

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

**Federal Highway Administration  
Planning and Environmental Linkages Questionnaire  
April 5, 2011**

This questionnaire is intended to act as a summary of the Planning process and ease the transition from planning to a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis. Often, there is no overlap in personnel between the planning and NEPA phases of a project, so consequently much (or all) of the history of decisions made in the planning phase is lost. Different planning processes take projects through analysis at different levels of detail. NEPA project teams may not be aware of relevant planning information and may re-do work that has already been done. This questionnaire is consistent with the 23 CFR 450 (Planning regulations) and other FHWA policy on Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) process.

The Planning and Environmental Linkages study (PEL Study) is used in this questionnaire as a generic term to mean any type of planning study conducted at the corridor or subarea level which is more focused than studies at the regional or system planning levels. Many states may use other terminology to define studies of this type and those are considered to have the same meaning as a PEL study.

At the inception of the PEL study, the study team should decide how the work may later be incorporated into subsequent NEPA efforts. A key consideration is whether the PEL study will meet standards established by NEPA regulations and guidance. One example is the use of terminology consistent with NEPA vocabulary (e.g. purpose and need, alternatives, affected environment, environmental consequences).

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

<b>1. Background:</b>	
a. Who is the sponsor of the PEL study? (State DOT, Local Agency, Other)	
	Wayne County Commissioners (West Virginia) KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission
b. What is the name of the PEL study document and other identifying project information (e.g., sub-account or STIP numbers, long-range plan, or transportation improvement program years)?	
	Harvey Road Connector PEL Study: 2020-2025 STIP, 2040 MTP and 2018 -2021 TIP S350-HAR/VE - 1.00
c. Who was included on the study team (Name and title of agency representatives, consultants, etc.)?	
	<p><u>Stakeholder Advisory Group</u>            Jimmy Boggs, Wayne County Administrator            Saleem Salameh, Deputy Director, KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission            Karen Allen, WVODH Planning Division            Brian Chapman, WVDODH Planning Division            Steve Engelhardt, WVDODH Environmental            Audy Perry, Executive Director, Heritage Farm Museum &amp; Village</p> <p><u>Consultant</u>            E.L. Robinson Engineering Co. (ELR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leigh Lane, Project Manager / NEPA Expert</li> <li>• Douglas Parker, Environmental Manager</li> <li>• Chris Inscore, Natural Resources Lead</li> <li>• Caroline Williams, Roadway Engineer</li> <li>• Roland Robinson, Roadway Engineer</li> <li>• Scott LeRose, Roadway Engineer</li> <li>• Dane Ismart, Traffic Engineer</li> </ul>
d. Provide a description of the existing transportation facility within the corridor, including project limits, modes, functional classification, number of lanes, shoulder width, access control and type of surrounding environment (urban vs. rural, residential vs. commercial, etc.)	
	A study area for the PEL study was defined as Harvey Road (west), Johnstown Road (north), WV-152 (east), German Ridge Road (south). Modes of transportation include vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, school buses, and transit buses. A detailed description of the existing transportation system is provided in Chapter 4 of the PEL study report.

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

Road	Federal Functional Classification <sup>1</sup>	State Functional Classification <sup>2</sup>	Number of Lanes	Shoulder Width	Access Control	Surrounding Environment
Harvey	Minor Collector	Collector	1.5 with 3 1 lane bridges	None	None	Residential (Cabell) Rural (Wayne)
Johnstown	Unclassified	Collector	1.5	None	None	Residential
WV-152 Cabell County	Major Arterial	Feeder	4 lane divided	10 foot	None	Mixed Commercial / Residential
WV-152 Wayne County	Major Collector	Feeder	2	2 foot	None	Rural
German Ridge Road	Unclassified	Collector	1 unmarked pavement	None	None	Rural
Proposed Connector	Urban Minor Collector	Collector	2	5 foot	None	Rural

<sup>1</sup>[https://gis.transportation.wv.gov/ftp/FunctionalClassMaps/Federal\\_Functional\\_Class.pdf](https://gis.transportation.wv.gov/ftp/FunctionalClassMaps/Federal_Functional_Class.pdf)

<sup>2</sup>[https://gis.transportation.wv.gov/ftp/FunctionalClassMaps/State\\_Functional\\_Class.pdf](https://gis.transportation.wv.gov/ftp/FunctionalClassMaps/State_Functional_Class.pdf)

e. Provide a brief chronology of the planning activities (PEL study) including the year(s) the studies were completed.

The Harvey Road Connector PEL study was initiated in June 2020 and concluded in July 2021.

- 7/2020 PEL study initiated
- 9/2020 – Start of Study Letter
- 11/2020 – Goal and objectives
- 12/2020 – Traffic / KYOVA model; corridor environmental evaluation of initial alternatives; unreasonable alternatives eliminated; ; selected 6 reasonable alternatives
- 1/2021 – conceptual roadway designs for 6 reasonable alternatives
- 3/2021 – Field reconnaissance; cultural resources review
- 4/2021 – Resource agency coordination; virtual public meeting
- 5/2021 – In-person open house
- 6/2021 – Recommended 3 alternatives carried forward to NEPA
- 7/2021 – Final report

f. Are there recent, current, or near future planning studies or projects in the vicinity? What is the relationship of this project to those studies/projects?

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

Section 4.2 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study provides details on the local planning context. In total seven local plans and one previous study were found to reflect upon the project objectives:

- 2009 Wayne County Achieving 20/20 Vision Plan – enhance basic infrastructure within Wayne County
- 2013 City of Huntington 2025 Plan – improve connections for pedestrians and bicycles and explore potential economic development along Harvey Road
- 2017 KYOVA 2040 Integrated Metropolitan Transportation Plan – enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system; create a system of interconnected streets to improve mobility; multi-use trail along Harvey Road
- 2017 Heritage Farm Museum and Village Access Road Study evaluated alternatives for a new connector between WV-152 and Harvey Road.
- 2018 Region 2 Planning and Development Council Regional Development Plan – WV-152 area of growth in Wayne County; Heritage Farm Museum and Village positive effect on regional tourism.
- 2018 KYOVA Exit 8 / I-64 Mixed Use Development and Traffic Mobility Study – WV-152 area of opportunity, designate as tourism corridor
- 2020 Region 2 Planning and Development Council’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2020-2024 – heritage tourism important to the area and Heritage Farm Museum and Village part of that heritage tourism
- 2020 Region 2 Planning and Development Council Appalachian Heartland Initiative Strategic Marketing and Economic Feasibility Study – supports new connecting road between Harvey Road and WV-152

There are no transportation projects currently in the vicinity beyond maintenance (ditching & patching):

<https://wvdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=07cdf407117e43c69e33e301b82d8f91>

**2. Methodology used:**

a. What was the scope of the PEL study and the reason for completing it?

Harvey Road is a minor urban collector traversing Cabell County into Wayne County. It is a key connecting route from the southern portion of Huntington to the northern region of Wayne County. The KYOVA identified the Harvey Road Connector as an important potential investment to improve east-west accessibility, mobility, and connectivity in northern Wayne County between Harvey Road (County Road 9) and WV-152 (5th Street Road). The existing roadway infrastructure connecting east to west is substandard due to narrow road widths and poor site distance creating travel inefficiencies and unsafe travel conditions. As a result, the lack of accessibility, mobility, and connectivity to the Wayne County section of Harvey Road represents a deficiency in the overall regional transportation network which reduces access to jobs, recreation, and entertainment options for residents in both Wayne and Cabell Counties as well as regional visitors. Consequently, KYOVA in cooperation with Wayne County initiated a PEL study in 2020 to closely examine the need for a connecting roadway between Harvey Road and WV-152 including evaluation of potential alternatives.

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

b. Did you use NEPA-like language? Why or why not?	
NEPA-like language was used to streamline the environmental process for the future transportation project in the study area.	
c. What were the actual terms used and how did you define them? (Provide examples or list)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Scoping” was the start of study letter (which included the environmental features map) used to solicit early input from resource agencies and local agencies.</li> <li>• “Goal and objectives” was used instead of purpose and need.</li> <li>• “Initial Study Area” encompassed the initial alternatives in the first level of screening.</li> <li>• “Logical Termini” were the beginning and endpoints of the alternatives.</li> <li>• “Environmental Features Map” identified all desktop GIS features.</li> <li>• “Design Study Area” encompassed the alternatives in the second level of screening.</li> <li>• “Initial Alternatives” were the alternatives developed for the first level of screening.</li> <li>• “Alternatives” were the alternatives remaining after the initial screening.</li> <li>• “Potential Impact Matrix” details the potential community and environmental resource impacts.</li> <li>• “Alternatives Recommended for NEPA Project Phase” are the alternatives remaining after the second level of screening.</li> </ul>	
d. How do you see these terms being used in NEPA documents?	
<p>These terms will be used in NEPA documents in a similar fashion as they were used in the Harvey Road Connector PEL study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoping process</li> <li>• Logical termini</li> <li>• The project goal and objectives will translate to the project “Purpose and Need”.</li> <li>• Reasonable alternatives can be adopted in the NEPA study process as well as the elimination of 3 alternatives based on public input to focus the NEPA study area to 3 alternatives for detailed environmental surveys as well as location and design.</li> </ul>	
e. What were the key steps and coordination points in the PEL decision-making process? Who were the decision-makers and who else participated in those key steps? For example, for the corridor vision, the decision was made by state DOT and the local agency, with buy-in from FHWA, the USACE, and USFWS and other resource/regulatory agencies.	
Regular monthly project meetings were held with the Stakeholder Advisory Group.	
<b>Key Decision Points / Steps</b>	<b>Decision Makers / Participants</b>
Scoping process - Approve initial study area	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Scoping process - Approve logical termini	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

Scoping process - Validate environmental features map	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Scoping process - Approve start of study letter (Sent to 54 federal, state, local, and tribal entities. Appendix D in the report includes the full list.)	Stakeholder Advisory Group
Scoping process - Conduct interviews	Consultant
Traffic analysis	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Roadway deficiencies	Consultant
Validating goal and objectives	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Developing initial 9 alternatives	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Screen initial 9 alternatives to 6	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Approve design study area	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant
Conceptual roadway design	Consultant
Construction cost estimate	Consultant
Cultural resources screening	WVDOH Planning Division
Field reconnaissance	Consultant
Resource agency consultation (attended by 15 federal, state, or local agencies representatives including FHWA, EPA, WVDNR, and Cabell County. Appendix D in the report includes the full list.)	Stakeholder Advisory Group
Public engagement activities	Stakeholder Advisory Group
Screen 6 alternatives to 3	Stakeholder Advisory Group / Consultant

**f. How should the PEL information be presented in NEPA?**

The information produced and decisions made in the PEL study can serve as a starting point for more detailed, project-specific analyses in NEPA.

- The goal and objectives (purpose of and need) established as a result of the PEL study will be used for subsequent project-specific NEPA documents.
- The PEL study process followed NEPA “like” protocols therefore the vetting of reasonableness is sufficient to be incorporated by reference to focus the NEPA study process on the 3 recommended alternatives.
- The field reconnaissance findings will guide future NEPA environmental studies.
- The public engagement activities will provide context for the public’s role in the decision-making process and will also be incorporated by reference into future NEPA studies.

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

<b>3. Agency coordination:</b>
a. Provide a synopsis of coordination with Federal, tribal, state and local environmental, regulatory and resource agencies. Describe their level of participation and how you coordinated with them.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• On September 29, 2020, a Start of Study letter was emailed to 54 federal, state, local, and tribal entities.</li><li>• On March 31, 2021, an email invitation was sent to 31 federal, state, and local agencies inviting them to attend a virtual consultation meeting.</li><li>• On April 14, 2021, a virtual consultation meeting was held from 10:30AM to 12:00PM.</li><li>• Agencies provided initial comments in the chat box and those comments expressed their appreciation of being informed about the project and its status.</li><li>• The resource agencies did not provide any additional comments by the May 31, 2021, deadline.</li></ul> <p>Chapter 7 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes resource agency coordination. Appendix B of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study provides detailed documentation of resource agency coordination.</p>
b. What transportation agencies (e.g., for adjacent jurisdictions) did you coordinate with or were involved during the PEL study?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• KYOVA Interstate Planning Commission funded the study and was on Stakeholder Advisory Group.</li><li>• WVDOH was on the Stakeholder Advisory Group.</li><li>• Tri-River Transit Authority was interviewed.</li><li>• FHWA was an attendee of the resource agency virtual consultation meeting.</li></ul>
c. What steps will need to be taken with each agency during NEPA scoping?
Each agency will be provided a copy of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study report. The NEPA scoping would be done in consideration of the recommendation of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study. During the NEPA process, agencies would be reengaged in accordance with their regulatory jurisdiction.
<b>4. Public coordination:</b>
a. Provide a synopsis of your coordination efforts with the public and stakeholders.
Public engagement activities included:

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

- a project information webpage
- an online survey with 6 questions (2 on selecting an alternative, 2 on ranking alternatives, and 1 open ended feedback, and 1 for signing up for future involvement)
- April 14, 2021, virtual public meeting
- May 13, 2021, in-person open house

Public response was:

- Public support was highest for Alternatives 3, 4, and 5
- The public was strongly against Alternative 7

Chapter 8 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes public coordination. Appendix B of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study provides detailed documentation of public coordination.

**5. Purpose and Need for the PEL study:**

- a. What was the scope of the PEL study and the reason for completing it?

PEL Study Scope

- Scoping
  - Initial study area
  - Logical termini
  - Review local plans
  - Desktop GIS review
  - Environmental features map
  - Start of study letter
- Project goal and objectives
  - Interviews
  - Traffic analysis
  - Identify unsafe roadway conditions (roadway deficiencies)
  - Developing and validating project goal and objectives
- Alternatives development and evaluation
  - Develop initial 9 alternatives
  - Screen the initial 9 alternatives against project goal and objectives and identified environmental features (resulting in elimination of 3 alternatives)
  - Further screen the 6 remaining alternatives
    - Conceptual roadway designs
    - Construction cost estimates
    - Design study area
    - Cultural resources screening
    - Field reconnaissance
- Public and stakeholder engagement
  - Monthly stakeholder advisory group meetings
  - Bimonthly KYOVA Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Board Meetings
  - Start of study letter
  - Virtual resource agency consultation (presented 6 alternatives)
  - Virtual public meeting (presented 6 alternatives)



**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In-person open house (presented 6 alternatives)</li> <li>● PEL study recommendations             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Resulted in elimination of 3 more alternatives and the identification of the 3 best alternatives to be carried forward to NEPA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>b. Provide the purpose and need statement, or the corridor vision and transportation goals and objectives to realize that vision.</p>
<p><b>Project goal:</b> Improve accessibility, mobility, and connectivity within northern Wayne County between Harvey Road (County Road 9; at Ellis Lane) and WV-152 (at German Ridge Road).</p> <p><b>Project Objectives:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase overall travel efficiency to the Wayne County section of Harvey Road.</li> <li>2. Increase transportation redundancy for the Wayne County section of Harvey Road.</li> <li>3. Reduce exposure to unsafe roadway conditions for all vehicle types.</li> <li>4. Accommodate transit opportunities within the available project resources.</li> <li>5. Accommodate bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the available project resources.</li> <li>6. Support state, regional, and local plans for increased economic development opportunities.</li> </ol> <p>Chapter 3 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes the project goal and objectives. Appendix A provides detailed documentation on the development of the project goal and objectives.</p>
<p>c. What steps will need to be taken during the NEPA process to make this a project-level purpose and need statement?</p>
<p>The project goal and objectives will need to be translated into the NEPA Purpose and Need Statement.</p>
<p><b>6. Range of alternatives:</b> Planning teams need to be cautious during the alternative screen process; alternative screening should focus on purpose and need/corridor vision, fatal flaw analysis, and possibly mode selection. This may help minimize problems during discussions with resource agencies. Alternatives that have fatal flaws or do not meet the purpose and need/corridor vision will not be considered reasonable alternatives, even if they reduce impacts to a particular resource. Detail the range of alternatives considered, screening criteria, and screening process, including:</p>
<p>a. What types of alternatives were looked at? (Provide a one or two sentence summary and reference document.)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No build</li> <li>● Upgrade existing (north and south)</li> <li>● New location (Alternatives 1-7)</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 6 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes alternatives development and evaluation.</p>
<p>b. How did you select the screening criteria and screening process?</p>

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

The alternatives development and evaluation process consisted of an iterative, two-tiered process:

- First level screening included a corridor level evaluation (desktop analysis) of potential environmental impacts as well as how well they would address the project goal and objectives. Three alternatives were eliminated because they did not meet the project goal and objectives as well as had substantially high potential environmental impacts.
- Second level screening was initiated by further evaluation of the six remaining alternatives through development of conceptual roadway designs, in-depth cultural resources screening, and a field reconnaissance for water features and threatened and endangered species habitat. These six alternatives were presented to resource agencies and the public for their feedback.
- Second level screening continued by screening the six remaining alternatives for additional potential environmental impacts, how they could address the project goal and objectives, and input from resource agencies and the public. Three additional alternatives were eliminated.

Chapter 6 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes alternatives development and evaluation.

- c. For alternative(s) that were screened out, briefly summarize the reasons for eliminating the alternative(s). (During the initial screenings, this generally will focus on fatal flaws.)

**Initial screening eliminated**

- Upgrade existing north
  - Does not meet project goal and objectives.
  - Extensive potential human and natural environmental impacts.
- Upgrade existing south
  - Does not meet project goal and objectives.
  - Extensive potential human and natural environmental impacts.
- Alternative 6
  - Does not meet project goal and objectives.
  - Extensive potential human and natural environmental impacts.

Section 6.3 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes initial screening.

**Second level screening eliminated**

- Alternative 1
  - High potential natural environmental impacts.
  - No public support.
  - Utility conflicts.
- Alternative 2
  - High potential natural environmental impacts.
  - No public support.
  - High utility conflicts.

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

- Alternative 7
  - Extensive potential human and natural environmental impacts.
  - Public controversy.
  - High utility conflicts.

Sections 6.4 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes second level screening.

d. Which alternatives should be brought forward into NEPA and why?

**Alternatives Recommended for NEPA Project Phase**

- Alternative 3
  - Low potential human and natural environmental impacts.
  - Highest public support.
- Alternative 4
  - Low potential human and natural environmental impacts.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> highest public support.
- Alternative 5
  - Low potential human and natural environmental impacts.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> highest public support.

Chapter 9 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes alternatives recommended for NEPA project phase.

e. Did the public, stakeholders, and agencies have an opportunity to comment during this process?

**Public engagement**

- a project information webpage
- an online survey with 6 questions (2 on selecting an alternative, 2 on ranking alternatives, and 1 open ended feedback, and 1 for signing up for future involvement)
- April 14, 2021, virtual public meeting
- May 13, 2021, in-person open house

Chapter 8 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes public coordination. Appendix B of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study provides detailed documentation of public coordination.

**Stakeholder**

- Regular monthly project meetings were held with the Stakeholder Advisory Group.
- Bimonthly KYOVA Technical Advisory Committee and Policy Board Meetings

**Agency Coordination**

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

- On September 29, 2020, a Start of Study letter was emailed to 54 federal, state, local, and tribal entities.
- On March 31, 2021, an email invitation was sent to 31 federal, state, and local agencies inviting them to attend a virtual consultation meeting.
- On April 14, 2021, a virtual consultation meeting was held from 10:30AM to 12:00PM.
- Agencies provided initial comments in the chat box and those comments expressed their appreciation of being informed about the project and its status.
- The resource agencies did not provide any additional comments by the May 31, 2021, deadline.

Chapter 7 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes resource agency coordination. Appendix B of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study provides detailed documentation of resource agency coordination.

f. Were there unresolved issues with the public, stakeholders, and/or agencies?

There were no unresolved issues.

**7. Planning assumptions and analytical methods:**

a. What is the forecast year used in the PEL study?

Year 2050

b. What method was used for forecasting traffic volumes?

- KYOVA Travel Demand Model
- August 2020 questionnaire for Heritage Farm Museum and Village

Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes traffic analysis.

c. Are the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with each other and with the long-range transportation plan? Are the assumptions still valid?

Yes, the project vision (goal and objectives) are consistent with the 2009 Wayne County Achieving 20/20 Vision Plan; the 2013 City of Huntington 2025 Plan; the 2017 KYOVA 2040 Integrated Metropolitan Transportation Plan; the 2018 Region 2 Planning and Development Council Regional Development Plan; the 2018 KYOVA Exit 8 / I-64 Mixed Use Development and Traffic Mobility Study; the 2020 Region 2 Planning and Development Council's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2020-2024; the 2020 Region 2 Planning

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

<p>and Development Council Appalachian Heartland Initiative Strategic Marketing and Economic Feasibility Study; and the WVDOH 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan.</p>	
<p>d. What were the future year policy and/or data assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs, and network expansion?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2050 traffic projections were utilized</li> <li>• KYOVA used socio-economic projects for their model</li> <li>• No project land use plan was available, therefore, no project land use trends were evaluated</li> </ul>	
<p><b>8. Environmental resources</b> (wetlands, cultural, etc.) reviewed. For each resource or group of resources reviewed, provide the following:</p>	
<p>a. In the PEL study, at what level of detail was the resource reviewed and what was the method of review?</p>	
<p>Initial screening at a GIS desktop level was conducted for the initial study area for the following resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NWI wetlands</li> <li>• Streams (linear feet)</li> <li>• 100-year floodplain</li> <li>• Farmland of Statewide Importance</li> <li>• Residential structures</li> <li>• Commercial structures</li> <li>• Places of worship</li> <li>• Major utilities</li> <li>• Threatened and endangered species listings</li> <li>• Wild or Stocked Trout Streams</li> <li>• 500-year Floodplain</li> <li>• State Game Lands, Forest, or Parks</li> <li>• Natural or Wild Areas</li> <li>• National Natural Landmarks</li> <li>• Mines/Mineral Resources</li> <li>• Wildlife Management Areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Facilities</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Recreation Facilities</li> <li>• Health Care Facilities</li> <li>• Hospitals</li> <li>• Nursing Homes</li> <li>• Public Schools</li> <li>• Private Schools</li> <li>• Community Colleges</li> <li>• Day Cares</li> <li>• Cemeteries</li> <li>• Listed National Register Sites</li> <li>• Section 4(f) Properties</li> <li>• Section 6(f) Properties</li> <li>• New Signalized Intersections</li> <li>• Railroad Facilities</li> <li>• Hiking Trails/Scenic Walkways Affected</li> <li>• Bikeways Affected</li> </ul>
<p>Secondary screening was conducted for the design study area. In March 2021, a field reconnaissance was conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medley Fork (along Harvey Road) and the unnamed tributary to Hisey Fork (along WV-152) were visually evaluated for the potential habitat for endangered clubshell, fanshell, pink mucket, sheepnose, and shuffbox mussels.</li> </ul>	

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

- LiDAR Mapping maps were overlaid on the design study area to identify potential features for further evaluation during the field reconnaissance. The LiDAR mapping was used to identify seventeen areas within the design study area to evaluate for potential bat habitat (gray, Indiana, and northern long-eared) and unidentified waters of the U.S. These features included potential drainage features, concave features with potential wetlands, and potential ledge or cliff faces seen in the LiDAR mapping.
- The WVDOH was provided shapefiles for the design study area and six alternatives. WVDOH conducted a more in-depth cultural resources screening by buffering those by 1.5 miles.

Chapter 5 and Section 6.4.5 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes the resources reviewed.

b. Is this resource present in the area and what is the existing environmental condition for this resource?

- There is a very low probability of clubshell habitat in isolated portions of both Medley Fork and the UT to Hisey Fork.
- The design study area falls within Zone 16 of the WVDOH MOU for threatened and endangered species.
- The field reconnaissance found rock ledges and small caves that present potential suitable habitat for gray bat.
- The field reconnaissance concluded the entire design study area presented a variety of preferred habitat for both Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat.
- The field reconnaissance found that many of the potential drainage features identified by the LiDAR maps were ephemeral in nature. Several features could potentially be classified as intermittent and/or perennial. In addition, one hillside spring/seep was located which could potentially feed a wetland further downslope.
- Streams (Medley Fork and an unnamed tributary to Hisey Fork) were found in the area.
- 0.85-acres of 100-year floodplain were identified.
- Farmland of Statewide Importance was identified.
- Residential and commercial properties were identified
- 1 place of worship was identified.

Chapter 5 and Section 6.4.5 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes the resources found.

c. What are the issues that need to be considered during NEPA, including potential resource impacts and potential mitigation requirements (if known)?

- Species survey for endangered clubshell.
- Species surveys for endangered gray, Indiana, and northern long-eared bat.
- Evaluation of the applicability of the WVDOH MOU
- Noise analysis if required
- Archeological investigation
- Historic Properties Survey

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

With more refined roadway designs

- Wetland delineations (minimal)
- Stream delineations and classifications.
- Farmland of Statewide Importance evaluation.
- Residential relocations.

d. How will the planning data provided need to be supplemented during NEPA?

Depending on the date of the NEPA study, traffic data may need to be updated.

**9. List environmental resources you are aware of that were not reviewed in the PEL study and why.** Indicate whether or not they will need to be reviewed in NEPA and explain why.

The following resources were not evaluated as part of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study: noise, archaeological and historic properties surveys, energy, soils and geology. Additional environmental analysis will be required as part of future NEPA analysis and documentation.

**10. Were cumulative impacts considered in the PEL study?** If yes, provide the information or reference where the analysis can be found.

Section 6.4.6 of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes direct, indirect, and cumulative effects analysis. Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects were assessed using a high-level qualitative approach focused on identifying considerations for the NEPA phase.

There is a potential for cumulative impacts to endangered bat species. However, WVDOH has a 2011 programmatic agreement with FHWA and US Fish and Wildlife Service to minimize and mitigate impacts. As part of the NEPA phase, additional evaluation will be required to determine if there are substantial cumulative impacts to notable environmental features.

**11. Describe any mitigation strategies discussed at the planning level that should be analyzed during NEPA**

The applicability of the WVDOH threatened and endangered species programmatic agreement should be evaluated.

**Harvey Road Connector PEL Study – PEL Questionnaire  
Completed July 30, 2021**

**12. What needs to be done during NEPA to make information from the PEL study available to the agencies and the public? Are there PEL study products which can be used or provided to agencies or the public during the NEPA scoping process?**

Chapters 7 and 8 and Appendix B of the Harvey Road Connector PEL study summarizes resources agency consultation and public engagement activities. . The resource agencies that participated in the coordination meetings, as well as the public, were notified of the final PEL study upon completion of the study and the public was notified that the recommendations of the PEL study would be incorporated into NEPA. The PEL study was intended to provide a framework for the long-term implementation of the project as funding is available and to be used as a resource for future NEPA documentation.

**13. Are there any other issues a future project team should be aware of?**

a. Examples: Controversy, utility problems, access or ROW issues, encroachments into ROW, problematic land owners and/or groups, contact information for stakeholders, special or unique resources in the area, etc.

- Potential residential relocations (dependent on roadway designs)
- The owner and 25 employees of Paris Signs on Leitner Drive came out against Alternative 7 due to the risk of closing the business.
- A property owner on Leitner Drive also was against Alternative 7 due to impacts to their family land.
- Natural gas pipeline crossing