036-49-03898 AEBL US 36 EB over LITTLE WHITE LICK CREEK



Inspection Date: 03/03/2022 Inspected By: Travis Smith Inspection Type(s): Routine



Latitude: 39.76402 Longitude: -86.31075



Latitude: 39.76402 Longitude: -86.31075 Inspector: Travis Smith Inspection Date: 03/03/2022 Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

Bridge Inspection Report

#### General Notes:

As of 7/1/13, the district boundary between the Crawfordsville and Greenfield districts was officially re-aligned to match the Western border of Marion County. Thus, all bridges previously inspected by Crawfordsville in Marion County became Greenfield district bridges. However, in an effort to level out the workload between districts, the State Bridge Inspection Manager had the Crawfordsville district continue to inspect these structures, even though they were technically now part of the Greenfield district. In March of 2020, the inspection of these bridges was given to Greenfield. Str. #36-49-3898 AEBL is one of these bridges.

Bent #1 is WEST.

The bridge was built in 1976 w/ 2" Bituminous overlay, under contract R-10034. 'A' Rehab (Replaced approach slabs, longitudinal & transverse joints, New latex concrete overlay & Added Concrete barrier) in 1991, B-19601.

DES. #1900340 - Programmed to be widened in 2023, contract R-41781.

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

Bridge Inspection Report

#### IDENTIFICATION

(1) STATE CODE:	185 - Indiana	(12) BASE HIGHWAY NETWORK	: 1
(8) STRUCTURE:	011680	(13A) INVENTORY ROUTE:	000000001
(5 A-B-C-D-E) INV. ROUTE:	1 - 2 - 1 - 00036 - 0	(13B) SUBROUTE NUMBER:	01
(2) HIGHWAY AGENCY DISTRICT:	03 - Greenfield	(16) LATITUDE:	39.76402
(3) COUNTY CODE:	049 - MARION	(17) LONGITUDE:	-86.31075
(4) PLACE CODE:	36000 - INDIANAPOLIS	A) STATE NAME:	
(6) FEATURES INTERSECTED:	LITTLE WHITE LICK	B) PERCENT	%
(7) FACILITY CARRIED:	CREEK US 36 EB	(99) BORDER BRIDGE STRUCT. NO:	
(9) LOCATION:	02.30 W I-465		
(11) MILEPOINT:	0000.860		
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M	IATERIAL		
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN:	IATERIAL	(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT:	1 003
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN:	IATERIAL 2 - Concrete continuous	(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT: (46) NUMBER OF APPROACH SPANS:	N 003 0000
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR:	IATERIAL 2 - Concrete continuous 01 - Slab	(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT: (46) NUMBER OF APPROACH SPANS: (107) DECK STRUCTURE TYPE:	V 003 0000 1 - Concrete Cast-in- Place
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR: (44) STRUCTURE TYPE, APPROACH SPANS:	IATERIAL 2 - Concrete continuous 01 - Slab	<ul> <li>(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT:</li> <li>(46) NUMBER OF APPROACH SPANS:</li> <li>(107) DECK STRUCTURE TYPE:</li> <li>(108) WEARING SURFACE/PROT SYS:</li> </ul>	N 003 0000 1 - Concrete Cast-in- Place
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR: (44) STRUCTURE TYPE, APPROACH SPANS: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN:	IATERIAL 2 - Concrete continuous 01 - Slab 0 - Other	<ul> <li>(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT:</li> <li>(46) NUMBER OF APPROACH SPANS:</li> <li>(107) DECK STRUCTURE TYPE:</li> <li>(108) WEARING SURFACE/PROT SYS:</li> <li>A) WEARING SURFACE:</li> </ul>	N 003 0000 1 - Concrete Cast-in- Place 3 - Latex Concrete or similar additive
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR: (44) STRUCTURE TYPE, APPROACH SPANS: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR:	IATERIAL 2 - Concrete continuous 01 - Slab 0 - Other 00 - Other	<ul> <li>(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT:</li> <li>(46) NUMBER OF APPROACH SPANS:</li> <li>(107) DECK STRUCTURE TYPE:</li> <li>(108) WEARING SURFACE/PROT SYS:</li> <li>A) WEARING SURFACE:</li> <li>B) DECK MEMBRANE:</li> </ul>	V 003 0000 1 - Concrete Cast-in- Place 3 - Latex Concrete or similar additive 0 - None
STRUCTURE TYPE AND M (43) STRUCTURE TYPE, MAIN: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR: (44) STRUCTURE TYPE, APPROACH SPANS: A) KIND OF MATERIAL/DESIGN: B) TYPE OF DESIGN/CONSTR:	IATERIAL 2 - Concrete continuous 01 - Slab 0 - Other 00 - Other	<ul> <li>(45) NUMBER OF SPANS IN MAIN UNIT:</li> <li>(46) NUMBER OF APPROACH SPANS:</li> <li>(107) DECK STRUCTURE TYPE:</li> <li>(108) WEARING SURFACE/PROT SYS:</li> <li>A) WEARING SURFACE:</li> <li>B) DECK MEMBRANE:</li> <li>C) DECK PROTECTION:</li> </ul>	N 003 0000 1 - Concrete Cast-in- Place 3 - Latex Concrete or similar additive 0 - None 0 - None

#### AGE OF SERVICE

(27) YEAR BUILT:	1976	(28) LANES:		
(106) YEAR RECONSTRUCTED:	1991	A) ON BRIDGE:	02	
		B) UNDER BRIDGE:	00	
(42) TYPE OF SERVICE:		(29) AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC:	024998	
A) ON BRIDGE:	1 - Highway	(30) YEAR OF AVERAGE DAILY	2019	
B) UNDER BRIDGE:	5 - Water way	TRAFFIC:		
		(109) AVERAGE DAILY TRUCK	05	%
		TRAFFIC: (19) BYPASS DETOUR LENGTH:	001	MI

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

Bridge Inspection Report

#### GEOMETRIC DATA

(48) LENGTH OF MAX SPAN:	0048.0 FT	(35) STRUCTURE FLARED:	0 - No flare		
(49) STRUCTURE LENGTH:	00121.5 FT	(10) INV RTE, MIN VERT CLEARANCE:	99.99 FT		
(50) CURB/SIDEWALK WIDTHS:		(47) TOT HODIZ CLEADANCE	0417 FT		
A) LEFT	00.0 FT	(47) TOT HORIZ CLEARAINCE.	041.7 FT		
B) RIGHT:	00.0 FT	(53) VERT CLEAR OVER BR RDWT:	99.99 FI		
(51) BRDG RDWY WIDTH CURB- TO-CURB:	041.7 FT	UNDERCLEARANCE: A) REFERENCE FEATURE:	Ν		
(52) DECK WIDTH, OUT-TO-OUT:	043.2 FT	B) MIN VERT UNDERCLEAR:	00.00 FT		
(32) APPROACH ROADWAY	042.0 FT	RIGHT:			
(33) BRIDGE MEDIAN:	0 - No median	A) REFERENCE FEATURE:	Ν		
		B) MIN LATERAL UNDERCLEAR:	: 000.0 FT		
(34) SKEW:	00 DEG	(56) MIN LATERAL UNDERCLEAR ON LEFT:	00.0 FT		
INSPECTIONS					
(90) INSPECTION DATE: (92) CRITICAL FEATURE INSPECTION: A) FRACTURE CRITICAL	03/03/2022 N	(91) DESIGNATED INSPECTION FREQUENCY: (93) CRITICAL FEATURE INSPECTION DATE:	24 MONTHS		
REQUIRED/FREQUENCY:		A) FRACTURE CRITICAL DATE:			
B) UNDERWATER INSPECTION	Ν	B) UNDERWATER INSP DATE:			
C) OTHER SPECIAL INSPECTION REQUIRED/FREQUENCY:	N N	C) OTHER SPECIAL INSP DATE:			
CONDITION					
(58) DECK:	6 - Satisfactory Condition (minor deterioration)	(60) SUBSTRUCTURE:	7 - Good Condition (some minor problems)		
(58.01) WEARING SURFACE:	6 - Satisfactory Condition	(61) CHANNEL/CHANNEL PROTECTION:	6 - Bank slump. widespread minor		
(59) SUPERSTRUCTURE:	6 - Satisfactory Condition (minor deterioration)	(62) CULVERTS:	aamage N - Not Applicable		
CONDITION COMMENTS					

6 - Satisfactory Condition (minor deterioration)

(58) DECK:

Comments:

See Superstructure.

(58.01) WEARING SURFACE: 6 - Satisfactory Condition

Comments:

Wearing surface: some fairly wide longitudinal cracks (~120'); some fairly wide transverse cracks (60').

Inspector: Travis Smith Inspection Date: 03/03/2022 Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report

(59) SUPERSTRUCTURE: 6 - Satisfactory Condition (minor deterioration)

Comments:

3-span Continuous Reinforced Concrete Slab:

South coping - large areas repointed along bottom edge with longitudinal cracks & delaminations (span A - 36', span B - 30', span C - 36') - some areas spalling w/ rebar exposed (10' in span A & 8' in span C);

End spans - longitudinal cracking near centerline with minor delaminations, rust-staining & efflorescence (36' in span A, 20' in span C) - some spalls due to lack of cover in span C;

Longitudinal joint - repointing, fairly wide longitudinal cracks & delaminations (span A - 33', span B - 38', span C - 36') - 5' spalled w/ rebar exposed span A.

#### (60) SUBSTRUCTURE:

7 - Good Condition (some minor problems)

Comments:

Pier stems: minor vertical cracks; repointed area at South end of Pier #3 starting to spall off (1').

#### (61) CHANNEL/CHANNEL 6 - Bank slump. widespread minor damage

#### PROTECTION

Comments:

Channel flows from North to South below the bridge.

5' high bank erosion - from South end of Pier #3 heading South past ROW.

Rip rap at end bents.

(62) CULVERTS:	N - Not Applicable
----------------	--------------------

Comments:

#### LOAD RATING AND POSTING

(31) DESIGN LOAD:	5 - HS 20	(66) INVENTORY RATING:	0.843
(70) BRIDGE POSTING	5 - Equal to or above legal loads	(65) INVENTORY RATING METHOD	: 8 - Load and Resistance Factor Rating (LRFR)
(41) STRUCTURE OPEN/POSTED/CLOSED:	A - Open		rating report by rating factor (RF)
(64) OPERATING RATING:	1.093		method using HL-93 loadings.
(63) OPERATING RATING METHOD:	8 - Load and Resistance Factor Rating (LRFR)	(66B) INVENTORY RATING (H):	1040111801
	rating report by rating	(66C) TONS POSTED :	
	HL-93 loadings.	(66D) DATE POSTED/CLOSED:	
APPRAISAL			
SUFFICIENCY RATING:	92.7	(36) TRAFFIC SAFETY FEATURE:	
STATUS:	0	36A) BRIDGE RAILINGS:	1
(67) STRUCTURAL EVALUATION	1:6	36B) TRANSITIONS:	0
(68) DECK GEOMETRY:	7	36C) APPROACH GUARDRAIL:	0
(69) UNDERCLEARANCES, VERTICAL & HORIZONTAL:	Ν	36D) APPROACH GUARDRAIL ENDS:	1
<ul><li>(71) WATERWAY ADEQUACY: Comments: High Water Elevation = 768.4 Low Concrete Elevation = 770</li></ul>	9 - Bridge Ab	ove Flood Water Elevations	
(72) APPROACH ROADWAY ALIC Comments:	GNMENT: 8 - Equal to p	present desirable criteria	

#### (113) SCOUR CRITICAL BRIDGES:

8 - Stable for scour conditions

Piles, minor scour @ piers #2 & 3, in-filling under Span B. Bridge is stable for scour conditions.

#### CLASSIFICATION

Comments:

(20) TOLL:	3 - On Free Road	(21) MAINT. RESPONSIBILITY:	01 - State Highway Agency			
(22) OWNER:	01 - State Highway Agency	(26) FUNCTIONAL CLASS OF INVENTORY RTE:	12 - Urban - Principal Arterial - Other Freeway			
(37) HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE	: 5 - Not eligible		or Expressway			
(101) PARALLEL STRUCTURE:	R - Right structure	(100) STRAHNET HIGHWAY:	Not a STRAHNET route			
(103) TEMPORARY STRUCTURE:	(North or East)	(102) DIRECTION OF TRAFFIC:	1-way traffic			
(105) FEDERAL LANDS	0-Not Applicable	(104) HIGHWAY SYSTEM OF INVENTORY ROUTE:	1 - Structure/Route is on NHS			
HIGHWAYS: (112) NBIS BRIDGE I ENGTH	Ves	(110) DESIGNATED NATIONAL	Inventory route on National Truck Network			
	105	NET WORK.	National ITuck Network			
NAVIGATION DATA						
(38) NAVIGATION CONTROL:	0 - No navigation	(39) NAVIGATION VERTICAL CLEAR: 000.0 FT				
	(bridge permit not required)	(116) MINIMUM NAVIGATION VERT. FT CLEARANCE, VERT. LIFT BRIDGE:				
(111) PIER OR ABUTMENT PROTECTION:		(40) NAV HORIZONTAL CLEARA	ANCE: 0000.0 FT			
PROPOSED IMPROVEMEN	VTS					
(75A) TYPE OF WORK:		(95) ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT	COST: \$ 000000			
(75B) WORK DONE BY:		(96) TOTAL PROJECT COST:	\$ 000000			
(76) LENGTH OF IMPROVEMENT	: 000000 FT	(97) YR OF IMPROVEMENT COS	ΓEST:			
(94) BRIDGE IMPROVEMENT	\$ 000000	(114) FUTURE AVG DAILY TRAF	FIC: 023925			
0001.		(115) YR OF FUTURE ADT:	2034			

	Environment	Total Quantity	Units	Condition State 1	Condition State 2	Condition State 3	Condition State 4
38 - Reinforced Concrete Slab	2 - Low	5249	sq. ft.	4984	265	0	0
	Slab Area =	Lo x Wo					
	121.50' X 43	.20' =	5248	.80 SF			
510 - Wearing Surfaces		5067	sq. ft.	4887	180	0	0
	Wearing Surface Area = Lo x Wc						
	121.50' X 41	.70' =	5066	5.55 SF			
210 - Reinforced Concrete Pier Wall	2 - Low	86	ft.	85	1	0	0
	Tot. wall leng	gth = Np x	(Wo / c	cos(π/180	x Sk) - 2 x	(Lh)	
	2 EA X (43.2	200 LF/cos	(π/18	0 x 0.0000	0) - 2 EA x	(0.00 LF)	= 86.40 LF
	2 Piers X	43.20	)' =	86.40 I	LF		
215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	2 - Low	86	ft.	86	0	0	0
	Abuts. Lengt	th = 2 EA >	k Wo / c	cos(π/180	x Sk)		
	2 Abutments 2 Abutments	X 43.200 X 43.20'	LF/c = 86.40	cos( π/180 ) LF	) x 0.00000	))	
	End bents ar	re identifie	d as ab	utments fo	r Element	Level insp	ections.
302 - Compression Joint Seal	2 - Low	86	ft.	0	0	86	0
	Joints. Lengt	th = 2 EA	x Wo / d	cos(π/180	x Sk)		
	2 Joints X 43 2 Joints X 43	3.200 3.20' = 86.4	LF/co 40 LF	os( π/180	x 0.00000	)	
321 - Reinforced Concrete Approach Slab	2 - Low	1710	sq. ft.	1656	54	0	0
	Total Approa	ach Slab A	rea = V	/c ( La + L	ong Side)		
	Wc X ( La + 41.70' X (20.	(La + Wc ) .50' + 20.5	X tan(P 0') =	I/180 X Sk 1709.7	)) 0 SF		
331 - Reinforced Concrete Bridge Railing	2 - Low	243	ft.	243	0	0	0
	2 barrier rails	s X 121.50	)' = 243	.00 LF			

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

Bridge Inspection Report



PHOTO 2

Description South elevation



PHOTO 3 Description

Bent 1, West

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



#### PHOTO 4

Description Span A, cracks, delaminations, spalling



PHOTO 5

Description Span A center construction joint, delaminating repointing



PHOTO 7

Description Span A, South coping underside

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



PHOTO 8

Description Span A South coping, cracks, delamintions, spalling



PHOTO 9 Description Pie

Pier 2

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

Bridge Inspection Report



#### PHOTO 10

Description





PHOTO 11 Description

South coping Span B, underside



#### PHOTO 12

Description Deck under Span B



**PHOTO 13** 

Description Span B, cracks, delaminating

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



#### PHOTO 14

Description Center construction joint, repointing, delaminating



PHOTO 15 Description Pier 3



PHOTO 16

Description Dec



PHOTO 17

Description Center construction joint, delaminating repointing

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



#### PHOTO 18

Description Span C, cracks, delaminations, rust staining



PHOTO 19

Description Span C, South coping, delaminating repointing



PHOTO 20

Description Span C, cracks with efflorescence, SE corner



PHOTO 21

Description South coping Span C, spalling

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

Bridge Inspection Report



PHOTO 22 Bent 4, East Description



PHOTO 23 Description South coping

Asset Name:036-49-03898 AEBLFacility Carried:US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



#### PHOTO 24

Description





PHOTO 25

Description

East approach slab

Asset Name: Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



PHOTO 26

Cracks East approach slab Description



PHOTO 27 Description East joint

Asset Name:036-49-03898 AEBLFacility Carried:US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



PHOTO 28

Description Deck over looking West



PHOTO 29

Description East approach from center

Appendix I-152

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



**PHOTO 30** 

Description

Looking South



PHOTO 31

Description West approa

West approach from center

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



**PHOTO 32** 

Description

Deck over looking East



PHOTO 33 Description Wes

West joint



**PHOTO 34** 

Description We

West approach slab



**PHOTO 35** 

Description Cracks West approach slab

Asset Name: 036-49-03898 AEBL Facility Carried: US 36 EB

#### Bridge Inspection Report



**PHOTO 36** 

Description

West approach



PHOTO 37 Description

ector: ection Date:	Smith, Travis 03/03/2022	Structure Number: Facility Carried:	011680 US 36 EB		
	Bridge	e Inspection Report			
		Miscellan Asset	eous Asset Data Management		011680
L	oad Rating 2:				
H	las the dead load o arrying members o	or the structural condition hanged since the last ins	of the primary load pection?	No - Req	Load Rating Update Not Update Not
<u>E</u> Ir IN	xtended Frequen hspector: NDOT Reviewer:	<u>cy:</u>		Subr	nittal Date:
Т	his bridge has been a	accepted into the Extended F	requency Program.	Аррг	oval Date:
<u>Ј</u> Т	oints: * India	cate location, type, and ra	ating of lowest rated jo	int.	4 - Poor Condition.
N C	orth/East				leaking, noising damage, areas of adhesion loss
Т	ransverse joints ty	pe IA: glands mostly gon	e; minor spalling.		
I C	erminal Joints:	*Rating of lowest rate	d terminal joint.	7	
<u>C</u>	oncrete Slopewa	II: *Rating of lowe	st rated slopewall.	N	
С	comments:				
B N C	earings: * Indica - No Bearing(s)	ate type, and rating of lov	vest rated bearing.		

Structure Number: Facility Carried:

Facility Carried:

Bridge Inspection Report

Approach Slabs:

\* Indicate if present & condition rating.

1 - Approach Slabs

7 - Good condition, minor cracking, wide spacing

Comments:

Approach slabs: West - fairly wide transverse cracks (25'), small patching at right edgeline (2 SF) & minor spall at right edgeline & end of slab (1 SF); East - fairly wide transverse cracks (25'), triangular patch at right edgeline at IA joint (1 SF).

011680

US 36 EB

**<u>Paint:</u>** \* Indicate if paint present , year painted & condition rating.

N - No Paint

Ν

Comments:

Endangered Species: * If yes, add one photo to the dropdown field	d
Bats: seen or heard under structure? *	Ν
Birds/swallows/nests seen? Empty nests present? *	Ν

#### **BRIDGE Culvert Geometry:**

Barrel Length: Height: Width:

# **Culvert Inspection Report**

CV 036-049-65.70 US 36 over



Inspection Date: 03/16/2022 Inspected By: Travis Smith Inspection Type(s): Culvert

#### PAGE NUMBER

REPORT COVER	3
LOCATION MAP	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
CULVERT INSPECTION OUTPUT REPORT	7
CULVERT ADDITIONAL TREATMENT OUTPUT REPORT	11
PICTURES	12
SKETCHES	16
MISCELLANEOUS ASSET DATA	17
MAINTENANCE - CULVERT	19

Culvert Inspection Report



Latitude: 39.76376 Longitude: -86.32069 Culvert Inspection Report



Latitude: 39.76376 Longitude: -86.32069 Inspector: Travis Smith Inspection Date: 03/16/2022 Structure Number:93003946Facility Carried:US 36

Culvert Inspection Report

#### Executive Summary

Culvert is rated in poor condition because there were a couple of holes that were completely rusted through the pipe approximately 20' into the pipe from the South end. Other than that no noted concerns. There is no approach guardrail. The culvert is about 6' below the road surface. I walked through the culvert during the inspection. The channel runs from the East toward the West. Some scouring on the West end. 5/20/2019

Inspector:	Smith,Travis	Structure Number:	93003946
Inspection Date:	03/16/2022	Facility Carried:	US 36
		Culver Inspection Report t	

tructure Number: CV	036-049-65.70	Large (	Culvert Insp	ection Repo	ort	Insp	ector:	Smith,	I ravis
(8) Asset Code:		9300394	6	(2	7) Year Built:		0000		
Asset Name:		CV 036-0	949-65.70	(9	) 0) Inspection Da	te:	03/16	6/2022	
OLD Culvert ID:		036-49-6	5.70	(9	1) Inspection Fre	quency:	12		
Team Assignment:		03			Additi	onal Treatme	nt Exist	S	
			Identificat	ion					
(2) Highway Agency Di	strict:	03			(3) C	county Code:	049		
Sub District:		3100			Ram	p ID:			
(42B) Type of Service (	Under):	5				Adjacent	to Road	dway	
(7) Facility Carried:	US 36			(6) Fea	tures Intersected	l:			
(9) Location: 2.77	W I-465	(9	.01) Location A	Additional Desc	ription:				
(11) Milepoint: 0			(16) Latitude:	39.76376		(17) Long	itude:	-86.32	2069
(104) Highway System	of the Inventory	Route:	1	(26) Fu	nctional Classific	ation of Inver	ntory Ro	ute:	0
			Geometric I	Data					
3arrel Length (ft.): 18 Measurement Remarks:	37	10.0	Original Culver	rt Shape: F	Round		(01)	Chow.	
Structure Additional Description:	Corrugated	Metal Pipe	10.8' x 10.8' C	MP					
Openings:									
Direction	Opening	Ope	ening	Direction		Opening			Openi
1.	Latitude	Lon	gitude	3.		Latitude			Longit
2.				4.					
Openings Comments:									
Follow Up Required:									
*If checked, please describe for follow up:									
		Endan	gered Species	<u>i</u>					
	Bats: seen or h	eard under	structure? *		N - No evidence of bats				
	Birds/swallows	/nests seen	? Empty nests	present?	N - No Birds and/or Nests	3			
	* If yes, add on	e photo to t	he dropdown fi	eld	VISI				

Inspector:	Smith, Travis	Structure Number:	93003946
Inspection Date:	03/16/2022	Facility Carried:	US 36
Culver Inspection Report t			

General Condition Ratings			
(36A) Bridge Railings:	Ν	(36C) Approach Guardrail:	Ν
(36B) Transitions:	Ν	(36D) Approach Guardrail Ends:	Ν
Culvert:			
(62) Culvert - Rating:	4		
(62) Culvert Rating Comments:	Fairly large rust holes in line throughout the struct of culvert near the north horizontal seam/bolts. Al the South outlet. Program Year 2023, DES	floor near both ends, heavier at South end. Heav ure with scattered hot spots of corrosion and thir end has an area of corrosion and rust staining co I concrete anchors have very heavy deterioration \$ #2002284	ry corrosion at water nning metal. West side oming from the o. Small scour hole at
Deck:	-		
(58) Deck:	Ν		
(58a) Deck Comments: Superstructure:			
(59) Superstructure:	Ν		
(59.01) Superstructure Comments:			
Substructure:			
(60) Substructure:	Ν		
(60.01) Substructure Comments:			
CV-Headwall/Anchor Rating	4		

Channel	2
	_

(61) Channel and Channel Protection:	6
(61.01) Channel and Channel Protection Comments:	There is slight bank erosion and channel scour at the south end of the structure. The channel flows from the north to the south.
Bank Erosion Rating:	6
Drift/Sediment Rating	7
Channel Alignment Rating	7
	Check this box if culvert has OBSTRUCTED flow

Describe Obstruction:

Page 2

03/16/2022 Inspection Date:

Culvert Inspection Report

#### Pictures





Description South elevation





Road over

#### Inspector: Travis Smith

Inspection Date: 03/16/2022

93003946 US 36

Culvert Inspection Report

#### Pictures



РНОТО 3

Description SW anchor



PHOTO 4

Description Missing SE anchor

Inspection Date: 03/16/2022

Culvert Inspection Report

#### Pictures



PHOTO 5

Description

North elevation



PHOTO 6

Description

Inside North end

Inspector: Travis Smith

Inspection Date: 03/16/2022

93003946 US 36

Culvert Inspection Report

#### Pictures



PHOTO 7

Description West side near North end



PHOTO 8

Description Large holes near South end

From:	Darrah, Taylor N
To:	Rachel Pluckebaum
Subject:	RE: Des. No. 1800035 & Des. No. 1800037 - Bat and Heritage Database Check (1900340 & 1900341)
Date:	Friday, February 5, 2021 8:17:50 AM
Attachments:	image001.png
	image002.png
	image003.png
	image004.png
	image005.png
	image006.png

Rachel,

A review of the USFWS GIS database for Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat roosting, hibernacula and capture sites was conducted for Des No's 1900340 and 1900341 on February 5, 2021. There are no documented sites within a half mile the project area. The USFWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) website must be consulted and a new project created to obtain an official species list and complete the questionnaire for the project to determine the applicability of the programmatic consultation. If needed, the IPaC generated documents must be forwarded to the USFWS for verification.

Thank you,

#### **Taylor Darrah**

Environmental Section Manager Indiana Department of Transportation 32 South Broadway Greenfield, IN 46140 Office: (317) 467-3915 Cell: (317) 526-6080 Email: TDarrah@indot.in.gov







## School of Forestry

## **Species from Feces Results**

Client	Kirk Roth, Corradino, LLC, kroth@CORRADINO.com
Invoice number	20200925_1
Project ID	KRoth
Sequencing date	January 2021
Report date	January 2021
Technician	Daniel Sanchez
Bioinformatician	Daniel Sanchez

#### Sample processing:

We received five 15 mL vials of bat guano and a tissue sample. The goal was to identify one or more bat species in the guano and to identify the tissue sample to species. We noted no issues with sample preservation and quality upon receipt of the vials. We decontaminated all vials with 10% bleach prior to handling and processing.

We successfully extracted genomic DNA and amplified a short-section of cytochrome oxidase subunit I (COI) from all samples using our standard methodology (Walker et al. 2016; Walker et al. 2019). Amplified product was sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq V3 600 cycle kit to obtain DNA sequences (reads) of one or more taxa per sample. Sequencing reads were computationally processed to obtain read variants of the highest taxonomic quality in QIIME2 v2020.11 (Bolyen et al. 2018). Priming regions, adapters, and read-through were removed using cutadapt v2.1 (Martin 2011) to isolate the 202 base pair fragment of interest. We removed low quality reads, alleviated sequencing contamination by joining paired-end reads, and filtered out PCR artifacts (chimeric reads) using DADA2 (Callahan et al. 2016). Using our positive control, we identified a read threshold by which to filter out read variants of likely sequencing error. Sequences were then classified using a naïve-Bayes machine learning classifier (Bokulich et al. 2018) that we trained against our custom reference database. We retained species classifications only if they were classified by at least 90% bootstrap support. Any read variants not classified using the machine learning algorithm to species were cross-referenced against the National Center for Biotechnology Information's (NCBI) GenBank database (Benson et al. 2009) using BLAST (Altschul et al. 1990) with taxa classified using Least Common Ancestor (LCA)

Bat Ecology & Genetics Lab, School of Forestry, NAU, P.O. Box 15018, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 www.nau.edu\batdna

Questions? Faith.Walker@nau.edu; Carol.Chambers@nau.edu

analysis in MEGAN v6 (Huson et al. 2007). This cross-referencing step helps to alleviate any false negative bat classifications in the naïve-Baye's model or identify non-bat taxa.

#### <u>Results:</u>



Reads	After filtering	Taxonomy assigned
Total	381277	377940
Mean	76255.4	75588
Median	60132	60132
SD	48218.4003	48295.9172
iqr	17800	17800
Min	32184	29912
Max	158135	157070
N.samples	5	5

Bat Ecology & Genetics Lab, School of Forestry, NAU, P.O. Box 15018, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 <u>www.nau.edu\batdna</u> Questions? <u>Faith.Walker@nau.edu</u>; <u>Carol.Chambers@nau.edu</u> Our positive control, containing a known mixture of four bat species, amplified and sequenced in expected read proportions. None of the negative controls prepared with your samples amplified. All samples were successfully sequenced. We detected two bat taxa in the dataset, *Eptesicus fuscus* and a species of Myotis that was unable to be classified to the species level. Given its low read count, we believe the DNA sequence of this unknown Myotis was likely of poor quality. Both taxa are known to occur in Indiana.

The bat pup tissue sample from East Span was genetically identified as *Eptesicus fuscus*.

#### Accompanying files:

Along with a PDF of the detection barplots, we included an Excel (xlsx) spreadsheet that includes all figures, all taxonomic data, and sequencing pass and read summaries.

KRoth\_20200925\_1\_BEGLresults.xlsx Batdetection\_plot.pdf

#### References:

Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic Local Alignment Search Tool. J Mol Biol.:8.

Benson DA, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Lipman DJ, Ostell J, Sayers EW. 2009. GenBank. Nucleic Acids Res. 37(suppl\_1):D26–D31. doi:10.1093/nar/gkn723.

Bokulich NA, Kaehler BD, Rideout JR, Dillon M, Bolyen E, Knight R, Huttley GA, Gregory Caporaso J. 2018. Optimizing taxonomic classification of marker-gene amplicon sequences with QIIME 2's q2-feature-classifier plugin. Microbiome. 6(1):90. doi:10.1186/s40168-018-0470-z.

Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet C, Al-Ghalith GA, Alexander H, Alm EJ, Arumugam M, Asnicar F, et al. 2018. QIIME 2: Reproducible, interactive, scalable, and extensible microbiome data science. PeerJ Inc. Report No.: e27295v2. [accessed 2019 Jul 3]. https://peerj.com/preprints/27295.

Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJA, Holmes SP. 2016. DADA2: Highresolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat Methods. 13(7):581–583. doi:10.1038/nmeth.3869.

Huson DH, Auch AF, Qi J, Schuster SC. 2007. MEGAN analysis of metagenomic data. Genome Res. 17(3):377–386. doi:10.1101/gr.5969107.

Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. EMBnet.journal. 17(1):10–12. doi:10.14806/ej.17.1.200. Bat Ecology & Genetics Lab, School of Forestry, NAU, P.O. Box 15018, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 <u>www.nau.edu\batdna</u> Questions? <u>Faith.Walker@nau.edu</u>; <u>Carol.Chambers@nau.edu</u> Walker FM, Tobin A, Simmons NB, Sobek CJ, Sanchez DE, Chambers CL, Fofanov VY. 2019. A fecal sequel: Testing the limits of a genetic assay for bat species identification. PLOS ONE. 14(11):e0224969. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0224969.

Walker FM, Williamson CHD, Sanchez DE, Sobek CJ, Chambers CL. 2016. Species From Feces: Order-Wide Identification of Chiroptera From Guano and Other Non-Invasive Genetic Samples. Russo D, editor. PLOS ONE. 11(9):e0162342. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162342.





## **School of Forestry**

## **Species from Feces Results**

Kirk Roth, Corradino, LLC, kroth@CORRADINO.com
20210609_1
KRoth
19 July 2021
22 July 2021
Daniel Sanchez
Daniel Sanchez

#### Sample processing:

We received eight 15 mL vials of bat guano. The goal was to identify one or more bat species in a mixture for each sample. We noted no issues with sample preservation and quality upon receipt of the vials. We decontaminated all vials with 10% bleach prior to handling and processing.

We successfully extracted genomic DNA and amplified a short-section of cytochrome oxidase subunit I (COI) from the samples using our standard methodology (Walker et al. 2016; Walker et al. 2019). Amplified product was sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq V3 600 cycle kit to obtain DNA sequences (reads) of one or more taxa per sample. Sequencing reads were computationally processed to obtain read variants of the highest taxonomic quality in QIIME2 v2020.11 (Bolyen et al. 2018). Priming regions were removed using cutadapt v3.1 (Martin 2011) to isolate the 202 base pair fragment of interest. We removed low quality reads, alleviated sequencing contamination by joining paired-end reads, and filtered out PCR artifacts (chimeric reads) using DADA2 (Callahan et al. 2016). Using our positive control, we identified a read threshold by which to filter out read variants of likely sequencing error. Sequences were then classified using a naïve-Bayes machine learning classifier (Bokulich et al. 2018) that we trained against our custom reference database. We retained species classifications only if they were classified with at least 90% bootstrap support. Any read variants not classified using the machine learning algorithm to species were cross-referenced against the National Center for Biotechnology Information's (NCBI) GenBank database (Benson et al. 2009) using BLAST (Altschul et al. 1990) with taxa classified using Least Common Ancestor (LCA) analysis in MEGAN

Bat Ecology & Genetics Lab, School of Forestry, NAU, P.O. Box 15018, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 <u>www.nau.edu\batdna</u> Questions? Faith.Walker@nau.edu; Carol.Chambers@nau.edu v6 (Huson et al. 2007). This cross-referencing step helps to alleviate any false negative bat classifications in the naïve-Baye's model or identify non-bat taxa.



#### Results:

Our positive control, containing a known mixture of nine bat species (of three families) amplified and sequenced eight of nine. None of the negative controls prepared with your samples amplified. Seven of the eight samples were successfully sequenced. **We detected big brown bat (***Eptesicus fuscus***) for 100% of the sequences of all samples.** The species is widespread across North America. Sample C-2 failed because it did not yield identifiable DNA sequences.

#### Accompanying files:

Along with a PDF of the detection barplots, we included an Excel (xlsx) spreadsheet that includes all figures, all taxonomic data, and sequencing pass and read summaries.

KRoth\_20210609\_1\_BEGLresults.xlsx Batdetection\_plot.pdf

Bat Ecology & Genetics Lab, School of Forestry, NAU, P.O. Box 15018, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 <u>www.nau.edu\batdna</u> Questions? Faith.Walker@nau.edu; Carol.Chambers@nau.edu

#### References:

Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic Local Alignment Search Tool. J Mol Biol.:8.

Benson DA, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Lipman DJ, Ostell J, Sayers EW. 2009. GenBank. Nucleic Acids Res. 37(suppl\_1):D26–D31. doi:10.1093/nar/gkn723.

Bokulich NA, Kaehler BD, Rideout JR, Dillon M, Bolyen E, Knight R, Huttley GA, Gregory Caporaso J. 2018. Optimizing taxonomic classification of marker-gene amplicon sequences with QIIME 2's q2-feature-classifier plugin. Microbiome. 6(1):90. doi:10.1186/s40168-018-0470-z.

Bolyen E, Rideout JR, Dillon MR, Bokulich NA, Abnet C, Al-Ghalith GA, Alexander H, Alm EJ, Arumugam M, Asnicar F, et al. 2018. QIIME 2: Reproducible, interactive, scalable, and extensible microbiome data science. PeerJ Inc. Report No.: e27295v2. [accessed 2019 Jul 3]. https://peerj.com/preprints/27295.

Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Rosen MJ, Han AW, Johnson AJA, Holmes SP. 2016. DADA2: Highresolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. Nat Methods. 13(7):581–583. doi:10.1038/nmeth.3869.

Huson DH, Auch AF, Qi J, Schuster SC. 2007. MEGAN analysis of metagenomic data. Genome Res. 17(3):377–386. doi:10.1101/gr.5969107.

Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. EMBnet.journal. 17(1):10–12. doi:10.14806/ej.17.1.200.

Walker FM, Tobin A, Simmons NB, Sobek CJ, Sanchez DE, Chambers CL, Fofanov VY. 2019. A fecal sequel: Testing the limits of a genetic assay for bat species identification. PLOS ONE. 14(11):e0224969. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0224969.

Walker FM, Williamson CHD, Sanchez DE, Sobek CJ, Chambers CL. 2016. Species From Feces: Order-Wide Identification of Chiroptera From Guano and Other Non-Invasive Genetic Samples. Russo D, editor. PLOS ONE. 11(9):e0162342. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162342. Tree Clearing Map (1 of 3) US 36, from Raceway Rd. to I-465 Des. No's. 1800035 & 1800037, Corridor Improvements Marion County, Indiana



#### Sources: 0.1 0.05 0 0.1 Non Orthophotography Miles

**Data** - Obtained from the State of Indiana Geographical Information Office Library

<u>Orthophotography</u> - Obtained from Indiana Map Framework Data (www.indianamap.org)

Map Projection: UTM Zone 16 N Map Datum: NAD83

This map is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This information is not warranted for accuracy or other purposes.

# INDIANA STATEWIDE AERIAL IMAGERY FLOWN 2016

Legend

Potential Tree Clearing Area

Tree Clearing Map (2 of 3) US 36, from Raceway Rd. to I-465 Des. No's. 1800035 & 1800037, Corridor Improvements Marion County, Indiana



#### Sources: 0.1 0.05 0 0.1 Non Orthophotography Miles

**Data** - Obtained from the State of Indiana Geographical Information Office Library

<u>**Orthophotography**</u> - Obtained from Indiana Map Framework Data (www.indianamap.org)

Map Projection: UTM Zone 16 N Map Datum: NAD83

This map is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This information is not warranted for accuracy or other purposes.

# INDIANA STATEWIDE AERIAL IMAGERY FLOWN 2016

Legend

![](_page_49_Picture_9.jpeg)

Tree Clearing Map (3 of 3) US 36, from Raceway Rd. to I-465 Des. No's. 1800035 & 1800037, Corridor Improvements Marion County, Indiana

![](_page_50_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Sources: 0.1 Non Orthophotography

0.1 0.05 0 0.1 Miles

**Data** - Obtained from the State of Indiana Geographical Information Office Library

<u>Orthophotography</u> - Obtained from Indiana Map Framework Data (www.indianamap.org)

Map Projection: UTM Zone 16 N Map Datum: NAD83

This map is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This information is not warranted for accuracy or other purposes.

# INDIANA STATEWIDE AERIAL IMAGERY FLOWN 2016

Legend

![](_page_50_Picture_11.jpeg)

Tree Clearing Map (Shiloh Creek) US 36, from Raceway Rd. to I-465 Des. No's. 1800035 & 1800037, Corridor Improvements Marion County, Indiana

![](_page_51_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Sources:0.0150.007500.015Non OrthophotographyImage: Constraint of the state of Indiana GeographicalMilesData- Obtained from the State of Indiana GeographicalMilesInformation Office LibraryOrthophotography- Obtained from Indiana Map Framework Data

(www.indianamap.org)

Map Projection: UTM Zone 16 N Map Datum: NAD83

This map is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This information is not warranted for accuracy or other purposes.

# INDIANA STATEWIDE AERIAL IMAGERY FLOWN 2016

## Legend

### Potential Tree Clearing Area

Tree Clearing Map (East Fork White Lick Creek) US 36, from Raceway Rd. to I-465 Des. No's. 1800035 & 1800037, Corridor Improvements Marion County, Indiana

![](_page_52_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Sources:0.0150.007500.015Non OrthophotographyImage: Constrained from the State of Indiana GeographicalMilesDataObtained from the State of Indiana Map Framework Data

(www.indianamap.org)

Map Projection: UTM Zone 16 N Map Datum: NAD83

This map is intended to serve as an aid in graphic representation only. This information is not warranted for accuracy or other purposes.

# INDIANA STATEWIDE AERIAL IMAGERY FLOWN 2016

## Legend

### Potential Tree Clearing Area