5100040/">http://bridgehunter.com/in/martin/5100040/</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>000137</td>
<td>5100061</td>
<td>Deep Cut Connector (Historic Bridge Inventory Documents list Dale Courtwright Rd)</td>
<td>Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>00030</td>
<td>5500024</td>
<td>Mahalasville Rd.</td>
<td>Pike Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>00044</td>
<td>5500037</td>
<td>Peavine Rd.</td>
<td>Stotts Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1173249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>00056</td>
<td>5500049</td>
<td>Teeters Rd.</td>
<td>W. Fork Clear Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>00103</td>
<td>5500084</td>
<td>Briarhopper Rd.</td>
<td>Lambs Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bridge No.</td>
<td>NBI No.</td>
<td>Road Carried</td>
<td>Feature Crossed</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Des. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>252-55-01968</td>
<td>30720</td>
<td>SR 252</td>
<td>Long Run Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0401165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>K2</td>
<td>5600113</td>
<td>E. Allen St.</td>
<td>Kent Ditch</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers &amp; SHPO communications</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>00077</td>
<td>5900058</td>
<td>CR 250 S</td>
<td>Lick Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>00027</td>
<td>6000025</td>
<td>CR 150 E</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>00103</td>
<td>6000075</td>
<td>CR 750 S</td>
<td>Branch of Brush Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>00105</td>
<td>6000077</td>
<td>CR 750 S</td>
<td>Lick Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>00188</td>
<td>6000134</td>
<td>CR 225 S</td>
<td>Sand Lick Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>00072</td>
<td>6100059</td>
<td>CR 600 W</td>
<td>Big Racoon Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0800716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>00248</td>
<td>6100218</td>
<td>CR 1200 E</td>
<td>Conrail Railroad</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0900839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>00071</td>
<td>6300057</td>
<td>Meridian Rd.</td>
<td>Patoka River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>00144</td>
<td>6300098</td>
<td>CR 500 E</td>
<td>Branch South Fork Patoka River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>00147</td>
<td>6300100</td>
<td>CR 350 E</td>
<td>Patoka River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0902251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey</td>
<td>00091</td>
<td>6500247</td>
<td>Pfeiffer Rd.</td>
<td>Big Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey</td>
<td>00195</td>
<td>6500150</td>
<td>Upper Mt Vernon Rd</td>
<td>Little Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey</td>
<td>00327</td>
<td>6500255</td>
<td>Kreitenstein Rd.</td>
<td>Big Creek</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>00137</td>
<td>6700122</td>
<td>CR 100 E</td>
<td>Big Walnut Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>9982470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bridge No.</td>
<td>NBI No.</td>
<td>Road Carried</td>
<td>Feature Crossed</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Des. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>00199</td>
<td>6700173</td>
<td>CR 1300 S</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Section 106 documents &amp; NBI data</td>
<td>0200745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SHPO letter of 8/9/2004 states nothing in project APE is NRHP eligible; finding of &quot;No Historic Properties Affected&quot; signed by FHWA 7/15/2004; SHPO concurrence letter dated 9/21/2004; not processed under Historic Bridge PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>00070</td>
<td>6900053</td>
<td>CR 650 N</td>
<td>Little Otter Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>00057</td>
<td>7200043</td>
<td>Plymouth Rd.</td>
<td>Town Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00149</td>
<td>7300137</td>
<td>CR 425 S</td>
<td>Conns Creek</td>
<td>Demolished; No replacement structure</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Email from County's consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A; bridge had been bypassed; bridge was reclassified from Select to Non-Select in 2013 prior to demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>009-73-01994B</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>SR 9</td>
<td>Flatrock River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0100327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>00308</td>
<td>7400168</td>
<td>CR 700 E</td>
<td>Branch of Crooked Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe</td>
<td>026-79-03346B</td>
<td>6690</td>
<td>SR 26</td>
<td>South Fork of Wildcat Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>9608220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe</td>
<td>052-79-01784EEBL</td>
<td>19010</td>
<td>US 52</td>
<td>Wabash River &amp; SR 43 (River Road)</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0400774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Non-Select Bridges That Have Been Replaced (including proposed replacements, as indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vigo</td>
<td>00151</td>
<td>8400113</td>
<td>Gannon Rd.</td>
<td>East Little Sugar Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Section 106 documents &amp; NBI data</td>
<td>0200751; SHPO letter of 1/8/2003 states bridge is not NRHP eligible; finding of &quot;No Historic Properties Affected&quot; signed by FHWA 7/15/2003; not processed under Historic Bridge PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>00023</td>
<td>8600020</td>
<td>CR 350 S</td>
<td>Redwood Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>055-86-03502B</td>
<td>19740</td>
<td>SR 55</td>
<td>Big Pine Creek</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0800834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>00058</td>
<td>8800038</td>
<td>Canton/S. Boston Rd.</td>
<td>Middle Fork Blue River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>00060</td>
<td>8800040</td>
<td>Harristown Rd.</td>
<td>Branch W Fork Blue River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>00173</td>
<td>8900126</td>
<td>Mineral Springs Road</td>
<td>Greens Fork River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0801062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>00213</td>
<td>8900160</td>
<td>Charles Rd.</td>
<td>Whitewater River</td>
<td>Replaced</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NBI data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>027-89-03748</td>
<td>7210</td>
<td>US 27</td>
<td>E. Fork Whitewater River</td>
<td>Proposed for replacement</td>
<td>Put on hold in 2012**Not yet counted as loss in grand tally</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>9702981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV
Part IV-- List of all known Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been bypassed or left in place

As outlined in the following table, INDOT-CRO has knowledge of twenty-three (23) Select Bridges and two (2) Non-Select Bridges that have been bypassed or left in place for bicycle/pedestrian use. Some of these bridges had already been bypassed or converted to pedestrian use at the initiation of the Historic Bridge Inventory when their original Select/Non-Select designation was given. Others have been bypassed as a result of projects processed under the Historic Bridges PA. Most of these bridges are being utilized for bicycle/pedestrian traffic.
## Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Bypassed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>Select/Non-Select?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>00268</td>
<td>200201</td>
<td>Bostick Rd.</td>
<td>St. Marys River</td>
<td>Bypassed and rehabilitated for pedestrian use</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0901914</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>[00541]</td>
<td>XX032</td>
<td>Wells St.</td>
<td>St. Marys River</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviess</td>
<td>00183</td>
<td>1400119</td>
<td>CR 1025 E</td>
<td>E. Fork White River</td>
<td>Pre pre-HBPA MOA, relocated &amp; rehabilitated as pedestrian structure in Charlestown State Park</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0088430</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>00115</td>
<td>1600093</td>
<td>CR 500 S</td>
<td>Sand Creek</td>
<td>Pre pre-HBPA MOA, bypassed &amp; rehabilitated as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0400255</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart</td>
<td>XX029</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Jefferson St.</td>
<td>Hydraulic Canal</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhart</td>
<td>XX019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Murray St.</td>
<td>Hydraulic Canal</td>
<td>Repaired &amp; painted with local money; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>00398</td>
<td>2600279</td>
<td>Old SR 65</td>
<td>Patoka River</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>0088660 &amp; 0500816</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>XX005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Near Broyles Rd.</td>
<td>White Lick Creek</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure near Washington Township Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>00178</td>
<td>3200137</td>
<td>CR 50 S</td>
<td>W. Fork White Lick Creek</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Bypassed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>Select/Non-Select?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>XX020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>north of Old Ben Dr.</td>
<td>Kokomo Creek</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure in Highland Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>XX001</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Interior Roadway</td>
<td>Drainage Ditch</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Located at Lake County Fairgrounds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte</td>
<td>XX022</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Near 8th &amp; Dixon, Michigan City</td>
<td>Nickelplate RR</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>000128</td>
<td>4700096</td>
<td>Huron Williams Rd.</td>
<td>E. Fork White River</td>
<td>Bypassed and rehabilitated for pedestrian use</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0201239</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>00161</td>
<td>5500125</td>
<td>Old SR 37</td>
<td>Little Indian Creek</td>
<td>Bypassed and rehabilitated for pedestrian use</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>1400880</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>XX006</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Upper Falls Cataract Falls</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure in Cataract Falls State Recreation Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>XX024</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>West of CR 500 E</td>
<td>Kankakee River</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>00291</td>
<td>6600152</td>
<td>CR 625 E</td>
<td>Tippecano River</td>
<td>Bypassed and rehabilitated for pedestrian use</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0301024</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>00125</td>
<td>6700111</td>
<td>CR 550 S</td>
<td>Big Walnut Creek</td>
<td>Bypassed and rehabilitated for pedestrian use</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0900908 &amp; 1006547</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>00010</td>
<td>6700009</td>
<td>CR 1050 N</td>
<td>Big Racoon Creek</td>
<td>Bypassed and utilized for pedestrian use</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0710940</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Bypassed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>Select/Non-Select?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>00159</td>
<td>6700138</td>
<td>CR 625 W</td>
<td>Big Walnut Creek</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td>[00081]</td>
<td>XX030</td>
<td>CR 850 W</td>
<td>Otter Creek</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>0151A</td>
<td>7400139</td>
<td>CR 1475 E</td>
<td>Anderson River</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>00213</td>
<td>7100019</td>
<td>Walking Path</td>
<td>St. Joseph River</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion</td>
<td>00071</td>
<td>8300036</td>
<td>CR 40 W</td>
<td>Vermillion River</td>
<td>No change since implementation of HBPA; Utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Historic Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>XX026</td>
<td>[00298]</td>
<td>Tioga Rd.</td>
<td>Lake Freeman</td>
<td>Closed &amp; rehabilitated &amp; utilized as pedestrian structure</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>9880600</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V
Part V-- List of all known Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Relocated

As outlined in the following table, INDOT-CRO has knowledge of nine (9) Select Bridges and one (1) Non-Select Bridge that have been relocated or are proposed for relocation. Some of these bridges had already been relocated or were proposed for relocation at the initiation of the Historic Bridge Inventory when their original Select/Non-Select designation was given. Others have been relocated as a result of projects processed under the Historic Bridges PA. Most of these bridges are being utilized for bicycle/pedestrian traffic. One was removed from its original location after collapse from overweight vehicle; its components are stored at the county highway department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>Select/Non-Select?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>00207</td>
<td>0600140</td>
<td>O’Neal Rd./Holliday Rd.</td>
<td>Big Eagle Creek</td>
<td>Removed from original site after collapse from overweight vehicle; components stored at county highway department</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Online newspaper articles</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>00026</td>
<td>300024</td>
<td>CR 850 E</td>
<td>Clifty Creek</td>
<td>Relocated and rehabilitated on People Trail</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>9982690, 0401196, 1173209</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>046-11-01316A</td>
<td>17050</td>
<td>SR 46</td>
<td>Eel River</td>
<td>Proposed for Reuse on Salt Creek Trail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0800910</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>00042</td>
<td>1300033</td>
<td>South Alton Rd.</td>
<td>Mill Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for Relocation to Sycamore Springs Park for Use as Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>1400804</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>00085</td>
<td>1800070</td>
<td>CR 800 E</td>
<td>Mississinewa River</td>
<td>Proposed for Reuse on Cardinal Greenway Trail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0500078</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>00058</td>
<td>3100036</td>
<td>Valley View Rd.</td>
<td>Indian Creek</td>
<td>Proposed for reuse on Indian Creek Trail</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MOA executed in 2017 (lead federal agency = US Army Corps of Engineers)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>00189</td>
<td>3600125</td>
<td>Base Rd.</td>
<td>Wayman Ditch</td>
<td>Relocated to the Jackson County Fairgrounds; no new structure</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Discussion on Bridge Hunter Website: <a href="http://bridgehunter.com/in/jackson/3600125/">http://bridgehunter.com/in/jackson/3600125/</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Bridge No.</td>
<td>NBI No.</td>
<td>Road Carried</td>
<td>Feature Crossed</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Des. No.</td>
<td>Select/Non-Select?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>00097</td>
<td>4800086</td>
<td>CR 450 N</td>
<td>Killbuck Creek</td>
<td>Replaced and proposed for Reuse by City of Anderson</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>0100372</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00013</td>
<td>7300013</td>
<td>CR 9875 W</td>
<td>Buck Creek</td>
<td>Closed &amp; proposed for relocation &amp; rehabilitation on local trail</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Section 106 Documents</td>
<td>0100361 &amp; 1592859</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>00113</td>
<td>8800075</td>
<td>Fredericksburg Rd.</td>
<td>S. Fork Blue River</td>
<td>Relocated and rehabilitated on trail system in Hamilton County</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Section 106 documents</td>
<td>9982610</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part VI
Part VI--List of all known Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Closed

As outlined in the following table, INDOT-CRO has knowledge of eleven (11) Select Bridges and nineteen (19) Non-Select Bridges that are currently closed. They most recently carried vehicular traffic, but were closed for safety reasons. Some of them are no longer being included in the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) database. These bridges are noted as such.
### Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Closed to Vehicular Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>Select/Non-Select?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>00032</td>
<td>600022</td>
<td>CR 350 W Sugar Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>00127</td>
<td>1100105</td>
<td>CR 200 S Birch Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>00089</td>
<td>1600069</td>
<td>CR 180 E Lost Fork Sand Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI Data (no longer in NBI data in 2018)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>00113</td>
<td>2300088</td>
<td>CR 30 E Coal Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI Data (no longer in NBI data in 2018)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00110</td>
<td>280074</td>
<td>CR 150 E Plummer Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00237</td>
<td>2800165</td>
<td>CR 100 S Buck Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>00272</td>
<td>2800176</td>
<td>CR 200 N Indiana Railroad Company</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>00158</td>
<td>3600103</td>
<td>CR 600 E Smart Ditch</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NBI Data (no longer in NBI data in 2018)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>P000-39-02602</td>
<td>60360</td>
<td>Entrance Road (Madison State Hospital)</td>
<td>Madison Railroad</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>00007</td>
<td>4000007</td>
<td>CR 900 N Bear Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00052</td>
<td>4700027</td>
<td>Washing County Bridge Rd.</td>
<td>E. Fork White River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00054</td>
<td>4700029</td>
<td>Jasper McKeaigg Rd.</td>
<td>Guthrie Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00139</td>
<td>4700106</td>
<td>Saddle Barn Rd.</td>
<td>Leatherwood Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>00172</td>
<td>4700114</td>
<td>Cement Plant Rd.</td>
<td>Leatherwood Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Select and Non-Select Bridges that have been Closed to Vehicular Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>NBI No.</th>
<th>Road Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Des. No.</th>
<th>Select/Non-Select?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>3313L</td>
<td>4900336</td>
<td>Hobart Avenue</td>
<td>Bean Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>00028</td>
<td>5200022</td>
<td>CR 100 E</td>
<td>Eel River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>9982330 (Eliminated in 2012)</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>00054</td>
<td>5200041</td>
<td>CR 950 N</td>
<td>Eel River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>00182</td>
<td>5300091</td>
<td>Old SR 46</td>
<td>Branch of Jacks Defeat Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>00224</td>
<td>5500142</td>
<td>Old SR 37</td>
<td>Indian Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI Data indicates it's currently used for pedestrian traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>00169</td>
<td>6300110</td>
<td>CR 625 S</td>
<td>Cup Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey</td>
<td>00066</td>
<td>6500200</td>
<td>Wilsey Road</td>
<td>Black River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey</td>
<td>00202</td>
<td>6500251</td>
<td>John Mills Rd.</td>
<td>Little Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>00021</td>
<td>6800012</td>
<td>CR 500 N</td>
<td>Elkhorn Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>00226</td>
<td>6800181</td>
<td>CR 400 S</td>
<td>Greenville Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush</td>
<td>00112</td>
<td>7000101</td>
<td>Offutt Bridge Rd.</td>
<td>Little Blue River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00031</td>
<td>7300031</td>
<td>CR 800 E</td>
<td>Little Blue River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00041</td>
<td>7300041</td>
<td>CR 275 N</td>
<td>Sugar Creek</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>00147</td>
<td>7300135</td>
<td>Mound Rd.</td>
<td>Flatrock River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>00165</td>
<td>8500535</td>
<td>CR 325 E</td>
<td>Eel River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>00191</td>
<td>8900141</td>
<td>Heiney Road</td>
<td>Whitewater River</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NBI Data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-Select</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part VII
Part VII--Tally of Extant Select and Non-Select Bridges

Below is a “running tally” of extant Select and Non-Select bridges compared to the original total of Select and Non-Select Bridges from 2010. For Select bridges to be considered a “loss” in this context, they have been demolished and/or their original Select designation was changed to Non-Select. Bridges that are going to be reused on local trail systems, have been bypassed, or have been relocated are not counted as a “loss” in this tally. Non-Select Bridges “proposed for replacement” have been included as a “loss” only after the public hearing for the proposed project has been held, as noted in Part III of this report. Until that point, the procedures under the Historic Bridges PA are still on-going and the preferred alternative has not yet been finalized. It should be noted that the tally for Select bridges reflects one “gain” since the 2010 list - INDOT Bridge No. 135-55-01522B was changed from not NRHP-eligible to Select in 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select Bridges</strong></td>
<td>435</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Select Bridges</strong></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachments
Indiana Department of Transportation

County: Morgan
Route: SR 135
Des. No.: 1600025

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

Road No./County: SR 135 / Morgan County
Designation Number: 1600025
Project Description/Termini: Bridge rehabilitation of Bridge No. 135-55-01522C; NBI Number: 026700 over Indian Creek. Termini extend 350 feet south and 350 feet north of the bridge. Project Location is 0.33 miles south of SR 252.

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Approval

ESM Signature Date ES Signature Date

FHWA Signature Date

Release for Public Involvement

N/A

ESM Initials Date

ES Initials Date 6-28-18

Certification of Public Involvement

Mary Wright 9/6/18

Office of Public Involvement Date

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

INDOT ES/District Env.
Reviewer Signature: Date:

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: Mark A. Beck, PE; CrossRoad Engineers, P.C.

This is page 1 of 25 Project name: Bridge Project, SR 135 over Indian Creek Date: June 22, 2018

Form Version: June 2013
Attachment 2

Attachment 1
Indiana Department of Transportation

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

Road No./County: SR 46, Franklin County
Designation Number: 1296697
Project Description/Termini: Bridge Project/ SR 46 over Little Laughery Creek, 1.22 mile west of SR 229

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Approval
ESM Signature Date ES Signature Date

FHWA Signature Date

Release for Public Involvement
N/A
ESM Initials Date

RE 7B 9-4-18
ES Initials Date

Certification of Public Involvement
Marylutz
Office of Public Involvement Date

INDOT ES/District Env.
Reviewer Signature: Date:

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: Leigh Montana, ASC Group Inc.

This is page 1 of 31 Project name: SR 46 over Little Laughery Creek Date: August 28, 2018
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LOUISVILLE DISTRICT,
THE INDIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
AND THE DELAWARE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

REGARDING
THE PROPOSED REHABILITATION OF DELAWARE COUNTY BRIDGE No. 701
DELAWARE COUNTY, INDIANA
LRL-2017-00549-MKD

WHEREAS, the Delaware County Highway Department (the Applicant) proposes to rehabilitate Delaware County Bridge No. 701 (Undertaking);

WHEREAS, the Undertaking would impact waters of the United States, requiring a permit from the Department of the Army (DA);

WHEREAS, the Applicant has applied for a DA permit (ID No. LRL-2017-00549-mkd);

WHEREAS, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Louisville District (the Corps) has defined the Undertaking's permit area pursuant to 33 CFR Part 325 Appendix C as the impacts to waters of the United States, the bridge, the bridge approaches and any associated access and staging areas;

WHEREAS, the Corps has coordinated the cultural resources review pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended (54 U.S.C. 300101 et seq);

WHEREAS, the Corps has consulted with the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other consulting parties pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800, regulations implementing the NHPA;

WHEREAS, the Corps and the SHPO have determined that the Undertaking would have an Adverse Effect upon Bridge 701, which has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion C;

WHEREAS, the applicant has been invited to sign the MOA; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a)(1), the Corps has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of its Adverse Effect determination, provided the specified documentation, and the ACHP has chosen not to participate in the consultation pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(a)(1)(iii);

NOW, THEREFORE, the Corps, the Applicant, and the SHPO agree that the Undertaking shall be accomplished in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the effect of the Undertaking on a historic property.

Attachment 3
Stipulations

The Corps shall condition the permit, if issued, to ensure that the following stipulations are implemented in a timely manner:

I. DELAWARE COUNTY BRIDGE No 701

A. Recordation

1. In order to preserve a record of its history and appearance, the Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the bridge is recorded by a SHPO-approved professional architect, historian, architectural historian, or qualified engineer experienced in the documentation of engineering resources who meets or exceeds the qualifications set forth in the Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation” (48 FR 44716-42). Indiana Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology Minimum Architectural Documentation Standards are specified and will include:

   a. Archival research to gather specific historic information from appropriate data sources; a brief report describing the history and architectural significance of the bridge will be prepared.

   b. Digital Photodocumentation of the bridge to include prints from digital images showing the bridge’s architectural and structural elements, surrounding environmental settings, views from each approach, and any other significant, character-defining details. A set of black and white prints printed on archival quality, acid free paper labeled with the bridge name, address, city, county, date, site number, and direction, in pencil or archival photographic marker shall be provided to SHPO along with a compact-disc (CD) containing the electronic data files saved in uncompressed .TIF format and a digital photo log;

   c. If available, a copy of the original construction plans and details shall be provided by the Applicant. If no construction plans are available, the applicant shall provide measured drawings of the structure prepared by an architect or architectural historian experienced in producing measured drawings. Architectural drawings may be done using Computer-Aided Drafting (CAD) or by hand with ink on translucent material; all materials must be archival stable and clearly labeled. Architectural drawings must be reduced to 8.5” x 11” or scanned into a readily available viewing program such as PDF;

   d. Drafts of the completed documentation will be submitted by the Applicant to the Corps and to the SHPO for review and acceptance. Upon notification of acceptance, the applicant will provide one original and one copy to the SHPO. The applicant will make the information available on its web site and will also provide copies of the completed documentation to Indiana Landmarks, Eastern Regional Office. Completed documentation must be reviewed and approved by the SHPO prior to any work beginning on the bridge.
II. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

A. The Applicant shall ensure that all historic documentation work undertaken and completed pursuant to this Memorandum of Agreement is accomplished by or under the direct supervision of a preservation professional meeting the qualifications set forth in the Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation” (48 FR 44716-42). The Applicant, through consultation with the SHPO, shall ensure that the preservation professional selected to complete the work has been approved for such work by the SHPO.

III. POST REVIEW DISCOVERY

A. If, during the implementation of the Undertaking, a previously unidentified cultural resource is encountered, the applicant will ensure that the construction contractor stops work within 100 feet of the newly identified cultural resource and immediately notify the Corps.

B. Upon notification of a previously unknown resource, the Corps will notify the IN SHPO and consult with the IN SHPO, the applicant and consulting parties to evaluate the newly identified resource and/or develop an appropriate treatment plan, as necessary, pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800, and the Secretary of the Interior’s "Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation"; IC 14-21-1, 312 IAC 21, and 312 IAC 22 and the most current Guidebook for Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory—Archaeological Sites.

IV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A. Should any signatory, or invited signatory who signs the MOA object at any time in writing to the Corps regarding any action carried out or proposed with respect to the Undertaking or to the manner in which the terms of this MOA are implemented, the Corps shall consult with such party to resolve the objection. The Corps also shall notify the other signatories and concouring parties to this MOA of such objection, and provide them the opportunity to participate in any consultations to resolve the objection. If the Corps determines that such objection cannot be resolved, the Corps will forward all documentation relevant to the dispute, including the Corps’s proposed resolution, to the ACHP. Within thirty (30) days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the ACHP shall exercise one of the following options:

1. Advise the Corps that the ACHP concurs in the Corps’s proposed response to the objection, whereupon the Corps will respond to the objecting party accordingly; or

2. Provide the Corps with recommendations, which the Corps shall take into account in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection.

B. Should the ACHP not exercise one of the above options within thirty (30) days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the Corps may assume the ACHP’s concurrence in its proposed response to the objection.
Memorandum of Agreement
Delaware County Bridge No. 701
LRL-2017-00540-002

V. TERMINATION

A. If the Corps determines that it cannot implement the terms of this agreement, or if a signatory or invited signatory that signs the MOA determines that the agreement is not being properly implemented, such party may propose to the other signatories to this agreement that it be terminated, in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(c)(1) and (8).

B. The party proposing to terminate this agreement shall so notify all parties to this agreement, including the concurring parties, explaining the reasons for termination and affording the parties at least thirty (30) days to consult and seek alternatives to termination. The parties shall then consult.

C. If after the expiration of thirty (30) days (or such greater time period as may be agreed upon by all signatories) an agreement to avoid termination cannot be reached, the Corps or other signatory may terminate this agreement by so notifying all parties in writing.

D. Should this agreement be terminated, the Corps shall either:

1. Consult in accordance with 36 C.F.R. § 800.6 to develop a new MOA; or
2. Request the comments of the ACHP pursuant to 36 C.F.R. § 800.7.

VI. AMENDMENTS

A. Any signatory, or invited signatory, to this agreement that signs the MOA may propose to the Corps that the agreement be amended, whereupon the Corps shall consult with the other parties to this agreement to consider such an amendment. 36 C.F.R. § 800.6(c)(1) and (7) shall govern the execution of any such amendment. The signatures of all of the signatories shall be required for any amendment hereto to be effective.

VII. DURATION

A. If the terms of this agreement have not been implemented within six months of the issue date of the Permit (if such a permit is issued by the Corps), this agreement shall no longer be in effect. In such event, the Corps shall so notify the parties to this agreement, and shall re-initiate review of the Undertaking in accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part 800.

B. This agreement shall be effective upon signature of the Corps and filing with the ACHP and shall remain in effect until the earliest of the following occurs: all of its terms are satisfied, the implementation period has expired, or it is amended or terminated and replaced.

C. Execution of this agreement and implementation of its terms shall evidence that the Corps has afforded the ACHP an opportunity to comment on the proposed Delaware County Bridge 701 rehabilitation project and its effects on historic properties, and that the Corps has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties.
Memorandum of Agreement
Delaware County Bridge No. 761
LRL-2017-00549-nckd

SIGNATORIES:

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LOUISVILLE DISTRICT

Lee Anne Devine
Chief, Regulatory Division

30 Jan 2018
Date

INDIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

Mitchell K. Zoll
Division Director
Indiana Department of Historic Preservation and Archaeology

11/18/2015
Date
Memorandum of Agreement
Delaware County Bridge No. 701
LRL-2017-00549-mkd

INVITED SIGNATORY:

DELAWARE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

James King, President

Sherry Riggin, Vice President

Shannon Henry, Member

Steven G. Craycraft
Delaware County Auditor - Attest

1/16/2018
1/16/18
01/14/2018
01/16/2018

Date
Date
Date
Date

Attachment 3
Crew working on Delaware County bridge finds 80-year-old note

ALBANY, Ind. – A crew working on a bridge in Delaware County came across a real blast from the past: a letter from the workers who built it eight decades ago.

According to officials in Albany, workers were using a jackhammer to break up concrete last week on the Water Street Bridge/Bridge 701 when they came across a glass jar. The jar broke when it hit the ground—but it was the paper inside that got the crew’s attention.

When they unfolded the tattered piece of paper, they found the names of 17 people who worked on the bridge in 1938 and 1939.

The note is titled “List of last crew working on the bridge, May 16th, 1939.” It lists the names of carpenters, cement finishers, laborers, a tool checker, concrete mixer operator, carpenters’ helpers and timekeeper.

The note concludes with a simple request: “Should this list at some later date be found, please publish in Albany and Muncie newspapers.”
The town of Albany posted the photo on its Facebook page last week. City officials are asking any family members of the 30s bridge crew to contact them:

If any of these workers were from your family, and you have a picture of them, please send it to townofalbany@albanyin.com. We would like to honor the crew members by recognizing them. We will be posting this picture on our Facebook page also and would like family and friends of crew members to share a memory of them. If you heard any stories about the bridge construction from these crew members, please share that with us.

The town plans to put the note on display.
People Trail’s new Haw Creek crossing finished

By Mark Webber — Feb. 7 3:30am

The pedestrian crossing over Haw Creek in Columbus — a project years in the making — has opened for walking, jogging or bicycling after a series of delays.

Barricades were removed late last week from the newly
People Trail’s new Haw Creek crossing finished

refurbished old Newbern Bridge almost five months after the historic structure was placed in position south of the 25th Street bridge.

A post-opening ribbon-cutting ceremony is expected to be scheduled in the next two to three weeks, Columbus Parks director Mark Jones said.

After three cranes hoisted the structure into place over Haw Creek on Sept. 7, local officials expressed optimism about an official opening six weeks later.

Story continues below gallery
However, manufacturing problems involving a subcontractor hired to construct specialty railings resulted in long and unanticipated delays, Jones said.

Unexpected obstacles involving the old Newbern Bridge have reached almost a legendary status among county officials and contractors.

As historic bridge consultant D. Eric Brunn put it last year, it’s the only local project that took three decades spanning two millenniums to complete.

**Bridge history**

In 1999, the Bartholomew County commissioners voted to close the deteriorating one-lane, iron-truss bridge along County Road 850E in the eastern part of the county.

Initially, efforts were undertaken to move the historic structure to Anderson Falls Park, but that idea was eventually dropped in favor of the People Trail in Columbus.

The first big delay came in 2001, when archaeologists uncovered more than 350 artifacts at the site. More than $100,000 in local tax money was spent to carefully excavate the area, remove the artifacts and to document them.

But without that investment of time and money, the county risked losing federal funds to build a new bridge, as well as a $584,000 state grant to refurbish the existing one, county commissioner Larry Kleinhenz said.

After being forced to file extensive paperwork on the structure’s historic status, the county was then required to spend thousands of dollars for redesign work and soil tests required to keep the federal grants.
Further delays came when the county went to court in 2012 to establish who owned five parcels of needed property near Clifty Creek.

Later that same year, the state pulled its reconstruction grant because delays made transportation officials believe the county was never going to spend the money. It took more than a year of lobbying before the grant was restored in January 2014.

It took 16 years after the commissioners determined the old bridge had to go before the old bridge finally went.

Three cranes lifted the historic structure from its foundations near the Newbern United Methodist Church in February 2015. The replacement bridge was installed in less than a year.

After the old bridge was completely disassembled, each piece was transported to a northern Indiana metal shop, Brunn said.

New parts were substituted for pieces that could not be salvaged, said Brunn, who works for the Columbus-based engineering consulting firm Strand Associates.

Old rivets were taken out, new bolts were put in, and rusted joints were replaced, county highway engineer Danny Hollander said.

Despite the extensive amount of work, Hollander estimates about 95 percent of the original bridge remains.

**New home**

Last spring, workers began to reassemble all the pieces on the east bank of Haw Creek in Columbus. The now-bright-red structure was finally moved into place shortly after Labor Day weekend.
Pre-assembled wood decking was then placed on the structure, while permanent foundation attachments were made, Jones said.

While long-term bridge maintenance is now the responsibility of the city of Columbus, Jones says it’s worth the expense.

It will provide bicyclists and pedestrians safe passage across the river without having to dealing with traffic on busy 25th Street or National Road, he said.

Additionally, organizers of the Mill Race Marathon, conducted each September, will consider whether to incorporate the bridge into the running courses, Jones said.

**Newbern Bridge timeline**

1910: Original bridge constructed over Clifty Creek along County Road 850N on the northwest side of Newbern. Originally built for trains, the bridge was later modified for vehicular traffic.

1982: Bridge reconstructed.

1999: Bartholomew County Commissioners vote to replace the aging bridge and $960,000 in federal funding is acquired for the project.

2001: Archaeologists uncover more than 350 artifacts under Clifty Creek at the site. Replacement is delayed.

2003: Despite concerns over deterioration, the 12-ton weight limit for the Newbern Bridge is maintained.

2004: Indiana first lady Nancy Kernan announces Bartholomew County will receive a $584,000 state grant to refurbish the existing Newbern bridge once it is replaced.

2010: Proposal emerges that the old bridge could be used as part of the Columbus People Trails, spanning Haw Creek south of 25th Street.

2012: Due to delays, the 2004 grant for the reconstruction project over Haw Creek is dropped by the state.

2013: Both city and county leaders lobby the state Department of Transportation to restore reconstruction funds.

2014: The transportation department agrees to restore funding in January. A determination is made to close the 104-year-old bridge the first full week of November.

2015: Historic Newbern Bridge taken apart, transported on flatbed trucks to Lincoln Park in Columbus, where it will be stored prior to restoration.

2016: County approves funds needed to restore the bridge for use as a pedestrian path.

2017: The bridge is reassembled on the east side of the river over several months and finally placed in position over Haw Creek on Sept. 7. Delays in obtaining specialty railings keeps the crossing closed for several months.

2018: Barricades are removed Feb. 1 that allow the 108-year-old bridge to become part of a new Columbus People Trail extension.
**Indiana Department of Transportation**

County  Montgomery  Route  SR 32  Des. No.  1400240

FHWA-Indiana Environmental Document

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM**

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road No./County:</th>
<th>SR 32 / Montgomery County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation Number:</td>
<td>1400240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Project - SR 32 over Walnut Fork Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project limits will extend 120 ft. west of the bridge, and 180 ft. east of the bridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After completing this form, I conclude that this project qualifies for the following type of Categorical Exclusion (FHWA must review/approve if Level 4 (C5)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Approval  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6-6-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESM Signature  | Date  | ES Signature  | Date |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert E. Dike</td>
<td>2018.06.06 14:02:26</td>
<td>-04'00'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FHWA Signature  | Date |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-6-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Release for Public Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Release for Public Involvement</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESM Initials</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wright</td>
<td>5/21/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification of Public Involvement

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

INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature:  | Date |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-6-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer:  

Blayna Stoner Phillips, Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC

This is page 1 of 23  | Project name:  | Bridge Project SR 32 over Walnut Fork Creek  | Date:  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 3, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form Version: June 2013
Attachment 2
Indian Department of Transportation

County Dearborn County

Route SR 46 over East Fork of Tanners Creek

FHWA-Indiana Environmental Document

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Road No./County: SR 46, Dearborn County

Designation Number: 1383701

Project Description/Termini: Bridge rehabilitation or bridge that carries SR 46, crossing East Fork of Tanners Creek in Dearborn County, Indiana

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical Exclusion, Level 2</th>
<th>The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical Exclusion, Level 3</td>
<td>The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Categorical Exclusion, Level 4</td>
<td>The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Assessment (EA) - EAs require a separate FONSI. Additional research and documentation is necessary to determine the effects on the environment. Required Signatories: ES, FHWA

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

Approval ___________________________ Date ___________________________

ESM Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

FHWA Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Release for Public Involvement

ESM Initials ___________________________ Date ___________________________

ES Initials ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Certification of Public Involvement

Name and Organization of CE/EA Prepare: SR 46 over East Fork of Tanners Creek Bridge Rehabilitation

Date: 1/25/18

Office of Public Involvement

Date: 1/25/18

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

INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: Harry Hildes, ASC Group, Inc.

Date: 2/20/18

This is page 1 of 28 Project Name: SR 46 over East Fork of Tanners Creek Bridge Rehabilitation

Date: November 8, 2017

Form Version: June 2013
Attachment 2
**Indiana Department of Transportation**

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM**

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road No./County:</th>
<th>Pagoda Drive/Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation Number:</td>
<td>1401724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description/Termini:</td>
<td>Pagoda Drive over Pleasant Run Bridge Project - Approximately 0.12 mile south of Raymond Street within Garfield Park, Marion County, Indiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Categorical Exclusion, Level 2**
- The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager)

**Categorical Exclusion, Level 3**
- The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division)

**Categorical Exclusion, Level 4**
- The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA

**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 within which the project is located to release for public involvement or sign for approval.

**Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESM Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ES Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert E. Dirks</td>
<td>3/7/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FHWA Signature

**Release for Public Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESM Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ES Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>REB</td>
<td>12-21-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certification of Public Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mary Wright</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Public Involvement</td>
<td>2/2/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature:**

Signature: [Signature]

Date: 3/7/18

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

Jaime Byerly / RQAW Corporation

**This is page 1 of 40**

**Project name:** Pagoda Drive over Pleasant Run Bridge Project

**Date:** December 21, 2017
Indiana Department of Transportation

County: Montgomery  Route: SR 32 over Sugar Creek  Des. No. 1298423

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

Road No./County: SR 32 / Montgomery County
Designation Number: 1298423
Project Description/Termini: Bridge Project, Bridge No. 032-54-03347A carrying SR 32 over Sugar Creek, 200 feet east and west of the bridge

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

| Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager) |
| Categorical Exclusion, Level 3 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division) |
| Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 4 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES, FHWA |

Environmental Assessment (EA) – EAs require a separate FONSI. Additional research and documentation is necessary to determine the effects on the environment. Required Signatories: ES, FHWA

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

Approval
ESM Signature  Date  ES Signature  Date
N/A

Release for Public Involvement
ESM Initials  Date  ES Initials  Date
N/A  4-2-18

Certification of Public Involvement
ESM Initials  Date
Office of Public Involvement  Date
Mary Wright  5/21/18

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

INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature:
Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: Christian Radcliff, Beam, Longest and Neff, LLC

This is page 1 of 25  Project name: Bridge Project  Date: March 26, 2018

Attachment 9
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION AND
THE INDIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
SUBMITTED TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
PERSUANT TO 36 C.F.R. Section 800.6(b)(iv)
FOR THE CRAWFORD COUNTY BRIDGE NO. 42 PROJECT
ON SOUTH ALTON ROAD (COUNTY ROAD 253) OVER MILL CREEK
IN BOONE TOWNSHIP, CRAWFORD COUNTY, INDIANA
INDOT DES. NO. 1400804

WHEREAS the Crawford County Board of Commissioners proposes to bypass Bridge No. 42 (NBI No. 1300033) in Boone Township, Crawford County, Indiana, and proposes to use funds administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO"), has defined the bypass project's area of potential effects ("APE"), as the term is defined in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.16(d), to include the project area and parcels adjacent to the project limits, with extensions to the east and southeast of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 to account for all potential alternatives and environmental factors; and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has found that Crawford County Bridge No. 42 carrying South Alton Road (County Road 253) over Mill Creek (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory [IHSSI] No. 025-042-30023) is within the APE; and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has determined, pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.4(c), that Crawford County Bridge No. 42 is eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("National Register"); and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has determined pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.5(a) that the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 will have an adverse effect on Crawford County Bridge No. 42; and

WHEREAS the FHWA has consulted with the Indiana SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108) and its implementing regulations (36 C.F.R. Section 800) to resolve the adverse effect to Crawford County Bridge No. 42; and

WHEREAS the public was given an opportunity to comment on the undertaking's adverse effect in a notice published on January 24, 2018 in the Clarion News; and

WHEREAS the FHWA has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation ("Council") of the adverse effect and invited the Council's participation in the project, pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.6(a)(1), in a letter dated January 22, 2018; and

WHEREAS the Council declined to participate in consultation in a letter dated February 6, 2018; and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has invited the Crawford County Board of Commissioners, the Indiana Department of Transportation ("INDOT"), and the Sycamore Springs Park/Clayton Roberson Family Foundation to participate in the consultation and to become signatories to this memorandum of agreement; and
WHEREAS the FHWA has consulted with the Indiana SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f) and its implementing regulations (36 C.F.R. Part 800) concerning the scope of work as presented in the materials dated January 17, 2018, and has agreed to proceed with the project as proposed; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the FHWA and the Indiana SHPO agree that, upon the submission of a copy of this executed memorandum of agreement, as well as the documentation specified in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.11(e) and (f) to the Council pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.6[b][1][iv]) and upon the FHWA’s approval of the bypass of Crawford County Bridge No. 42, the FHWA shall ensure that the following stipulations are implemented in order to take into account the effect of the undertaking on historic properties.

STIPULATIONS

I. Mitigation for the Crawford County Bridge No. 42 bypass will consist of the following measures.

A. Crawford County has secured Local Public Agency (LPA) funds (INDOT Des. No. 1800979) for either the preservation of the bridge in place or the relocation and rehabilitation of the structure by a qualified recipient(s). The recipient of the bridge shall enter into a third party agreement with the LPA to use the funds for the relocation and rehabilitation, if the bridge is not rehabilitated in place by Crawford County.

B. Sycamore Springs Park, operated by the Clayton Roberson Family Foundation, has offered to take ownership of Crawford County Bridge No. 42. If Sycamore Springs Park decides not to take ownership of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 or cannot demonstrate that it is a qualified recipient, then Crawford County shall advertise the availability of the bridge for adaptive re-use through local outreach and public notices in local and regional newspapers quarterly until the opening of the new bridge. If no qualified recipient comes forward to accept the bridge during this period, Crawford County shall rehabilitate the bridge in place in accordance with Stipulation I.G. and provide a parking area nearby for access to the bridge.

C. If Crawford County, INDOT, FHWA, and the Indiana SHPO agree that the offer and the proposed recipient are suitable and satisfactory to all parties, then the transfer of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 to Sycamore Springs Park or another qualified recipient may proceed, either instead of, or following, the rehabilitation of the bridge in place by Crawford County.

D. Sycamore Springs Park or other qualified recipient(s) of the structure must agree to the following terms prior to accepting ownership of Crawford County Bridge No. 42:

1. Accept all ownership rights and responsibilities connected now or in the future with the bridge.
2. Leave the bridge open to the public.
3. Maintain the features that give the structure its historical significance for a minimum period of twenty-five (25) years from the date from which the recipient(s) takes title of the bridge.
4. Assume future legal and financial responsibility for the bridge.
5. Indemnify and hold harmless any and all entities to include but not limited to Crawford County, the Crawford County Board of Commissioners, the Crawford County Highway Department, its elected officials, its appointed officials, its employees, and/or its agents for any and all expenses or charges to include attorney
fees that these entities or persons might have to pay by virtue of the successful owners’ actions, non-actions, or performance.

E. Sycamore Springs Park or any other qualified recipient(s) shall be required to provide photographs and mapping of the relocation site for Crawford County Bridge No. 42 to the Indiana SHPO for review, and perform archaeological investigations, as needed, at the proposed relocation site, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO. Sycamore Springs Park or any other qualified recipient(s) shall be permitted to change the relocation site in order to avoid an archaeological site.

F. If Crawford County Bridge No. 42 is to be dismantled, then the Crawford County Board of Commissioners shall prepare a disassembly plan for the bridge, which will be submitted to the Indiana SHPO for a 30-day review and comment period prior to beginning dismantling. The plan will include a description of how the bridge will be disassembled, transported to the relocation site, and reassembled to ensure that the bridge’s integrity is not diminished and that bridge components will not be damaged. The submitter of the disassembly plan will provide a written response to Indiana SHPO comments before proceeding. If comments are not received within thirty (30) days, the submitter may assume agreement from the Indiana SHPO on the plan submitted.

G. The Crawford County Board of Commissioners, or any other qualified recipient(s), will rehabilitate Crawford County Bridge No. 42 adhering as much as possible to the applicable rehabilitation standards and guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (“Standards”). The Crawford County Board of Commissioners shall submit detailed reassembly and rehabilitation plans for Crawford County Bridge No. 42 to the Indiana SHPO for a 30-day review and comment period prior to reassembly and rehabilitation. The submitter of the reassembly and rehabilitation plans will provide a written response to Indiana SHPO comments before proceeding. If comments are not received within thirty (30) days, the submitter may assume agreement from the Indiana SHPO on the plans submitted.

H. Prior to the commencement of construction activities for the new bridge, Crawford County Bridge No. 42 shall be documented by a qualified historian or architectural historian as defined by the Indiana SHPO in accordance with the Indiana SHPO Minimum Architectural Documentation Standards, which includes:

1. Archival research to gather specific historic information from appropriate data sources; a brief report describing the history and significance of the bridge and surrounding area will be prepared.
2. Digital photo documentation of the bridge shall include prints from digital images showing the bridges’ structural elements and details, surrounding environmental settings, views from each approach, and any other significant, character-defining details. A set of black and white prints printed on archival quality, acid-free paper labeled with the bridge name, address, city, county, date, site number, and direction, in pencil or archival photographic marker. A compact disc (“CD”) containing the electronic data files saved in uncompressed TIF format and a digital photo log shall be provided.
3. If available, a copy of original construction plans or other field plans or drawings maintained about the bridge shall be included. If satisfactory plans are not available, measured drawings of the structure will be prepared by an architect or architectural historian experienced in producing measured drawings. Drawings must be reduced to 8.5” x 11” or scanned into a readily available viewing program.
4. One draft of the completed documentation shall be submitted for a 30-day review period to the Indiana SHPO. The documentation shall be approved prior to any...
demolition or construction activities at the site. Upon notification of approval by the SHPO, one set of the documentation shall be provided to a public or not-for-profit entity in Crawford County that will retain the documentation permanently for access by the public and one set of the documentation shall be provided to the Indiana State Archives. The SHPO shall be notified of the final transmittal.

II. OBJECTION RESOLUTION PROVIDION

Disagreement and misunderstanding about how this memorandum of agreement is or is not being implemented shall be resolved in the following manner:

A. If the Indiana SHPO or any invited signatory to this memorandum of agreement should object in writing to the FHWA regarding any action carried out or proposed with respect to the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 or implementation of this memorandum of agreement, then the FHWA shall consult with the objecting party to resolve this objection. If after such consultation the FHWA determines that the objection cannot be resolved through consultation, then the FHWA shall forward all documentation relevant to the objection to the Council, including the FHWA's proposed response to the objection. Within 45 days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the Council shall exercise one of the following options:

i. Provide the FHWA with a staff-level recommendation, which the FHWA shall take into account in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection; or

ii. Notify the FHWA that the objection will be referred for formal comment pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.7(c), and proceed to refer the objection and comment. The FHWA shall take into account the Council's comments in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection.

B. If comments or recommendations from the Council are provided in accordance with this stipulation, then the FHWA shall take into account any Council comment or recommendations provided in accordance with this stipulation with reference only to the subject of the objection. The FHWA's responsibility to carry out all actions under the memorandum of agreement that are not the subjects of the objection shall remain unchanged.

III. POST-REVIEW DISCOVERY

In the event that one or more historic properties—other than Crawford County Bridge No. 42 (IHSSI No. 025-042-30023)—are discovered or that unanticipated effects on historic properties are found during the implementation of this memorandum of agreement, the FHWA shall follow the procedure specified in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.13, as well as IC 14-21-1-27 and IC 14-21-1-29, by stopping work in the immediate area and informing the Indiana SHPO and the INDOT Cultural Resources Office of such unanticipated discoveries or effects within two (2) business days. Any necessary archaeological investigations will be conducted according to the provisions of IC 14-21-1, 312 IAC 21, 312 IAC 22, and the most current Guidebook for Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory – Archaeological Sites.

IV. AMENDMENT

Any signatory to this memorandum of agreement may request that it be amended, whereupon the parties shall consult to consider the proposed amendment. 36 C.F.R. 800.6(c)(7) shall govern the execution of any such amendment.
V. TERMINATION

A. If the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 has not commenced within ten (10) years of the signing of this memorandum of agreement, or if the rehabilitation of Crawford County Bridge No. 42 pursuant to Stipulation I.I. has not commenced within ten (10) years of the opening to traffic of the bridge that bypasses Crawford County Bridge No. 42, then this memorandum of agreement shall be considered null and void. In such an event, the FHWA shall so notify the parties to this memorandum of agreement and, if it chooses to continue with the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 42, then it shall reinitiate consultation with the other consulting parties on developing a new memorandum of agreement pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800.

B. Any signatory to this memorandum of agreement may terminate it by providing thirty (30) days notice to the other parties, provided that the parties shall consult during the period prior to termination to seek agreement on amendments or other actions that would avoid termination. In the event of termination, the FHWA shall comply with 36 C.F.R. Sections 800.3 through 800.7 with regard to the review of the bridge bypass project.

C. In the event that the FHWA does not carry out the terms of this memorandum of agreement, the FHWA shall comply with 36 C.F.R. Sections 800.3 through 800.7 with regard to the review of the bridge bypass project.

The execution of this memorandum of agreement by the FHWA, INDOT, Crawford County Board of Commissioners, and the Indiana SHPO, the submission of it to the Council with the appropriate documentation specified in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.11(e) and (f), and the implementation of its terms evidence that the FHWA has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the bridge bypass project and its effect on historic properties and that the FHWA has taken into account the effects of the bridge bypass project on historic properties.
REQUIRED SIGNATORY

INDIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: [Signature]
Christopher A. Smith, Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Date: 7/17/18

Des. No.: 1400804, Final MOA, June 19, 2018 Version
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INVITED SIGNATORY

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: [Signature]
Laura Hilden, Environmental Services Director

Date: 6/22/2018
INVITED SIGNATORY

CRAWFORD COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

By: Dan Crecelius, Commissioner

Date: 6-28-18

By: Larry Ingle, Commissioner

Date: 6-28-18

By: Morton Dale, Commissioner

Date: 6-28-18

Des. No.: 1400804, Final MOA, June 19, 2018 Version
INVITED SIGNATORY

SYCAMORE SPRINGS PARK/CLAYTON ROBERSON FAMILY FOUNDATION

By: Ms. Nidrah Dial

Date: 6/22/2018

Ms. Nidrah Dial
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION AND
THE INDIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
SUBMITTED TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
PURSUANT TO 36 C.F.R. Section 800.6(b)(iv) FOR THE
CRAWFORD COUNTY BRIDGE NO. 43 PROJECT ON
BEECHWOOD ROAD (COUNTY ROAD 4) OVER THE LITTLE BLUE RIVER
IN BOONE TOWNSHIP, CRAWFORD COUNTY, INDIANA
INDOT DES. NO. 1400825

WHEREAS the Crawford County Board of Commissioners proposes to bypass Bridge No. 43 (NBI No. 1300071) in Boone Township, Crawford County, Indiana, and proposes to use funds administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO"), has defined the bypass project's area of potential effects (“APE”), as the term is defined in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.16(d), to include the project area and parcels within 500 ft from the project limits to account for all potential alternatives and environmental factors; and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has found that Crawford County Bridge No. 43 carrying Beechwood Road (County Road 4) over the Little Blue River (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory No. 025-042-30003) is within the APE; and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has determined, pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.4(c), that Crawford County Bridge No. 43 is eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (“National Register”); and

WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has determined pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.5(a) that the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 will have an adverse effect on Crawford County Bridge No. 43; and

WHEREAS the FHWA has consulted with the Indiana SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108) and its implementing regulations (36 C.F.R. Section 800) to resolve the adverse effect to Crawford County Bridge No. 43; and

WHEREAS the public was given an opportunity to comment on the undertaking's adverse effect in a notice published on July 11, 2018, in the Clarion News; and

WHEREAS the FHWA has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (“Council”) of the adverse effect and invited the Council's participation in the project, pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.6(a)(1), in a letter dated May 18, 2018; and

WHEREAS the Council declined to participate in consultation in a letter dated June 12, 2018; and
WHEREAS the FHWA, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO, has invited the Crawford County Board of Commissioners (“Crawford County”) and the Indiana Department of Transportation (“INDOT”) to participate in the consultation and to become signatories to this memorandum of agreement; and

WHEREAS the FHWA has consulted with the Indiana SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. § 306108) and its implementing regulations (36 C.F.R. Part 800) concerning the scope of work as presented in the materials dated May 18, 2018, and has agreed to proceed with the project as proposed; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the FHWA and the Indiana SHPO agree that, upon the submission of a copy of this executed memorandum of agreement, as well as the documentation specified in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.11(e) and (f) to the Council pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.6[b][1][iv]) and upon the FHWA's approval of the bypass of Crawford County Bridge No. 43, the FHWA shall ensure that the following stipulations are implemented in order to take into account the effect of the undertaking on historic properties.

STIPULATIONS

I. Mitigation for the Crawford County Bridge No. 43 bypass shall consist of the following measures.

   A. Crawford County has been attempting to market the availability of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 to interested parties through INDOT’s Historic Bridge Program since April 2017, and through signs posted at the project site since June 2017, and shall continue to actively pursue finding a new location for Crawford County Bridge No. 43 by those two measures, as well as by advertising the availability of the bridge for adaptive re-use through the additional measures listed below. This marketing period shall continue either until there is a signed agreement between Crawford County and a qualified recipient committing the qualified recipient to adhere to the terms of this memorandum of agreement or until after the opening of the bypassing bridge to vehicular traffic (anticipated to be approximately 12-18 months after the execution of this memorandum of agreement), whichever occurs first. Crawford County shall engage in the following, additional measures to advertise the bridge’s availability:

      1. Crawford County shall place advertisements or articles regarding the availability of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 in relevant statewide publications, including, at minimum, the Association of Indiana Counties Indiana News and the Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority’s IHCDA…The Magazine;

      2. Crawford County shall contact, by direct mailing, local and regional agencies, local government representatives, and state and local parks from surrounding counties to make them aware of the availability of the bridge. When preparing mailings, Crawford County shall request that the Indiana
SHPO review the list and submit names of any other entities that should be contacted.

3. Crawford County shall work with a local newspaper to publish a feature article describing the significance and availability of the bridge;

4. Crawford County shall place advertisements/public notices regarding the availability of the bridge in the *Indianapolis Star* and no less than (2) local newspapers covering the portion of the state near Crawford County. The notices shall occur within (1) month of the signing of this agreement and be followed by subsequent notices after three (3) months;

5. Crawford County shall work with the Crawford County Chamber of Commerce, the Crawford County Redevelopment Board, and other such organizations to feature the availability of the bridge in the e-mail newsletters of these organizations; and

6. Crawford County Bridge No. 43 shall remain posted on INDOT’s Historic Bridge Program website through the duration of these activities.

B. Should a qualified recipient come forward to accept ownership of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 during the period outlined in Stipulation I.A., the following stipulations shall apply:

1. Crawford County Bridge No. 43 shall remain in its original location until construction of the bypassing Beechwood Road (County Road 4) crossing over the Little Blue River is complete and open to traffic.

2. The qualified recipient of the structure shall be required to provide a written proposal to INDOT, FHWA, and Indiana SHPO for review and approval. The proposal shall include photographs and mapping depicting the proposed relocation site for Crawford County Bridge No. 43 and demonstrate sufficient funding to carry out the project in an appropriate manner. The recipient shall agree to perform archaeological investigations, as needed, at the proposed relocation site, in consultation with the Indiana SHPO. The qualified recipient shall be permitted to change the relocation site in order to avoid an archaeological site.

3. The qualified recipient of the bridge shall agree to the following terms through a written agreement with Crawford County prior to accepting ownership of Crawford County Bridge No. 43:
   a. Accept all ownership rights and responsibilities connected now or in the future with the bridge;
   b. Leave the bridge open to the public;
c. Maintain the features that give the structure its historical significance for a minimum period of twenty-five (25) years from the date from which the qualified recipient takes title of the bridge;
d. Assume future legal and financial responsibility for the bridge; and
e. Indemnify and hold harmless any and all entities to include but not limited to Crawford County, the Crawford County Board of Commissioners, the Crawford County Highway Department, its elected officials, its appointed officials, its employees, and/or its agents for any and all expenses or charges to include attorney fees that these entities or persons might have to pay by virtue of the successful owners’ actions, non-actions, or performance.

4. If the County, INDOT, FHWA, and Indiana SHPO agree that the offer and the recipient are suitable and satisfactory to all parties, the transfer of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 may proceed.

5. If Crawford County Bridge No. 43 is to be dismantled, then the qualified recipient that is acquiring the bridge shall prepare a disassembly plan for the bridge, which shall be submitted to INDOT and Indiana SHPO for a 30-day review and comment period prior to beginning dismantling. The plan shall include match-marking and mapping the bridge’s components to facilitate the structure’s reassembly at the relocation site. The qualified recipient shall provide a written response to Indiana SHPO comments before proceeding. If comments are not received within thirty (30) days, the qualified recipient may assume agreement from the Indiana SHPO on the plan submitted.

6. If Crawford County Bridge No. 43 is to be temporarily stored as part of the dismantling and reassembly, larger components shall be placed on blocks or railroad ties stored off the ground to discourage deterioration of bridge members. Smaller components (e.g., bearings, bracing rods, etc.) and other detached members shall be stored indoors in a secured facility.

7. The qualified recipient shall rehabilitate Crawford County Bridge No. 43 adhering as much as possible to the applicable rehabilitation standards and guidelines of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties ("Standards"). The qualified recipient shall submit detailed reassembly and rehabilitation plans for Crawford County Bridge No. 43 to INDOT and Indiana SHPO for a 30-day review and comment period prior to reassembly and rehabilitation. The qualified recipient shall provide a written response to Indiana SHPO comments before proceeding. If comments are not received within thirty (30) days, the qualified recipient may assume agreement from the Indiana SHPO on the plans submitted.

C. Should no qualified recipient come forward to accept ownership of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 during the period outlined in Stipulation I.A., Crawford County shall be allowed to proceed with demolition of Crawford County Bridge No. 43.
D. Prior to the commencement of construction activities for the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 43, Crawford County shall ensure that the bridge is documented by a qualified historian or architectural historian as defined by the Indiana SHPO in accordance with the *Indiana SHPO Minimum Architectural Documentation Standards*, which includes:

1. Archival research to gather specific historic information from appropriate data sources; a brief report describing the history and significance of the bridge and surrounding area shall be prepared.

2. Digital photo documentation of the bridge shall include prints from digital images showing the bridges’ structural elements and details, surrounding environmental settings, views from each approach, and any other significant, character-defining details. A set of black and white prints printed on archival quality, acid-free paper labeled with the bridge name, address, city, county, date, site number, and direction, in pencil or archival photographic marker, and a compact disc (“CD”) containing the electronic data files saved in uncompressed TIF format and a digital photo log shall be provided.

3. If available, a copy of original construction plans or other field plans or drawings maintained about the bridge shall be included. If satisfactory plans are not available, measured drawings of the structure shall be prepared by an architect or architectural historian experienced in producing measured drawings. Drawings shall be reduced to 8.5” x 11” or scanned into a readily available viewing program.

4. Prior to the commencement of demolition or construction activities, one draft of the completed documentation shall be submitted for a 30-day review period to Indiana SHPO. The documentation shall be approved prior to any demolition or construction activities at the site. Upon notification of approval by the SHPO, one set of the documentation shall be provided to a public or not-for-profit entity in Crawford County that will retain the documentation permanently for access by the public and one set of the documentation shall be provided to the Indiana State Archives. The SHPO shall be notified of the final transmittal.

II. OBJECTION RESOLUTION PROVISION

Disagreement and misunderstanding about how this memorandum of agreement is or is not being implemented shall be resolved in the following manner:

A. If the Indiana SHPO or any invited signatory to this memorandum of agreement should object in writing to the FHWA regarding any action carried out or proposed with respect to the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 or implementation of this memorandum of agreement, then the FHWA shall consult with the objecting party to resolve this objection. If after such consultation the FHWA determines that the objection cannot be resolved through consultation, then the FHWA shall forward all documentation relevant to the objection to the Council, including the FHWA’s proposed response to the objection. Within 45
days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the Council shall exercise one of the following options:

i. Provide the FHWA with a staff-level recommendation, which the FHWA shall take into account in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection; or

ii. Notify the FHWA that the objection will be referred for formal comment pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Section 800.7(c), and proceed to refer the objection and comment. The FHWA shall take into account the Council's comments in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection.

B. If comments or recommendations from the Council are provided in accordance with this stipulation, then the FHWA shall take into account any Council comment or recommendations provided in accordance with this stipulation with reference only to the subject of the objection. The FHWA's responsibility to carry out all actions under the memorandum of agreement that are not the subjects of the objection shall remain unchanged.

III. POST-REVIEW DISCOVERY

In the event that one or more historic properties—other than Crawford County Bridge No. 43 (IHSSI No. 025-042-30002)—are discovered or that unanticipated effects on historic properties are found during the implementation of this memorandum of agreement, the FHWA shall follow the procedure specified in 36 C.F.R. 800.13, as well as IC 14-21-1-27 and IC 14-21-1-29, by stopping work in the immediate area and informing the Indiana SHPO and the INDOT Cultural Resources Office of such unanticipated discoveries or effects within two (2) business days. Any necessary archaeological investigations shall be conducted according to the provisions of IC 14-21-1, 312 IAC 21, 312 IAC 22, and the most current Guidebook for Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory – Archaeological Sites.

IV. AMENDMENT

Any signatory to this memorandum of agreement may request that it be amended, whereupon the parties shall consult to consider the proposed amendment. 36 C.F.R. 800.6(c)(7) shall govern the execution of any such amendment.

V. TERMINATION

A. If the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 43 has not commenced within ten (10) years of the signing of this memorandum of agreement, then this memorandum of agreement shall be considered null and void. In such an event, the FHWA shall so notify the parties to this memorandum of agreement and, if it chooses to continue with the bypassing of Crawford County Bridge No. 43, then it shall reinitiate consultation with the other consulting parties on developing a new memorandum of agreement pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800.
B. Any signatory to this memorandum of agreement may terminate it by providing thirty (30) days notice to the other parties, provided that the parties shall consult during the period prior to termination to seek agreement on amendments or other actions that would avoid termination. In the event of termination, the FHWA shall comply with 36 C.F.R. Sections 800.3 through 800.7 with regard to the review of the bridge bypass project.

C. In the event that the FHWA does not carry out the terms of this memorandum of agreement, the FHWA shall comply with 36 C.F.R. Sections 800.3 through 800.7 with regard to the review of the bridge bypass project.

The execution of this memorandum of agreement by the FHWA, INDOT, Crawford County Board of Commissioners, and the Indiana SHPO, the submission of it to the Council with the appropriate documentation specified in 36 C.F.R. Section 800.11(e) and (f), and the implementation of its terms evidence that the FHWA has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the bridge bypass project and its effect on historic properties and that the FHWA has taken into account the effects of the bridge bypass project on historic properties.
REQUIRED SIGNATORY

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

By: [Signature]  
For: Mayela Sosa, Division Administrator

Date: 9-17-18
REQUIRED SIGNATORY

INDIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: [Signature] Date: 9/7/2018

Christopher A. Smith, Deputy Director, Indiana Department of Natural Resources
INVITED SIGNATORY

INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: ____________________________ Date: 9/10/2018
Laura Hilden, Environmental Services Director
INVITED SIGNATORY

CRAWFORD COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

By: [Signature]  
Dan Crecelius, Commissioner  
Date: 9-13-18

By: [Signature]  
Larry Ingle, Commissioner  
Date: 9-13-18

By: [Signature]  
Mordon Dale, Commissioner  
Date: 9-13-18
JUL 19 2018

Anuradha Kumar
Manager, Cultural Resources Office
Environmental Services
Indiana Department of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Re: Application by the Indiana Department of Transportation for the rehabilitation of Bridge No. P000-07-07101B (NB1 No. 60310), also known as the Ramp Creek Covered Bridge, which carries Park Road over North Fork Salt Creek at the north entrance of Brown County State Park near Nashville, Brown County (INDOT Des. No. 1601821; DHPA No. 20504)

Dear Ms. Kumar:

You are hereby notified that the Historic Preservation Review Board ("Review Board"), at its meeting in Indianapolis on July 18, 2018, in accordance with Indiana Code § 14-21-1-18, took the following action:

In regard to Agenda Item IV.1., a certificate of approval is granted to the Indiana Department of Transportation and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources on the following conditions:

1. If any prehistoric or historic archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code § 14-21-1-27 and -29) requires that the discovery be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations.

2. This certificate of approval will remain valid through July 18, 2020.

Copies of staff comments and recommendations are available for review and copying at the office of the Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 402 West Washington Street, Room W274, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 (telephone number 317-232-1646).

This action may be appealed by filing a written petition with the Natural Resources Commission, Division of Hearings, within eighteen (18) days of the mailing of this document. The petition should be addressed to:

Division of Hearings
Natural Resources Commission
Indiana Government Center North, Room N103
100 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2200

The petition shall contain specific reasons for the appeal and shall indicate the portion or portions of the state-funded action that are being appealed.
The review is a formal legal proceeding governed by the Administrative Orders and Procedures Act, Indiana Code § 4-21.5 and the Natural Resources Commission’s rules pertaining to adjudicative proceedings, 312 Indiana Administrative Code 3-1.

Any questions regarding this matter should be directed to the Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology.

Very truly yours,

Christopher A. Smith
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

CASJLCjle
**Indiana Department of Transportation**

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM**

**GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road No./County:</th>
<th>Dandy Trail / Marion County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designation Number:</td>
<td>1401722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Improvement project, Bridge #1501F, National Bridge Inventory (NBI) #4900100, begins on Dandy Trail, approximately 360.5 feet (ft.) northeast of its intersection with Salt Lake Road and extends approximately 526 ft. northeast across Eagle Creek in Wayne Township, Marion County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 2 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM (Environmental Scoping Manager) |
| Categorical Exclusion, Level 3 – The proposed action meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion Manual Level 3 - table 1, CE Level Thresholds. Required Signatories: ESM, ES (Environmental Services Division) |
| **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.

---

**Release for Public Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESM Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certification of Public Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Public Involvement</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDOT ES/District Ery:**

**Reviewer Signature:**

| Name and Organization of CE/EA Preparer: | Samuel P. Snell and Susan Castle, Metric Environmental, LLC |
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**Project name:** Dandy Trail Bridge 1501F over Eagle Creek  
**Date:** October 10, 2018
October 31, 2018

Mary Kennedy  
Historic Bridge Specialist  
Indiana Department of Transportation  
Cultural Resources Office  
100 N. Senate Avenue, Room N642  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

State Agency: Indiana Department of Transportation

Re: Application for a certificate of approval for preventative maintenance on Bridge No. 040-30-03505 carrying US 40 over Brandywine Creek (Des. No. 1700989; DHPA #1942)

Dear Ms. Kennedy:

Pursuant to Indiana Code 14-21-1-18 and 312 IAC 20-4, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology ("DHPA") has conducted a review of the materials dated September 28, 2018 and received by the DHPA on October 2, 2018, for the above indicated project in Greenfield, Hancock County, Indiana.

Thank you for your submission for the above indicated project. Although the project area is Bridge No. 040-30-03505, which is considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and rated ‘Select’ by the Indiana Historic Bridges Inventory, based on what we currently know, there will be no adverse impact on any known historic site or historic structure that is state owned. Therefore, under Subsection 11(c) of 312 IAC 20-4, a certificate of approval will not be necessary from the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board for this project.

Pursuant to 312 IAC 20-4-11(g), within fifteen (15) days after this determination, an interested person may request a member of the review board to provide public hearing and review under 312 IAC 2-3. The designated member shall issue a determination whether an application for a certificate of approval must be filed. If the designated member determines an application must be filed, the division shall place the completed application on the agenda of the review board’s next meeting. If the designated member determines that an application for a certificate is not required, the division director’s letter of clearance is affirmed. A determination under this subsection is not effective until the later of the following:

(1) fifteen (15) days after issuance of the determination; or
(2) the day resulting from a notice given under 312 IAC 2-3-7(d).

If any archaeological artifacts, features, or human remains are uncovered during construction, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 & 29) requires that the discovery must be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646.
If you have any further questions regarding this determination, please contact Chad Slider at (317) 234-5366 or eslider@dnr.IN.gov. Additionally, in all future correspondence regarding the above indicated project, please refer to DHPA #1942.

Very truly yours,

Christopher A. Smith
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

emc: Anuradha Kumar, INDOT
     Shaun Miller, INDOT
     Susan Branigan, INDOT
     Mary Kennedy, INDOT
     Shirley Clark, INDOT
     Joseph L. Skvarenina, Hancock County Historian
     Briquette S. Jones, President, Hancock County Historical Society
     Mark Dollase, Indiana Landmarks, Central Regional Office
     J. Scott Keller, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board
     Daniel Kloc, AIA, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board
     Beth McCord, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board
     April Sievert, Ph.D., Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board
     Joshua Palmer, AIA, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board
     Jason Larrison, AIA, Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board
     Christopher Smith, Deputy Director, Indiana Department of Natural Resources
October 19, 2018

Anuradha V. Kumar
Manager, Cultural Resources Section
Environmental Services
Indiana Department of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue, Room N642
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

State Agency: Indiana Department of Transportation ("INDOT")

Subject: Certificate of approval application for the 100% state-funded repair of the bridge carrying US 421 over Kilmore Creek (INDOT Bridge No. [421]39-12-01793C; NBI No. 32210), 0.31 mile south of SR 38, in Washington Township, Clinton County, Indiana (Des. No. 1801691; DHPA No. 23015)

Dear Ms. Kumar:

Pursuant to Indiana Code 14-21-1-18 and 312 Indiana Administrative Code ("IAC") 20-4, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology ("INDNR-DHPA") has reviewed INDOT's review request submittal form and letter, both of which were dated September 19, 2018, and which enclosed INDOT's certificate of approval ("COA") application and enclosures, which we received on September 21, 2018.

For the benefit of Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board ("Review Board") members and other interested persons, INDOT's September 19 letter and the certificate of approval application can be viewed online at IN SCOPE (http://erms.indot.in.gov/Section106Documents/) by searching under Designation Number 1801691.

The US 421 bridge over Kilmore Creek, of the Parker pony truss type, was identified as historic and Select in the Indiana Historic Bridge Inventory. It is considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C, as the certificate of approval ("COA") application says, "because it exemplifies a unique highway bridge type in Indiana and because it displays exceptional main span length for its type representing and innovative design." Accordingly, because this is a state-funded project that would alter a state-owned historic structure, Indiana Code 14-21-1-18 is applicable.

A previous, Federal Highway Administration- and INDOT-funded rehabilitation of the bridge was conducted in 2015 after a dual, federal Section 106 and 312 IAC 20-4-11.5 review in 2013 and 2014 (Des. No. 1006286; DHPA No. 15385). Since then, however, INDOT says that growing cracks in three of the four lower-chord gusset plates have been discovered, and all eight gusset plates have been found to have suffered section loss.

The scope of the repair work is described in INDOT's September 19 letter and in INDOT's COA application is as follows:

- The first floor beams adjacent the repair locations will be jacked to allow temporary support of the truss during construction via cross beams.
- Floor beam connections will be retrofitted for the temporary supports.
- The interior and exterior gusset plates and cover plates will be removed and replaced at all four corners of the bridge. Cover plates will be removed at all four corners. Some cover plates will be reinstalled, while others will be replaced. A total of 8 gusset plates will be replaced along with 4 cover plates.
- The rivets at the subject gusset plates and cover plates will be replaced with high strength round headed bolts.
It is proposed that the temporary support and gusset plate replacement occurs only on one side of the creek at a time.

The new steel members will be painted and any adjacent areas of paint damaged during construction will be cleaned and repainted. The paint will match the existing green color (Federal Color Standard No. 595, Color 24227).

The certificate of approval ("COA") application proposes 100% state-funded work on a state-owned historic structure, a bridge, but it does not indicate that the road (i.e. the deck or the approaches) will be altered, demolished, or removed. We have not found an applicable definition of "road" in Title 14 of the Indiana Code, but Indiana Code 8-23-1-23, which pertains to INDOT, contains the following definition:

Sec. 23. "Highway, street, or road" means a public way for purposes of vehicular traffic, including the entire area within the right-of-way. However, the term does not include a highway for the purposes of IC 8-2-1.

Indiana Code 8-2-1, which pertained to motor carrier regulation, has since been repealed.

Consequently, we think that the US 421 bridge over Kilmore Creek falls qualifies as part of a "road," as that term is used in Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(f).

Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(f) and (g) apply to a "substantial alteration of a road . . . within the boundaries of the property of a historic site or historic structure." However, in this project, it may not be essential to determine whether there will be a substantial alteration, because there will be some alteration of the bridge; a certificate of approval application has been filed that would satisfy the requirements of either Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(b) or Indiana Code 14-21-1-(g); and if Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(g) and (b) do not apply because the alteration will not be substantial, then it appears that Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(a) and (b) would apply, by default.

Based upon the submitted information and the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP") within the proposed project area; and we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the previously-submitted Indiana archaeological short report (Parsell, 02/11/2014), that no further investigations appear necessary at this proposed project area. However, this identification is subject to the project activities remaining within areas disturbed by previous construction of a recent and non-historical nature. If archaeological deposits are encountered from the post-contact period, they will be evaluated regarding their eligibility for the NRHP in consultation with the staff of the Indiana SHPO. Please contact our office if such deposits are encountered. The archaeological recording must be done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation" (48 F.R. 44716) and a report of the archaeological documentation must be submitted to our office for review and comment.

If any archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29) requires that the discovery must be reported to the Department of Natural Resources within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and 29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations.

As INDOT has pointed out, the repair work proposed will not be readily visible to the public. This repair project is limited in scope and in the amount of historic fabric on the bridge that will be replaced. Presumably, the replacement gusset plates and cover plates will be similar in appearance to the existing gusset plates and cover plates. Consequently, we have determined, pursuant to Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(g), that this project will not have an adverse impact on the only historic property within or near the project area, the US 421 bridge over Kilmore Creek.

Furthermore, because we have determined that this project will not have an adverse impact, we have concluded under 312 IAC 20-4-11(d) that it will not be necessary for INDOT to obtain a certificate of approval from the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board for the 100% state-funded repair of the bridge carrying US 421 over Kilmore Creek (INDOT Bridge No. [421]39-12-01793C; NBI No. 32210), 0.31 mile south of SR 38, in Washington Township, Clinton County, Indiana (Des. No. 1801691; DHFA No. 23015).

Pursuant to 312 IAC 20-4-11(g), within fifteen (15) days after this determination, an interested person may request a member of the Review Board to provide public hearing and review under 312 IAC 2-3. The designated member shall issue a
determination whether an application for a certificate of approval must be filed. If the designated member determines an application must be filed, then the division shall place the completed application on the agenda of the Review Board's next meeting. If the designated member determines that an application for a certificate is not required, then the division director's letter of clearance is affirmed. A determination under this subsection is not effected until the later of the following:

(1) fifteen (15) days after issuance of the determination; or

(2) the day resulting from a notice given under 312 IAC 2-3-7(d).

If you have questions about archaeological issues related to this project, please contact Wade Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.in.gov. Questions about the US 421 bridge over Kilmore Creek or other structures should be directed to John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jcarr@dnr.in.gov.

If there is any future correspondence about this project at the US 421 bridge over Kilmore Creek in Clinton County, please refer to DHPA No. 23015.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Christopher A. Smith
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

cc: James Miller, Clinton County Historian
    Historic Preservationists of Clinton County

enc: Anuradha Kumar, INDOT
     Mary Kennedy, INDOT
     Melissa Patton, INDOT Project Manager
     Shawn Miller, INDOT
     Susan Bronigin, INDOT
     Shirley Clark, INDOT
     Robert Dirks, P.E., Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
     Michelle Allen, Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
     Diane Hunter, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma
     Board of Commissioners of Clinton County, c/o Theresa Martin, Commissioners' Assistant
     Kevin Myers, Clinton County Highway Supervisor
     Clinton County Historical Society and Museum
     Tommy Kleckner, Indiana Landmarks, Western Regional Office
     James L. Cooper, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus of History, DePauw University
     Paul Brandenburg, Indiana Historic Spans Task Force
     J. Scott Keller, Review Board
     Daniel Kloc, AIA, Review Board
     Jason Harrison, AIA, Review Board
     Beth McCord, Review Board
     Joshua Palmer, AIA, Review Board
     April Sievert, Ph.D., Review Board
     Christopher Smith, Deputy Director, INDNR
     Chad Slider, INDNR-DHPA
     John Carr, INDNR-DHPA
     Wade T. Tharp, INDNR-DHPA
Something's pounding on the 300W bridge

County engineer: Unless the damage is stopped, the repair bill could be pricey

By JESSICA BRICKER

Wells County's vote centers were busy, but not too busy, early Tuesday morning on Indiana's primary election day.

County Clerk Yvette Runkle said 639 people had cast ballots as of 8:53 a.m. That was an average of about 200 per hour across the county's 16 vote centers — the Wells County Community Center at the 4-H Park, First Presbyterian Church in Bluffton, the Zanesville United Methodist Church, Lograth Gardens at Deans, and the campus of Southern Wells Community School.

Adding together early voting totals with the number of ballots cast Tuesday, Runkle said the total was 1,244 — about 9 percent of the county's 18,295 registered voters.

In 2014, 3,516 people cast ballots, a turnout of about 46 percent. As Runkle noted, however, Indiana had a say in the presidential balloting in 2016's primary.

Runkle said there were no major problems this morning. A early voter did visit matters at the Wells County Community Center but a replacement card was delivered to the site and problem fixed quickly.

Polls are open until 6 p.m.

Trump on Haspel: 'Too tough on terror' for Dems

By DER REICHMANN

WASHINGTON (AP) — CIA nominee Gina Haspel tried to convince skeptical Democrats on Monday that she's the right person to lead the spy agency, just two days after she offered to step aside amid heavy criticism of her role in the agency's brutal interrogation program at black sites overseas.

Haspel, who is using CIA director, had told the White House she didn't want to stay in contention if her bruising confirmation battle doesn't proceed her to the agency's brutal interrogation program at black sites overseas. Haspel, who is using the CIA director, had told the White House she didn't want to stay in contention if her bruising confirmation battle doesn't proceed her to the agency's brutal interrogation program at black sites overseas.

Haspel, who is using the CIA director, had told the White House she didn't want to stay in contention if her bruising confirmation battle doesn't proceed her to the agency's brutal interrogation program at black sites overseas.

"Looking forward to Wednesday," a smiling Haspel told report- ers as she bid into the office of Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., reporting the atmosphere at the Senate intelligence committee.

But it's not going to a pleasant afternoon.

State election systems even waitng security checkups

By CHRISTINA A. CASSIDY

With the midterms comming primaries a bit to join the balloting, the Department of Homeland Security, cybem as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the pri- mary and general elections.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.

The security reviews are done to identify any weak- ness that could be exploited by hackers; such examinations are routinely conducted in the primary and general elections even as we can to ensure that state elec- tronic voting systems are secure against hackers.

The department said it has com-调ed its 360 state election systems in past year of 17 state elec- tions, but had been unable to test them so far. It has pledged to do so by November for every state that asks.
**State election**

(Continued from Page 1)

The 2016 presidential election is now attracting more money and shifting to high-visibility venues. The reviews typically rely on databases of high-ranking party officials, including those with presidential ambitions.

Mark Herring, the Virginia attorney general, said he is highly motivated to defeat Donnelly.

In Tennessee, a Republican primary is underway, with the winner expected to lose in November.

In Indiana, a Democratic primary is scheduled for August, with candidates vying for the nomination.

In Wisconsin, a Democratic primary is set for July, with candidates running for the nomination.

In New Hampshire, a Democratic primary is planned for June, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Maine, a Democratic primary is scheduled for May, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Florida, a Democratic primary is planned for April, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Colorado, a Democratic primary is set for March, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Arizona, a Democratic primary is planned for February, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Nevada, a Democratic primary is scheduled for January, with candidates running for the nomination.

In New Mexico, a Democratic primary is set for December, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Utah, a Democratic primary is planned for November, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Idaho, a Democratic primary is scheduled for October, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Montana, a Democratic primary is set for September, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Wyoming, a Democratic primary is planned for August, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Kansas, a Democratic primary is scheduled for July, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Oklahoma, a Democratic primary is set for June, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Arkansas, a Democratic primary is planned for May, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Louisiana, a Democratic primary is scheduled for April, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Mississippi, a Democratic primary is set for March, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Alabama, a Democratic primary is planned for February, with candidates running for the nomination.

In New Jersey, a Democratic primary is scheduled for January, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Pennsylvania, a Democratic primary is set for December, with candidates running for the nomination.

In New York, a Democratic primary is planned for November, with candidates running for the nomination.

In New Hampshire, a Democratic primary is scheduled for October, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Maine, a Democratic primary is set for September, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Colorado, a Democratic primary is planned for August, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Arizona, a Democratic primary is scheduled for July, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Nevada, a Democratic primary is set for June, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Florida, a Democratic primary is planned for May, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Texas, a Democratic primary is scheduled for April, with candidates running for the nomination.

In California, a Democratic primary is set for March, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Illinois, a Democratic primary is planned for February, with candidates running for the nomination.

In Nebraska, a Democratic primary is scheduled for January, with candidates running for the nomination.
October 23, 2018

Nate Rumschlag, P.E.
County Highway Engineer
Wells County Highway Department
1600 West Washington Street
Bluffton, Indiana 46714

State Agency: Indiana Department of Transportation ("INDOT")

Subject: Wells County’s certificate of approval application for the removal of the existing concrete deck and replacement with a lighter weight timber deck on Wells County Bridge No. 112 carrying N CR 500 W over Eightmile Creek (a Community Crossings Matching Grant project) (no INDOT designation number; DHPA No. 23027)

Dear Mr. Rumschlag:

Pursuant to Indiana Code 14-21-1-18 and 312 Indiana Administrative Code ("IAC") 20-4, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology ("INDNR-DHPA" or "Indiana SHPO staff") has reviewed your certificate of approval application, which we received on September 24, 2018.

Wells County Bridge No. 112 is a single-span, Warren pony truss bridge that carries N CR 500 W across Eightmile (or Eight Mile) Creek in Union Township. Its address is 11900 N 500 W-90, Markle, Indiana 46770. The certificate of approval ("COA") application lists the construction date of the bridge as 1920.

Bridge No. 112 was identified as historic (i.e., eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or “NRHP”) under Criterion C and as Select in the Indiana Historic Bridges Inventory.

The COA application says that no other structures that are at least 50 years old are in the project area. Looking somewhat beyond the project area on the satellite view of an online map website, we think we see utility lines and poles nearby the project area. Also, a house with a swimming pool and a small lake lie somewhat farther from the project area, near the southwest quadrant of the crossing of Bridge No. 112 of Eightmile Creek and near the southern terminus of the project. Another house is within the southwest quadrant of the intersection of N CR 500 W and County Line Road (W CR 1200 N), near the northern terminus. The house near the southern terminus may be a structure that appears in on the 1972 USGS Zanesville, Indiana, quadrangle map, but it does not appear in the 2010 Wells County Interim Report, and while we cannot say for certain that the house is less than 50 years old, it apparently has no known architectural or historical significance. The house near the northern terminus appears neither on the USGS map nor in the interim report. Three houses with outbuildings in Allen County stand somewhat near the north side of County Line Road and the northern terminus, but only one of them, the farthest from the terminus, appears on the 1972 USGS map. None of the five properties mentioned above were rated “Contributing” or higher on the Indiana Buildings, Bridges, and Cemeteries Map. Thus, Bridge No. 112 appears to be the only aboveground historic property that could suffer any kind of impact from the project.

In regard to archaeological resources, based on the submitted information and documentation available to the Indiana SHPO staff, we have not identified any currently known archaeological resources listed in or eligible for inclusion in the NRHP within the proposed project area. However, this identification is subject to the project activities remaining within areas disturbed by previous construction of a recent and non-historical nature. If archaeological deposits are encountered from the post-contact period, they will be evaluated regarding their eligibility for the NRHP in consultation with the staff of the
Indian SHPO. Please contact our office if such deposits are encountered. The archaeological recording must be done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s “Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation” (48 F.R. 44716) and a report of the archaeological documentation must be submitted to our office for review and comment.

If any prehistoric or historic archaeological artifacts or human remains are uncovered during construction, demolition, or earthmoving activities, state law (Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29) requires that the discovery be reported to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (“INDNR-DHPA”) within two (2) business days. In that event, please call (317) 232-1646. Be advised that adherence to Indiana Code 14-21-1-27 and -29 does not obviate the need to adhere to applicable federal statutes and regulations, including but not limited to 36 C.F.R. Part 800.

The COA application proposes the following items of work for Bridge No. 112 and for the north and south roadway approaches on N CR 500 W:

- Removal of the existing, 10-inch concrete deck and replacement with a lighter weight timber deck.
- Replacement of deteriorated stringers in the end panels.
- Replacement of the 5-inch stringer bearing channel.
- Replacement of interior gusset plates at all four bearings.
- Replacement of deteriorated cross bracing in the southernmost panel.
- Replacement of the damaged mudwall at the south abutment.
- Straightening of existing bridge railing.
- Cleaning of bearings.
- Installation of a new bituminous roadway north of the bridge and extend to the intersection with the county line road and approximately 100 feet south of the bridge.
- Installation of guardrail at the four corners of the bridge.

This project will use state Community Crossings Matching Grant funds and, presumably, Wells County funds. The concrete bridge deck will be replaced with a wooden deck, some bridge components will be replaced on or near the lower chords of the trusses, and new bituminous pavement will be applied to N CR 500 W-90, and, thus, the project will alter a road. The bridge is a historic structure, although it is neither owned by the state nor listed in the NRHP or the Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures. We are in the process of interpreting a recent amendment of Indiana Code 14-21-1-18, especially as it applies to state-funded projects that have an impact on a road or a sidewalk within a historic site or a historic structure.

Having considered the scope of work and the plans submitted in the COA application in light of Indiana Code 14-21-1-18(f) and (g), we have determined that this project will not have an adverse impact on Wells County Bridge No. 112 or on any other historic structure or historic site.

Although no Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”) funds are proposed to be used in this project, we note, with regard to Stipulation IV.G. of the Indiana Historic Bridges Programmatic Agreement, that the historic integrity of Bridge No. 112, a Select Bridge, will not be diminished by this project.

Furthermore, because we have determined that this project will not have an adverse impact, we have concluded under 312 IAC 20-4-11(d) that it will not be necessary for INDOT to obtain a certificate of approval from the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board (“Review Board”) for the partially state-funded removal of the existing concrete deck and replacement with a lighter weight timber deck and other, proposed improvements on Wells County Bridge No. 112 carrying N CR 500 W over Eightmile Creek and the installation of bituminous pavement on that road north and south of the bridge (a Community Crossings Matching Grant project). Accordingly, this letter will serve as a director’s letter of clearance.

Pursuant to 312 IAC 20-4-11(g), within fifteen (15) days after this determination, an interested person may request a member of the Review Board to provide public hearing and review under 312 IAC 2-3. The designated member shall issue a determination whether an application for a certificate of approval must be filed. If the designated member determines an application must be filed, then the division shall place the completed application on the agenda of the Review Board’s next meeting. If the designated member determines that an application for a certificate is not required, then the division director’s letter of clearance is affirmed. A determination under this subsection is not affected until the later of the following:
(1) fifteen (15) days after issuance of the determination; or

(2) the day resulting from a notice given under 312 IAC 2-3-7(d).

If you have questions about archaeological issues related to this project, please contact Wade Tharp at (317) 232-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.in.gov. Questions about Wells County Bridge No. 112 or other structures should be directed to John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jcarr@dnr.in.gov.

If there is any future correspondence about this project at Wells County Bridge No. 112 over Eightmile Creek on N CR 500 W in Union Township, please refer to DHPA No. 23027.

Very truly yours,

Christopher A. Smith
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
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DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
DETROIT DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
MICHIANA BRANCH  
2422 VIRIDIAN DRIVE, SUITE # 200  
SOUTH BEND, IN 46628-3469  

January 24, 2019

ATTENTION OF:  
Engineering & Technical Services  
Regulatory Office  
Permit No. LRE-2018-00389-156-R18

Chad Slider  
Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology  
Indiana Department of Natural Resources  
402 W. Washington St., Rm W274  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dear Mr. Slider,

This letter is written in regards to the proposed Allen Street bridge replacement project (DHPA #22971) at Kent Ditch in Kentland, Indiana (Section 21, Township 27 North, Range 9 West, Newton County). Specifically, Newton County proposes the removal and replacement of the Allen Street Bridge, which is listed as Bridge No. 000K2 (NBI No. 5600113) in the Indiana Historic Bridge Inventory (M&H Architecture, Inc., 2009). We are writing in consideration of our responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The Corps has identified the permit area to include the areas of fill placement within Kent Ditch (approximately 66 linear feet at the site of the bridge), and the immediately adjacent uplands from where the bridge replacement work will be conducted (the roadway). The permit area is highlighted in the enclosed copy of project plan sheet 6 of 18 (Fig. 1).

According to the Historic Architectural Resource Assessment by Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc. (April 10, 2018), and noted in the October 12, 2018 letter from your office, there is a potentially eligible historic district located in close proximity to the permit area. This potential historic district includes the Saint Joseph Catholic Church, Rectory, Convent, and School. Bridge replacement would not have an effect on the physical or aesthetic character which make these structures potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). No adverse impact to the potential historic district is expected.
As described in our September 10, 2018 letter, we found that the Indiana Historic Bridge Inventory lists the non-select bridge as eligible because it was constructed by the state of Indiana as part of SR 7, and represents the state's development of the early highway system. However, we were unable to locate information to confirm that the bridge was constructed by the Indiana State Highway Commission for the early SR 7. It is our understanding that the US 24 corridor was designated as SR 7 prior to 1926. According to the National Bridge Inventory, the Allen Street Bridge was constructed in 1930, and then reconstructed in 1960. Additionally, the US 24 corridor runs along the north side of the Toledo, Peoria, & Western Railroad, north of Allen Street. According to publicly available sources, it appears that the bridge was constructed after the SR 7 designation was relocated to the corridor between Madison and Columbus in southeast Indiana. Also, it appears that the east-west highway route through Kentland would have historically run north along the railroad as it does present day, and not at Allen Street. Further, this bridge is not noted in the Newton County Interim Report (June 2009) or in the IDNR SHAARD database.

After receiving your October 12, 2018 letter advising that we consult regarding the NRHP eligibility status of the bridge, we invited Federal Highways, the Indiana Department of Transportation, the Newton County Historian, the Newton County Historical Society, Indiana Landmarks, Indiana Historic Spans Task Force, DePauw University, and the Newton County Highway Department to consult as part of the Section 106 process. In summary, the comments received related to the potential eligibility of the bridge are as follows:

1) Indiana Landmarks commented that unless evidence is found connecting the Allen Street bridge to the state's early highway system, the bridge does not appear to be eligible under Criterion A. Indiana Landmarks also agrees that the bridge is not eligible under Criterion C.

2) The Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) stated in their October 31, 2018 e-mail that they were unable to locate evidence that bridge was constructed for SR 7 as part of the state's early highway system.

The Newton County Historian also responded and stated they wished to be a consulting party, but they did not provide additional information about the bridge in their December 19, 2018 letter. We have enclosed copies of all comments received with our letter.
Our research and coordination has not discovered information which supports that the Allen Street bridge was constructed as part of SR 7 or as part of the early state highway system. Based on the absence of these historical connections, we conclude that the bridge is not eligible under Criterion A. We also determined that the bridge is not eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criteria B, C, or D. Overall, for the Allen Street bridge and the nearby potential historic district, we have determined that there will be no adverse effect to historic properties resulting from the project. We request your concurrence with our determination within 30 days of the date of this letter.

Should you have any questions, please contact Allison Klement at the above address, by E-Mail at Allison.M.Klement@usace.army.mil, or by telephone at (574) 232-1952 ext. 21965. In all communications, please refer to File Number LRE-2018-00389-156-R18.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Simon
Chief, Regulatory Office
Engineering and Technical Services

Enclosures

Copy Furnished

IDEM, Office of Water Quality, Maupin
IDNR, Division of Water, Mueliner
INDOT, Cultural Resources Office, Kennedy
Indiana Landmarks, Miller
Newton County Historian, Elijah
Newton County Highway Department, Pluimer
Beam, Longest & Neff, LLC, Keith
The Corps Permit area is limited to the area of fill placement within Kent Ditch and immediately adjacent uplands required to do the work. Permit Area highlighted below.
January 4, 2019

Charles M. Simon, Chief
Regulatory Office
Engineering & Technical Services
Department of the Army
Detroit District, Corps of Engineers
Michiana Branch
2422 Viridian Drive, Suite #200
South Bend, IN 46628-3489

RE: Permit No. LRE-2018-00389-156, Proposed Bridge Replacement Project at Kent Ditch in Kentland, Newton County, Indiana

Dear Mr. Simon,

Thank you for the letter requesting input for the proposed bridge replacement project at Kent Ditch in Kentland. I have reviewed the letter and accompanying Section 106 coordination documents, which outlines the uncertain conclusion concerning the eligibility of the Allen Street Bridge (Bridge 000K2) for the National Register of Historic Places. Unfortunately, I have no additional information regarding the origin of the bridge and its possible connection to the Indiana State Highway Commission’s early highway system.

Unless evidence can be uncovered connecting the Allen Street Bridge to the state’s early highway system and a wider historical significance, I do not believe the bridge would be eligible under Criterion A. I agree with the determination that the bridge is not eligible under Criterion C.

These comments are based on my review of the information provided in your letter dated December 20, 2018, and the Section 106 coordination documents. If there is further information that can be provided, please let me know so that I can reassess my comments.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me by phone or email at (219) 947-2657 or bmiller@indianalandmarks.org.

Sincerely,

Brad Miller, Director
Northwest Field Office
I just wanted to let everyone know that when preparing information for our annual historic bridges report, I discovered that Newton Co. Bridge #K2 is apparently the recipient of INDOT Community Crossings Grant Funds under Des. No. 1802117. This does not impact INDOT-CRO's level of involvement, but may impact how SHPO/DHPA reviews it in regard to state law.

Mary E. Kennedy
Historic Bridge Specialist
Cultural Resources Office
Environmental Services
100 N. Senate Ave., Room N642-ES
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Office: (317) 232-5215
Email: mkennedy@indot.in.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Kennedy, Mary [mailto:MKENNEDY@indot.in.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 4:08 PM
To: Klement, Allison MCIVUSARMYCELRE (US) <Allison.M.Klement@usace.army.mil>
Cc: Padgett, Kim Marie <KPadgett@dnr.IN.gov>; Johnson, Amy (DNR) <AJohnson@dnr.IN.gov>; Allen, Michelle (FHWA) <michelle.allen@dot.gov>; Joyce.Newland@dot.gov <Joyce.Newland@dot.gov>; Kumar, Anuradha <akumar@indot.in.gov>; Branigin, Susan <SBRanigin@indot.IN.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Newton Co Bridge #000K2 -Section 106 review letter from the IN DHPA

Allison,

Thank you for the information. In coordinating with our records staff, we don't have any information for SR 7 through Kentland, just for US 24. The information in your Sept. 10, 2018 letter to SHPO appears to be correct regarding the designation of US 24. We could not locate information that confirms Bridge 000K2 was constructed as part of SR 7 by the ISHC.

Whatever the Corps and SHPO agree upon regarding eligibility for Section 106 processing of this project, we would appreciate knowing the final outcome to provide an update for this bridge in our Historic Bridge PA annual report. For Select Bridges demolished with local funds, the HBPA states in Stipulation IV.G.:
Anticipatory Demolition - If FHWA or Indiana SHPO determine a bridge owner intentionally demolishes or otherwise diminishes the historic integrity of a Select Bridge under the bridge owner's jurisdiction with non-Federal-aid funds, then FHWA will comply with 36 CFR Part 800 for any future federal-aid bridge project proposed by that bridge owner. After the next Bridge Survey update is completed in accordance with Stipulation II.C.2, FHWA may process federal-aid projects in accordance with this Agreement for that bridge owner.

Section 110(k) of the National Historic Preservation Act prohibits FHWA from providing Federal-aid funds for a given project, where the bridge owner, with the intent to avoid the requirements of Section 106, has intentionally adversely affected the historic bridge prior to completion of NEPA (see 36 CFR 800.9(e)).

There aren't any stipulations similar to Stipulation IV.O for Non-Select Bridges (Bridge 000K2 is Non-Select). Per past guidance from FHWA, if an LPA demolishes a Non-Select Bridge with their own funds, they would still have access to the Historic Bridge PA efficiencies.

Let us know if you have any questions. While we appreciate being copied on the subsequent Section 106 documents for our annual report, we do not foresee having any further input on this project.

Attachment 18
Regards,

Mary E. Kennedy  
Historic Bridge Specialist  
Cultural Resources Office  
Environmental Services  
100 N. Senate Ave., Room N642-ES  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
Office: (317) 232-5215  
Email: mkennedy@indot.in.gov

*Updated Historic Property Report (HPR) guidelines can be found here *Design Memorandum 18-02 regarding the new procedures for Historic Bridge Alternatives Analysis Documents can be found here:  

-----Original Message-----
From: Klement, Allison M  
CIV USARMC CELRE (US)  
mklement@usace.army.mil
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2018 4:22 PM  
To: Kennedy, Mary <MKENNEDY@indot.IN.gov>  
Cc: Padgett, Kim Marie <KPadgett@dnr.IN.gov>; Johnson, Amy (DNR) <AJohnson@dnr.IN.gov>  
Subject: RE: Section 106 review letter from the IN Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology

**** This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email. ****

Hello Mary,

I've attached, broken into 3 PDF's, the information we submitted to the SHPO for this project. Included are our September 10, 2018 request letter and review request form to the SHPO, which includes a description of the Corps permit area, the application submitted to this office for the bridge replacement project, and a copy of the "Historic Architectural Resource Assessment" that was submitted to this office with the application. Please let me know if I can get you anything else.

Have a great evening,

Allison M. Klement  
Regulatory Project Manager  
Michiana Branch  
Regulatory Office  
US Army Corps of Engineers, Detroit District  
(574) 232-1952 ext. 21965  
FAX: (574) 232-3075  
mklement@usace.army.mil

Please visit our Detroit District Regulatory website at:  
BlockedBlockedhttp://www.be.usace.army.mil/Missions/RegulatoryProgramAndPermits.aspx  
We would appreciate your feedback. Our National Customer Service Survey is located at:  

-----Original Message-----
From: Kennedy, Mary [mailto:MKENNEDY@indot.IN.gov]
December 19, 2018
Newton Co. Historian
3329 S. 100 E.
Morocco, IN 47963

Dept. of Army
Detroit District, Corps of Engineers
Michiana Branch
2422 Viridian Dr.,Suite #200
South Bend, IN 46628-3489

Charles M. Simon
Attention: Engineering and Technical Services
Regulatory Office
Permit No. LRE-2018-00389-156

I, Diana L. Elijah, would like to be a consulting party throughout Section 106 process for this permit application.

I will try to get Kentland population involved in this process.

Thank you,

Diana L. Elijah

File No.LRE-2015-00598-102-N17

Attachment 18
November 13, 2018

Jay M. Ciavarella
Director
Office of Planning and Program Development
Federal Transit Administration, Region V
200 West Adams Street, Suite 320
Chicago, Illinois 60606-5253

Federal Agency: Federal Transit Administration, Region V ("FTA")

Re: FTA's October 10, 2018, adverse effect finding letter, supplemental Phase Ia archaeological records check and field reconnaissance survey report (S. Coughlin, D. Miller, and L. Konicki, 09/26/2018), and assessment of effect addendum memorandum (WSP, 10/2018), for the IndyGo Purple Line Bus Rapid Transit Project in Marion County, Indiana (DHPA No. 22038)

Dear Mr. Ciavarella:

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (54 U.S.C. § 306108), and implementing regulations at 36 C.F.R. Part 800, the staff of the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer ("Indiana SHPO" or "INDNR-DHPA") has reviewed FTA's October 10, 2018, finding letter and enclosures, which we received on October 11, 2018.

Although the concrete sidewalk on the south side of Marion County Bridge No. 1801 will be widened by six feet, the lanes will be reconfigured, and—if we understand correctly—a mountable curb will be installed in the bus lane, we do not think that the effect on the historic bridge will be adverse. Furthermore, we agree that none of the other above-ground historic properties that have been identified within the area of potential effects will be adversely affected.

In terms of archaeological resources, based upon the submitted information and the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the supplemental Phase Ia archaeological records check and field reconnaissance survey report (S. Coughlin, D. Miller, and L. Konicki, 09/26/2018), that archaeological site 12-Ma-1042 (the Interurban Group Site, which was identified during these archaeological investigations, and portions of which lie within the proposed project area) appears potentially eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP"); and that this archaeological site would be adversely affected by proposed project-related ground-disturbing activities. Site 12-Ma-1042 must either be avoided or subjected to further archaeological investigations. Additionally, site 12-Ma-1042 should be clearly marked so that it is avoided by all project-related ground-disturbing activities. If avoidance is not feasible, then a plan for subsurface archaeological investigations must be submitted to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology ("INDNR-DHPA") for review and comment. Any further archaeological investigations must be done in accordance with the "Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation" (48 F.R. 44716).

Additionally, based upon the submitted information and the documentation available to the staff of the Indiana SHPO, there is insufficient information regarding archaeological site 12-Ma-1043 (which was identified during these archaeological investigations, and portions of which lie within the proposed project area) to determine whether it is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. However, we concur with the opinion of the archaeologist, as expressed in the archaeological report, that the portions of site 12-Ma-1043 that lie within the proposed project area do not appear to contain significant archaeological deposits, and that no further archaeological investigations are necessary in those areas. The portions of archaeological site 12-Ma-1043 outside the proposed project area must either be avoided or subjected to further archaeological investigations. Additionally, those areas of...
the site should be clearly marked so that they are avoided by all ground-disturbing project activities. If avoidance is not feasible, then a plan for subsurface archaeological investigations must be submitted to the division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (“DHPA”) for review and comment. Any further archaeological investigations must be done in accordance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation” (48 F.R. 44716).

As a reminder, the archaeological site survey forms for archaeological sites 12-Ma-1042 and 12-Ma-1043 should be submitted to the Indiana DHPA SHAARD system database.

Accordingly, we concur with FTA’s October 10, 2018, Section 106 finding of Adverse Effect for this federal undertaking.

If you have questions about buildings, structures, or districts pertaining to this project, please contact John Carr at (317) 233-1949 or jcarr@dnr.in.gov. Questions about archaeological matters should be directed to Wade T. Tharp at (317) 233-1650 or wtharp1@dnr.in.gov.

In all future correspondence regarding the IndyGo Purple Line Bus Rapid Transit Project in Marion County, please continue to refer to DHPA No. 22038.

Very truly yours,

Chad W. Smith
Deputy Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

CAS:JLC:WT:wt

enc: Jay Clavarella, FTA
Susan Weber, FTA
Elizabeth Breiseth, FTA
Larry Buckel, Indiana Department of Transportation
Austin Gibble, IndyGo
Harry Nikides, ASC Group, Inc.
Leah Konicki, ASC Group, Inc.
David Klinge, ASC Group, Inc.
Aimee Paquin, WSP
Mark Zwayer, Indianapolis Department of Public Works
Elizabeth Nowak, Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission
Chad Slider, INDNR-DHPA
John Carr, INDNR-DHPA
Wade T. Tharp, INDNR-DHPA

enc for informational purposes: Robert Dirks, P.E., Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division
Anuradha Kumar, Indiana Department of Transportation
Susan Braniegain, Indiana Department of Transportation
Shawn Miller, Indiana Department of Transportation
Patrick Carpenter, Indiana Department of Transportation
Mary Kennedy, Indiana Department of Transportation
Franklin Street drawbridge repair gets expensive

La PORTE — Emergency repairs to the electrical system on the 85-year-old Franklin Street drawbridge over Trail Creek in Michigan City will cost four times more than anticipated after a contractor hit a few snags.

And because the mechanical system failed during testing Wednesday, county officials will have to meet in an emergency session Thursday to make additional repairs expected to cost another $50,000 to $100,000.

Rich Mrozinski, president of the county Board of Commissioners, said the electrical repairs passed inspection, but a large cast-iron coupling came loose during testing and will have to be replaced.

Traffic has been allowed to pass over the bridge, but the Indiana Department of Transportation will not allow the county to raise the span until it passes a second inspection, Mrozinski said.

"It should be a fairly simply repair," he said.

With boating season just around the corner, the clock is ticking.

At a meeting of La Porte County Council on Monday, Marquiss Electric representative Andy Skwiat reviewed a litany of problems his firm encountered after it was hired by the county to bore beneath the creek to replace electrical conduit that had corroded.

"Oh, it was fun," Skwiat said sarcastically.

In a split vote, the council approved the request from County Engineer Jay Sullivan for an additional appropriation of $183,060, bringing the cost of the electrical project to $529,060, according to County Auditor Joie Winski.

An estimate provided last summer for electrical repairs was $115,000.
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After quickly obtaining the required permits, Skwiat said, crews first attempted to drill 10 feet below the creek bed as required by code. They were unexpectedly blocked by a concrete foundation, a remnant of the former Smith Brothers plant, so they went deeper — first 30 feet, then 40 feet and then 60 feet.

In the process, he said, they struck an old and undocumented water line.

Also, the deeper boring required crews to start and end farther from the creek than planned, which would have increased costs even if one end had not run through soil contaminated by fuel oil from a long-forgotten factory along the waterway.

Skwiat said the contaminated soil had to be taken to a special landfill in Berrien County and replaced with clean fill.

The boring includes new conduit not only for power lines and electrical controls for the bridge but one to carry computer data and another left empty for future use.

Even though electrical issues have been resolved, even enhanced, Sullivan said, deterioration of the steel framework remains a concern.

Sullivan first brought concerns about the bridge to the attention of policymakers over the summer.

Although the bridge still worked, he said, inspectors noted the poor condition of the wiring and the lack of any redundancy, which left the reliable operation of the span in doubt.

County officials, citing the importance to both vehicular traffic and watercraft, declared the project an emergency, allowing the county Board of Commissioners to award a contract without going through the more time-consuming process of advertising for bids.

The motion to approve the additional appropriation Monday passed 4-3, with members Mike Mollenhauer, Randy Novak, Jeff Santana and John Sullivan voting in favor, and Mark Yagelski, Terry Garner and Cary Kirkham voting against.

Mrozinski said Marquiss Electric, which was on site during the inspection Wednesday, would also be asked to manufacture a new coupling for county to restore the mechanical operation of the bridge.
Indiana Department of Transportation

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION / ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Road No./County: Warren County Bridge No. 36/Warren and Fountain Counties
Designation Number: 1400805
Project Description/Terminals:
Warren County Bridge No. 36, a Select Historic Bridge Project, carrying County Road (CR) 100 East/CR 200 West over Wabash River, located 1.00 mile south of Grant Street in Washington Township (B-1 to B-3).
The project is located at Sta. 15+49 to Sta. 23+59. The project will occur at the north approach to the bridge and end approximately 150 feet south of the south approach.

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.

Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>ESM Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ES Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/26/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Release for Public Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESM Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ES Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification of Public Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/21/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

INDOT ES/District Env. Reviewer Signature: [Signature]
Date: 12/20/18

Name and Organization of CEFA Preparer: Hadeem Siddiki, NS Services

This is page 1 of 27 Project name: Warren County Bridge No. 36 Date: November 5, 2018
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Reward offered for information on Medora Covered Bridge damage

A reward of at least $200 is being offered for information that leads to the arrest and conviction of those who recently vandalized the Medora Covered Bridge.

Nick Walden is offering the reward and is collecting donations to increase the amount. Walden is a member of Friends of the Medora Covered Bridge, but that group is not involved with the reward, he said.

He said Wednesday others have told him they planned to add to the reward.

Walden said the most recent incident occurred around Dec. 30 and includes about a half dozen spots of graffiti.

The graffiti is on one of the western-facing entrance panels, multiple areas of the floor, inside walls and more. The paint includes initials, the numbers “812” and signs.

The number of incidents involving graffiti has increased over the last few months at the bridge, added to the National Register of Historic Places in 2007. A $1.3 million restoration project was completed in 2011.

Walden said he thinks it will be difficult to get a conviction despite a public effort to find whoever is responsible for the vandalism.

“That’s the hard part, but that’s what needs to be done because someone needs to be made an example of it,” he said. “I think they should have to help make the repairs.”

The county will have to take care of the damage, Walden said. He said entrance will require sanding and repainting. Walden has reported it to the Jackson County Highway Department, which handles repairs to the county’s bridges.

Walden gives tours of the bridge, and his artwork featuring the bridge routinely benefits the Friends group. That’s why he was heartbroken when he saw the graffiti.

He said he wishes the public would value the county’s historic sites more.

“I wish people had more respect for the historic places we have around here and the tourism it brings,” he said.

The bridge — constructed by J.J. Daniels in 1875 — is one of the county’s biggest attractions, drawing about 20,000 visitors annually. Visitors from all 50 states and many countries around the world have visited it.

It’s touted as the longest historic covered bridge in the country, spanning 430 feet over the East Fork White River along State Road 235. Its length is about 406 feet.
Walden said vandalism has long been a problem for the bridge. Friends of the Medora Covered Bridge has for years put forth an effort to raise enough money for a security camera system. It’s one of the reasons for its annual dinner on the bridge each August.

That project is expensive, coming at an estimated cost of $30,000. While that may seem high, much of the cost is to get electricity to the bridge, Walden said. The area has no security equipment.

"It’s basically a free-for-all out there right now," Walden said. "We are here to protect it, but we can’t be out here 24 hours a day."

Anyone with information should call police at 812-358-2141.

Jordan Richart
Jordan Richart is a reporter for The (Seymour) Tribune. He covers breaking news, crime, courts, county government and general assignment, among other things. Email him at jrichart@tribtown.com or follow him on Twitter below:
A Greene County covered bridge was damaged after police say a man drove a box truck through.

Posted: Jan. 8, 2019 3:22 PM
Posted By: Staff Report

GREENE COUNTY, Ind. (WTHI) - A Greene County covered bridge was damaged after police say a man drove a box truck through.

The 135-year-old bridge is called the Richland-Plummer Creek Covered Bridge.

It is located on south baseline road in Bloomfield.

Police say Paul Patton drove a box truck that was too tall through the bridge causing damage to it.

Police say Patton drove away without reporting it.

Charges have been sent to the Greene County Prosecutor’s Office for failure to stop after an accident.
Local News

Van crashes through bridge, hangs above river

By:
WANE Staff Reports  
Updated: Jan 22, 2018 09:57 AM EST

A van crashed through the Van Zile bridge northeast of Leo on Monday, Jan. 22, 2018.

SPENCERVILLE, Ind. (WANE) A van crashed through a single-lane bridge northeast of Leo early Monday and rescue crews pulled the driver to safety as it hung off the span.

Crews were called around 8 a.m. Monday to the Van Zile Road bridge over the St. Joseph River, just off S.R. 1 between Leo and Spencerville, on a report of a crash there. Responders arrived to find a white van crashed through the bridge rails, with its left front tire hanging off the bridge.

Officials said the driver was still in the van when crews arrived. She was pulled from the van through the passenger side door.

The woman was not hurt.

The driver - who has not been named - told investigators she lost control of the van as she approached the one-lane bridge. The roadway, which is a stone material, was icy at the time.

Officials said the van struck a vertical support beam, which kept the van from falling into the water below.

A tow truck was used to pull the van back onto the roadway. The woman eventually drove it away from the scene.

The crash left a gap in the bridge. The county highway department later Monday closed Van Zile Road between S.R. 1 and Hurshtown "until further notice."