MEMORANDUM

TO: DDR
FROM: DDE BH
SUBJECT: State Project S338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project ACST-2501 (003)D
Durbin Truss Demolition
Pocahontas County

Our Environmental Section has reviewed the subject project and has determined that this action falls under the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (CE) Classification #117a does not involve significant environmental impacts. This Programmatic CE approval was given by the Federal Highway Administration on July 11, 1988, and again on January 28, 2002.

Based on the information on the attached CE Evaluation, no significant impacts will result from this project.

RJS: Hh

Attachments

cc: DDE, (TC), PP
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION EVALUATION

I. Project Description: Bridge Demolition
A. Project Numbers: State: S328-250/13-0.31  Federal: ACST-2501(003)D
B. Name: Darbin Truss Bridge Removal
C. Route: CR 250/13
D. County: Pocahontas
F. ADT: Existing — Projected —
G. Existing Conditions: The existing bridge has been closed to traffic since March 2015.
H. Preferred Alternative: No build is the preferred alternative. The existing bridge will be removed, and no new bridge will be built.
I. Other Alternatives Considered: Rehab or New Bridge on existing location.

II. IMPACT EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments, Correspondence, and/or Mitigation proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Right of Way Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Residences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Vacant Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Federal Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Environmental Justice Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. CULTURAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SHPO Letter(7-7-2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RE (6-3-2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. SECTION 4(F), 6 (F)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>FWS MOU of 1-3-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Programmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DNR/RT (12-29-2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDE Staff performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 6 (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a freshwater mussel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Park, Recreational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>survey on 9-28-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Endangered Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Division of Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Forest Service Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Floodplain. Encroachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. National Park Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Army Corp of Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Farmland Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wild &amp; Scenic Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wetland Encroachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Categorical Exclusion is specific to the project as described in the text and shown on the attached graphics.

IF A TEMPORARY BYPASS CHANGES OR IS ADDED, THE PROJECT NEEDS TO BE RESUBMITTED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SECTION FOR REVIEW. WASTE AND BORROW AREAS outside of the project limits need a separate review to determine whether cultural or natural resources are affected.

Revised 3/10/2016
E. PERMITS REQUIRED

1. 404
2. 401
3. NPDES
4. Section 10
5. Special Use Permit (Nat. Forest)

F. NOISE (FROM 7-7-3)

G. AIR QUALITY (FROM 7-7-9)

H. WATER QUAL/STREAM IMPAC

I. Adjacent MS4

J. Haz WASTE/UNDERGRD TANKS

K. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

1. Maintenance of Traffic

Corps permit required

Temporary construction impacts
Temporary construction impacts
DEP/DOH approved generic sediment and erosion control plan
Coordination Letter (date) Contact Person (Name)

Bridge is currently closed no traffic to maintain.

III. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT:
Flyers (attached) were distributed throughout the town of Durbin on 9-28-2016 by DDE staff. A 30 day comment period of given. We received a total of 15 comments through the mail and had 24 online comments. 1 of the 39 comments supported our preferred alternative. The other 39 comments were for a replacement bridge to be put back, or rehabilitate the existing bridge. However; based on the short existing detour, low traffic volume and condition of the closed bridge, the WVDOH will proceed with a demolition contract to remove the structure. No new bridge will be built.

IV. ACTION(S) REQUIRED:
☐ A. Mussel Survey/Relocation for State listed Streams
☐ B. Mussel Relocation for Endangered Species Stream
☐ C. Environmental Commitment Checklist
☐ D. MS4 Commitment

This Categorical Exclusion is specific to the project as described in the text and shown on the attached graphics.

IF A TEMPORARY BYPASS CHANGES OR IS ADDED, THE PROJECT NEEDS TO BE RESUBMITTED TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL SECTION FOR REVIEW. WASTE AND BORROW AREAS outside of the project limits need a separate review to determine whether cultural or natural resources are affected.

Revised 3/10/2016
BRIDGE REPLACEMENT STUDY
DURBIN TRUSS
STATE PROJECT NO. S238-250/13-0.31
POCAHONTAS COUNTY

PROJECT SITE
DURBIN (P.O.)

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
ENGINEERING DIVISION
MARCH 2016
Cultural Resources Management Report
For Projects Exempt from SHPO Review

1. Project identification
   Project: Durbin Truss Bridge Removal
   County: Pocahontas
   State Project: U338-250/13-0.31
   Federal Project: ACST-2501(003)D
   USGS 7½' Topographic Quadrangle: Durbin
   UTM: NAD 83, Zone 17N, 601811.1 E, 4267503.1 N
   Date: June 3, 2016
   Author: Rachel Crawford
   Analyst: Traci Cummings
   Project Type: Bridge removal
   ☑ No potential to cause effects
   ☑ Screened Project

2. Description of undertaking
   a. The original truss was built by the York Bridge Company of York, Pennsylvania in 1907 (see photo 17). It has been closed to all vehicular and pedestrian traffic since November 2, 2015, due to its poor condition. The structure originally consisted of a 167-foot simple span steel pin connected through camel back truss span (SSTT) supported or assisted by a three-span continuous steel deck girder (SCDG) supported by four steel bents.

   The structure now consists of five spans (see photo 9): one simple I-Beam Span (SSIB), three continuous deck girder I-Beam spans (CSDG), and one continuous I-Beam Span (CSIB). The span lengths, measured from centerline to centerline of bearings, are as follows: Span No. 1 and No. 5 are 20 feet 10 and one-half inches, and Span Nos. 2, 3 and 4 are 23 feet 4 inches, 64 feet seven inches, and 32 feet 8 inches, respectively. The overall length, from face to face of the abutment backwalls, is 168 feet 9 inches. The bridge has a 14 feet 2 inch wide (out to out) laminated 2 x 6 inch timber deck. The clear width is 13 feet 2 inches. There is no sidewalk on the bridge.

   There are three alternatives for this project: Alternative No. 1 consists of replacing a new bridge at the current location while utilizing an existing detour to maintain traffic, Alternative No. 2 consists of rehabilitating the bridge and Alternative No. 3 consists of No-Build/Removal of Existing Bridge.

   Based on available data, a suitable detour for vehicular traffic is available and is only one mile long. Due to the recent commissioner’s orders to close the existing bridge to all vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and the existing suitable detour that is approximately 1.1 miles in length with a travel time of approximately two minutes, the no-build/removal alternative is the practical permanent solution.

   There would be no right of way acquisition necessary for this alternative, however, temporary construction easements may be needed for construction of a causeway to remove the piers. Pedestrians would be the most affected by removal of this bridge, but based on available information there is not a significant amount of pedestrian traffic to justify maintaining the existing bridge. Some utility relocations are anticipated for removal.

   Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative 3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

   b. Amount of new right of way and/or easements to be acquired: No right of way will be required but a temporary construction easement of less than one acre will be needed.

3. Pre-field research
   ☐ National Register of Historic Places (NR)
   ☑ Reports, Documents, Publications
   ☑ SHPO Files
   ☑ Maps
   ☐ County Records
   ☐ Informants (list below)
4. Results of pre-field research

a. Previous surveys or investigations conducted near the project area?  ☐ No  ☑ Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey ID#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance from project area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92-521-GB</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Investigations, Upper Greenbrier Public Service District Water System Improvement (1992)</td>
<td>0.02 miles west and 0.87 miles west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-1272-MULTI-10</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Investigations for the WVU-NRAO Segment 3 Fiber Optic Line Locations in Randolph and Pocahontas Counties, West Virginia (2012)</td>
<td>0.01 miles east and 0.07 miles east-northeast and 0.61 miles west-northwest and 0.41 miles south-southeast and 0.67 miles southeast and 0.72 miles southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-1272-MULTI-13</td>
<td>WVU-NRAO Segment 3 Redesign Addendum Archaeological Work (2012)</td>
<td>0.03 miles west and 0.14 miles west-northwest and 0.07 miles west-northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-536-DO-2</td>
<td>A Phase I Abbreviated Technical Report for Crestwood Appalachia Pipeline LLC., Marsden Gas Pipeline-Doddridge County (2013)</td>
<td>0.03 miles east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. National Register properties located within 1 mile of the project area?  ☑ No  ☐ Yes

c. Other cultural resources reported within 1 mile of the project area?  ☐ No  ☑ Yes

One site (46-PH-670-Whitehill Mill-ca. 1910), is located approximately 0.19 miles southeast of the project area.

5. Physical Setting

a. Topography: The project is located in the Allegheny Front region of the Appalachian Mountains in West Virginia (USDA 1918). The topography is characterized by steep mountain slopes and deep stream valleys. Elevation at the current project area is approximately 833 meters (2735 feet) above sea level.

b. Geology: Dhs: Hampshire Formation (Devonian) - Hampshire Formation - non-marine shales and fine micaceous sandstones, mostly red to brownish-gray, including siltstone, sandstone and conglomerate. Generally distinguishable from the underlying Chemung by non-marine character and red color.

c. Soils: The Berks series consists of moderately deep, well drained soils formed in residuum weathered from shale, siltstone and fine grained sandstone on rounded and dissected uplands. Slope ranges from 0 to 80 percent. Typical profile: Berks channery loam, on a south-facing slope of 3 to 8 percent in a cultivated field - 0 to 10 inches, channery loam; 10 to 17 inches, very channery loam; 17 to 21 inches, very channery silt loam; 21 to 26 inches, extremely channery loam; 26 to 33 inches, extremely channery loam; 33 inches, fractured shale bedrock.

The Dekalb series consists of moderately deep, excessively drained soils formed in material weathered from gray and brown acid sandstone in places interbedded with shale and graywacke. Slope ranges from 0 to 80 percent. Typical profile: 0 to 1 inches, slightly decomposed leaves and twigs; 1 to 3 inches, moderately decomposed mat of roots and leaves; 3 to 5 inches, very cobbly sandy loam; 5 to 9 inches, cobbly sandy loam; 9 to 20 inches, cobbly sandy loam; 20 to 30 inches, very cobbly sandy loam; 30 to 34 inches, extremely cobbly sandy loam; 34 inches, slightly weathered sandstone bedrock.
The Tioga series consists of very deep, well drained soils formed in alluvium on higher positions in flood plains. Permeability is moderate or moderately rapid in the solum and moderate to rapid in the underlying material. Slope ranges from 0 to 3 percent. Typical profile: 0 to 8 inches; silt loam, dry; 8 to 18 inches, silt loam; 18 to 36 inches, silt loam; 36 to 50 inches, silt loam.

d. Ground cover: Mixed hardwoods, mixed grasses, shrubs, saplings, multiflora rose.

e. Observations:

6. Field tests recommended? ☐ No ☐ Yes
   If no, explain: See methodology below.

7. Field research
   a. Methodology (how the area was examined, shovel test program; coverage map attached):
      A field visit was made on May 26, 2016, by WVDOH archaeologists Rachel Crawford and Jennifer Williamson to determine if testing is necessary in the project area. The visual reconnaissance determined that testing is not needed due to the topography and slope of the project area (see photos 2, 8, 13, 14 and 15). There is a very low probability that intact archaeological deposits exist within the project limits. No testing is necessary.

   b. Parts of the project area receiving incomplete coverage, and special problems encountered:

8. Results of field research (visual examination, interviews, shovel testing, artifacts collected)
   a. Prehistoric site investigation:

   b. Built environment survey:

   c. Cultural resources recorded (inventory forms and site location map attached):
      Field No.   Photo No.   Site Type

9. Evaluation of recorded resources for eligibility for the National Register.

10. Will the proposed undertaking affect eligible resources? ☐ No ☐ Yes
    If eligible resources are present but will not be effected, explain why.

11. Conclusions and recommendations
    Archaeological resources: Based on the nature of the proposed project there is a very low probability of significant intact archaeological resources that would be affected by the project. No further archaeological work is needed and there will be no effect to archaeological resources.

    History will be submitted to SHPO separately.

12. Supplemental data attached
    ☑ Photos
    ☑ Undertaking Vicinity Map
    ☐ Project Map
    ☑ Cultural Resources Map (USGS 7.5 Quad)
    ☑ Topographic Map (USGS 7.5 Quad)
    ☐ HPU file search form
    ☐ Continuation Sheet(s)
    ☐ Historic Bridge Evaluation Form
    ☐ Historic Property Inventory Forms
    ☐ Shovel test profiles
    ☐ Archaeological site form
    ☑ Other: Plan sheet
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July 7, 2016

Mr. Ben L. Hark
Environmental Section Head
Engineering Division
West Virginia Department of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

RE: Durbin Truss Bridge Repair
State Project: S38-250/18-0.31
FR# 12-696-PH-1

Dear Mr. Bailey:

We have reviewed the above referenced project to determine its effects to cultural resources. The following comments are offered under West Virginia Code 29-1-8.

According to the submitted information, the WV Division of Highways proposes three alternative plans for the Durbin Truss Bridge located over the West Fork River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. Alternative #1 will demolish the bridge and build a new 180' bridge in the footprint. Alternative #2 is to rehabilitate the bridge; however this is not recommended. Alternative #3, the preferred alternative is to remove the bridge and not replace the structure.

Architectural Resources:
We previously reviewed this project as a repair and concurred that the Durbin Truss Bridge is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. We maintain this opinion. We received the additional Historic Property Inventory form for the Vance House and concur that it is not eligible for the NRHP. We understand that for demolition or construction that portions of the Parkersburg-Staunton Turnpike maybe temporary location for logistics. In our opinion such temporary use will not be an adverse effect. No further consultation is necessary; however, we ask that you contact our office if your project should change.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service. If you have questions regarding our comments or the Section 106 process, please contact Ernest E. Blevins, Structural Historian, at (304) 558-0240.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Susan M. Pierce
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

SMP/EEB
January 3, 2017

Ben L. Hark
Environmental Section Head
Engineering Division
WV Division of Highways
1900 Kanawha Blvd. East
Building 5, Room 110
Charleston, WV 25305-0430

Dear Mr. Hark:

I have received and reviewed the mussel survey information for the projects listed in the table below. No further mussel issues need to be addressed with respect to these projects as long as instream activities are initiated prior to June 1, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Creek Box Beam</td>
<td>S301-40/5-0.01</td>
<td>Sugar Creek</td>
<td>Barbour</td>
<td>39.1177</td>
<td>-79.960081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgas Bridge</td>
<td>S303-3/9-0.05</td>
<td>Big Coal River</td>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>38.0589</td>
<td>-81.573495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnsville Timber Beam</td>
<td>S304-1/7-0.00</td>
<td>Oil Creek</td>
<td>Braxton</td>
<td>38.8635</td>
<td>-80.648626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Creek Bank</td>
<td>CR 1 MP 1.50</td>
<td>Oil Creek</td>
<td>Braxton</td>
<td>38.8680</td>
<td>-80.631435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Kite Bridge</td>
<td>S312-5-0.67</td>
<td>Brushy Run</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>39.0576</td>
<td>-79.1093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Layton Bridge</td>
<td>12-3/3-4.00</td>
<td>Middle Fork Patterson Creek</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>39.1653</td>
<td>-79.09657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandyville Bridge</td>
<td>S318-13-0.07</td>
<td>Left Fork Sandy Creek</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>38.9050</td>
<td>-81.65874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Run Rib Arch</td>
<td>S221-1-4.66</td>
<td>Freemans Creek</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>39.0926</td>
<td>-80.47819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crooked Fork W-Beam</td>
<td>21-20-3.18</td>
<td>Sand Fork</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>38.9704</td>
<td>-80.5827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green B &amp; Margie Blankenship</td>
<td>S324-3-0.08</td>
<td>Panther Creek</td>
<td>McDowell</td>
<td>37.4819</td>
<td>-81.8983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>River</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeden Thru Girder</td>
<td>S330-3/5-16.21</td>
<td>West Fork</td>
<td>Mingo</td>
<td>37.9095</td>
<td>-82.2486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Creek I Beam</td>
<td>S331-29/3-2.57</td>
<td>Indian Creek</td>
<td>Monongalia</td>
<td>39.6190</td>
<td>-80.1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Chicken House</td>
<td>36-19-5.05</td>
<td>N. Fk. S. Br. Potomac</td>
<td>Pendleton</td>
<td>38.6225</td>
<td>-79.5385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin Truss</td>
<td>U338-250/13-0.31</td>
<td>West Fork Greenbrier</td>
<td>Pocahontas</td>
<td>38.5501</td>
<td>-79.8316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Fork Bridge</td>
<td>S341-3-0.77</td>
<td>Marsh Fork</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>37.9614</td>
<td>-81.5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Run Slab</td>
<td>42-250-11.21</td>
<td>Laurel Run</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>38.6754</td>
<td>-79.9516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poca Truss</td>
<td>S344-13-7.42</td>
<td>Pocatalico River</td>
<td>Roane</td>
<td>38.6310</td>
<td>-81.4730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton Deck Girder</td>
<td>U349-32-12.84</td>
<td>Buckhannon River</td>
<td>Upshur</td>
<td>38.8195</td>
<td>-80.2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standingstone Bridge</td>
<td>S353-3-2.61</td>
<td>Standing Stone Creek</td>
<td>Wirt</td>
<td>39.0401</td>
<td>-81.3203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Fork Bridge</td>
<td>S354-25/13-0.19</td>
<td>Little Pond Creek</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>39.0829</td>
<td>-81.7177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the above address or phone number.

Sincerely,

Janet L. Clayton
Mussel Program Leader

cc: Danny Bennett, Anne Wakeford, Traci Cummings, Lovell Facemire
December 29, 2016

Mr. Ben Hark
Division of Highways
Engineering Division
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, WV 25301

Dear Mr. Hark:

We have reviewed our files for information on rare, threatened and endangered (RTE) species and natural trout streams for the area of the proposed highway project:

State Project U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project ACST-2501(003)D
Durbin Truss Bridge Demolition
Pocahontas County

There are no natural trout streams within the project area; however, we do have records for the following rare species from the West Fork River near Durbin:

- Rapids clubtail
- New River crayfish
- Greenbrier crayfish
- Candy darter
- Tongue-tied minnow
- Kanawha minnow
- New River shiner
- Eastern hellbender
- Gomphus quadricolor
- Cambarus chasmodactylus
- Cambarus smilax
- Etheostoma osburni
- Exoglossum laurae
- Phenacobius teretulus
- Notropis scabriceps
- Cryptobranchus alleganiensis

We know of no surveys that have been conducted in the immediate project area for rare species or rare species habitat; however, if Best Management Practices are followed, impacts to these species should be minimal. This response is based on information currently available and should not be considered a comprehensive survey of the area under review.
Thank you for your inquiry, and should you have any questions please feel free to contact me at the above number, extension 2048.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Barbara Sargent
Environmental Resources Specialist
Wildlife Diversity Unit
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION,
THE WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AND
THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

1.0 PURPOSE & SCOPE

This is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the West Virginia Department of Transportation (WVDOT) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). All parties are committed to achieving timely planning, development, design and implementation of adequate, safe, environmentally sound and economical transportation improvements while assuring the protection of Federally-listed endangered and threatened, and proposed and candidate species, and eagles, in accordance with the goals and requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGGEPA) (16 U.S.C. 668-668d, 54 Stat. 250), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321-4347). References to habitat in this MOU and attached appendices include critical habitat as defined in the ESA.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The ESA (section 7 (a) (2)) requires that each Federal agency consult with the USFWS to insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. In addition, Federal agencies shall utilize their authorities in order to conserve listed species that are protected under the ESA (section 7 (a) (1)). The BGGEPA prohibits anyone without a permit, including Federal and State agencies, from taking eagles, including their nests and eggs, or disturbing eagles. The ESA and BGGEPA and their associated policies, regulations, and guidelines set forth procedures by which Federal agencies, their designated representatives, and the USFWS shall work together to achieve these objectives.

NEPA requires Federal agencies to conduct environmental reviews to consider the potential impacts on the environment from implementation of their proposed actions. The NEPA statute and regulations set forth a process to evaluate potential impacts as well as requirements for documentation of decisions resulting from that process. These include determination of the proposed project’s potential environmental impacts; coordination with relevant agencies; and documentation of the analysis and decisions through an environmental impact statement, an environmental assessment, or a categorical exclusion supported by the administrative record.

This MOU between FHWA, WVDOT, and USFWS is intended to become an ongoing agreement among the parties to facilitate the conservation of these species and expedite the informal consultation process as required by the ESA and the BGGEPA. The USFWS reserves the right to comment separately on any project pursuant to the Clean Water Act, NEPA, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, or other statutes, laws and regulations. This MOU shall replace the
existing Blanket Letter Agreement between WVDOT and USFWS, which was signed March 15, 2005, and renewed on May 17, 2007. All parties recognize that the original “No Effect”/May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect” Blanket Agreement Approval has been an effective streamlining tool and wish to solidify the process with the signing of this MOU.

This MOU is limited to minor projects and maintenance activities routinely completed by WVDOT to ensure access and safety for the traveling public. Projects that do not fall under the “minor projects” definition are not covered under the MOU. For the purpose of this MOU “minor projects” are defined as all WVDOT projects that meet the standards for Categorical Exclusion or Programmatic Categorical Exclusion as set forth by NEPA. Examples of such projects include but are not limited to: pavement resurfacing; culvert replacement, extension or repair; bank stabilization; road realignment; safety improvement measures; guardrail placement or elimination; walking trails; bike paths; city improvement projects; bridge replacement or repair; landscaping; drainage modifications; and utility placement along existing rights-of-way.

In order to screen these projects for potential impacts to Federally-listed, proposed and candidate species, and eagles, WVDOT in coordination with USFWS and WVDNR developed a checklist and collection of Geographic Information System (GIS) layers that identify areas where these species may occur, as shown in Appendices A, B, and C.

Information on known locations of listed species and the potential range of listed species and their habitats were used in establishing the GIS layers. When appropriate, these layers also incorporate buffer zones around known or suspected species occurrence areas. To the extent possible, these buffer zones were based on information from established recovery plans (e.g., Cheat Mountain salamander), guidance documents (e.g., Bald Eagle Management Guidelines) or other appropriate sources.

3.0 WVDOT RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THIS MOU

WVDOT shall undertake the following activities:

3.1 The WVDOT or its authorized agent will screen all proposed minor project actions covered under this MOU using the GIS layers (Appendices B and C) and associated screening tool checklist (Appendix A).

A. The WVDOT will determine that the project will have “no effect” on Federally-listed, proposed and candidate species, and eagles when the proposed action:
   • does not occur within any of the identified environmentally sensitive areas; AND
   • does not require an individual Clean Water Act section 404 permit (issued through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers); AND
   • will have less than 17 acres (6.88 hectares) of timbering/clearing necessary for each project in its entirety.

No further coordination with USFWS will be required. A copy of the completed checklist (Appendix A) for the proposed action will be attached to the environmental document.
B. The WVDOT will document the proposed action has a minimum of a discountable affect on Federally-proposed and candidate species, and on eagles, and will determine that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" Federally-listed species, when the proposed action:

- occurs within any of the identified environmentally sensitive areas AND
- can implement all the identified specialized measures as identified in Appendix C; AND
- does not require an individual Clean Water Act section 404 permit (issued through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers); AND
- will have less than 17 acres (6.88 hectares) of timbering/clearing necessary for each proposed action in its entirety.

The WVDOT will send a notification (Appendix H) to USFWS that will include a copy of the completed checklist (Appendix A) for the proposed action, and a copy of the specialized measure(s) that will be implemented. A copy of the specialized measures will also be attached to any environmental and contracting documents prepared for the project. No further coordination with the USFWS will be required for those projects that will implement all specialized measures to avoid impacts to potentially affected species.

C. For projects that do not meet the "no effect" or the "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" criteria as defined above, WVDOT shall consult with the USFWS by submitting the package of information as outlined in Appendix I.

D. WVDOT will refer to and use Appendices D through G which contain requirements, special provisions and specialized Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce potential effects of construction projects on species protected under ESA and BGEPA as determined using Appendix A.

E. In the event that any species protected under the ESA or BGEPA is found during a stream or habitat assessment, all impacts and work shall stop, and the USFWS and other appropriate agencies shall be notified immediately.

F. The buffer zones and potential impact areas delineated in the referenced GIS layers were specifically designed to address small-scale proposed projects with limited additional rights-of-way that are the subject of this MOU. As a result, these buffer zones and impact areas are not appropriate to use when screening new construction and other larger-scale projects. Larger-scale proposed projects are still required to be submitted to the USFWS for individual project review. However, WVDOT may utilize the screening tool on larger projects to gain an initial perspective of whether the project will have ESA and/or BGEPA species issues. On such larger projects the GIS layers will only be used as a prescreening tool to help with early coordination with the USFWS. WVDOT desires to further develop the GIS screening tool to improve its future use and effectiveness on large scale projects.

G. Annually, by August 31, WVDOT will provide a summary or table listing each project that was cleared through this MOU, including the county in which it occurred. The
annual lists will be broken down into “no effect” and “may affect/not likely to adversely affect” projects.

4.0 USFWS RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THIS MOU

USFWS shall undertake the following activities:
USFWS will inform all parties of any changes to the relevant policy, listing status, species information, and species protected under ESA and BGEPA. USFWS will also review submittals, as described under Section 3.1 C, above, and will participate in any update or changes to the Appendices in this MOU.

If a project meets the criteria listed under Section 3.1 A of this MOU, USFWS concurs that such projects will have “no effect” on Federally-listed species; therefore, no Biological Assessment or further section 7 consultation pursuant to the ESA is required. If a project meets the criteria listed under Section 3.1 B with implementation of the specialized measures found in Appendices D through G, USFWS concurs that these projects “may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect” Federally-listed species.

5.0 FHWA RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THIS MOU

FHWA shall undertake the following activities:
FHWA will work cooperatively with all parties to ensure that the goals of WVDOT are met and proposed actions are in compliance with the ESA and BGEPA. FHWA agrees that WVDOT may perform informal consultation with USFWS on behalf of the FHWA. However, FHWA reserves the right to consult directly with any party to this agreement when FHWA deems such consultation appropriate.

6.0 EMERGENCY PROJECTS

For the purposes of this agreement an emergency project is defined as a situation when a transportation corridor area is cut off from normal emergency services after the collapse of a WVDOT structure, washout of roads, emergency closures of structures, etc.

6.1 WVDOT Emergency Consultation Procedures

WVDOT will work to rectify emergency situations as quickly as possible for the safety and welfare of the citizens of West Virginia. Before any work on an emergency project begins, WVDOT will screen these projects for any ESA/BGEPA issues per the procedures outlined in Sections 3.1 A and 3.1 B of this MOU. If the project requires further consultation with USFWS, WVDOT environmental personnel will immediately contact USFWS and verbally consult on the project to ensure that the work can begin as quickly as possible. Consultation will only occur on proposed projects that do NOT meet the criteria under Section 3.1 A or Section 3.1 B. WVDOT will subsequently send USFWS a notification of what was agreed to verbally and any documentation on the project’s construction/reconstruction activities. Any minimization and/or avoidance measures implemented in compliance with ESA or BGEPA pertaining to the emergency project will be included in the correspondence.
6.2 USFWS Procedures

USFWS will consult with WVDOT to address any emergency project issues when a project falls within the species zones outlined in this MOU. USFWS will review documentation submitted regarding emergency projects and any minimization and avoidance measures implemented, and inform WVDOT of any further action, information or documentation required.

6.3 FHWA Procedures

FHWA will assist both WVDOT and USFWS in any aspect of the emergency consultation procedures in order to facilitate implementation of emergency projects that potentially affect ESA Federally-listed, proposed, and candidate species, and/or species protected under BGEPA.

7.0 IT IS MUTUALLY UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES THAT:

7.1. Modifications

As new information becomes available regarding the listing status of a species, new range and distribution data, changes in recovery plans or changes in relevant policy, procedures or guidelines, then modifications to this MOU will be made in the form of updates to the Appendices. Updates or changes to the Appendices will not require new signatures of the parties but will be adopted by letters to the respective agency heads from the initiating agency.

7.2. Monitoring

WVDOT will track the usage of the MOU including the following information: Project Name, Project Number, County, Type of Project (i.e. bank stabilization, culvert replacement, bridge repair, etc.), and map coordinates in decimal degrees. This information will be kept in an approved electronic format and provided to USFWS annually by August 31.

7.3. Annual Meeting

All parties agree to participate in an annual meeting or conference call to be held during the month of August. This meeting will be used to discuss any changes in listing status, range, distribution, recovery plans, relevant policy, and issues or changes that need to be made to this MOU.

7.4. Termination

This MOU will be terminated if any one party withdraws by notification of termination in writing to all parties. The termination will take place 30 days after the date of the notification letter. The notification letter must be sent certified mail to the following personnel:
8.0 EFFECTIVE DATE AND SIGNATURE

This MOU shall be effective upon the signature of the authorized officials of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Highway Administration, and West Virginia Division of Highways, and can be terminated by the procedure written above.

Signatures and dates

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

[Signature] [Date: 12/15/2011]

Federal Highway Administration

[Signature] [Date: 11/3/12]

West Virginia Department of Transportation

[Signature] [Date: 12/31/11]
Appendices

NOTE: References to habitat include critical habitat as defined in the Endangered Species Act (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq).
Appendix A
WVDOT MINOR PROPOSED PROJECTS ESA/BGEPA CHECKLIST
Use the Environmentally Sensitive GIS Layers to answer these questions for each proposed project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Special Cond.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Requires clearing of 17 acres or more?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Requires an individual Clean Water Act section 404 permit?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Located within Zone 1?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Located within Zone 2 AND requires removal of trees &gt;5&quot; DBH?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Located within Zone 3 AND requires removal of more than 1/2 acre of forested habitat?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Located within Zone 4?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>B-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Located within Zone 5 or 7?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Located in Zone 6?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>C or E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Located within Zone 8?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>App E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Located within Zone 9?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>App D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Located within Zone 10?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Located within Zone 11?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Located within Zone 12 AND requires removal of more than ½ acre of trees from 4/1 to 11/15?</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Located within Zone A **</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered YES to either question 1, 2 or 13, then the project is not covered under the procedures established in this MOU. Individual consultation with the USFWS is required. Please complete this entire checklist and then prepare a submittal package as outlined in Appendix I.

If you answered NO to all questions except 14, then the project is a "no effect" and no further consultation with USFWS is required. Please check the following box.

☑  According to the procedures established in this MOU, the WVDOT has determined that this proposed project will have "no effect" on Federally-listed endangered or threatened species, or proposed or candidate species, eagles, or habitat for the species, including designated critical habitat. Therefore no biological assessment or further section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act is required with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Should project plans change, or if additional information on listed and proposed species becomes available, this determination may be reconsidered.

If you answered "NO" to questions 1 and 2 but "YES" to any question 3-13, please refer to special conditions or appendices listed for each question to which you answered "yes".

- If you can implement ALL the special conditions for affected species, as found in Appendices D thru G, then the project is determined to be a "may affect, not likely to adversely affect." Prepare a notification package as outlined in Appendix H and send it to the USFWS. No additional reply is needed from the USFWS. A copy of all the special conditions that will be implemented shall also be attached to any environmental and contracting documents prepared for the project.
• If you cannot implement ALL the special conditions, as found in Appendices D thru G, then further consultation with USFWS is required. Prepare a project review package as outlined in Appendix I and send it to the USFWS for their review and response.

Comments:  
Dublin, Missouri Bridge
USS-2501113-0.31
ACSI-25011003-0
Pocahontas County

Reviewed by: Glacie Moore  
Date: 4/13/16

*This form may only be used on “minor proposed projects” that are defined and included in the MOU between FHWA, WVDOT, USFWS, and WVDNR.

**Additional Zones not included in this MOU exist. These zones, however, do not pertain to endangered or threatened species and were not included in this MOU. They are included in this checklist for ease of overall project review. For example, Zone A refers to state listed mussel streams.
March 18, 2014

Mr. Ben Hark
West Virginia Department of Transportation
Division of Highways
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Re: West Virginia Division of Highways, Northern Long Eared Bat in the Memorandum of Understanding, West Virginia

Dear Mr. Hark:

This responds to your request of March 7, 2014, for information regarding use of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between West Virginia Division of Highways and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) as it pertains to the northern long eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis).

On October 2, 2013, in the Federal Register (78 FR 61045 -61080) the Service proposed the northern long eared bat for listing under the ESA. A final listing determination is anticipated within one year of the proposal.

In your March 7, 2014, request you proposed covering the northern long eared bat under the current MOU using protocols in place for the federally listed Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) until further guidance is available on the northern long eared bat. The Service concurs that the current MOU and associated Indiana bat protocols will be sufficient to cover the northern long eared bat until further information is available.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Liz Stout of my staff at (304) 636-6586 Ext. 15, Elizabeth_Stout@fws.gov, or at the letterhead address.

Sincerely,

John E. Schmidt
Field Supervisor
4/13/2016

Durbin Truss Bridge
U338-250/13-0.31
ACST-2501(003)D
Pocahontas County

No RTE Species Found

Crosses state listed mussel stream – West Fork Greenbrier River
LOCATION MAP
DURBIN BRIDGE
STATE PROJECT NO. S238-250/13-0.31
POCAHONTAS COUNTY

NOTES:
ALTERNATIVE 1 - REPLACES THE EXISTING BRIDGE WITH A NEW BRIDGE AT ITS EXISTING LOCATION WHILE UTILIZING AN EXISTING ROAD DETOUR.

LEGEND
ALT. NO. 1

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
ENGINEERING DIVISION
The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.

- **Alternative #1** - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- **Alternative #2** - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- **Alternative #3** - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:

RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
(Please print the following information)

NAME:

ADDRESS:

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FirstName</th>
<th>LastName</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>MailingAddress</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>ZipCode</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bpowell@bitmapped.net">bpowell@bitmapped.net</a></td>
<td>3292 University Ave Apt 603</td>
<td>Morgantown</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26505</td>
<td>I strongly support Alternative #3, the no build option. There are only a handful of properties that would be inconvenienced by the removal of this bridge and the detour is only about a mile. The cost to replace the bridge would greatly outweigh any benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Kane II</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkane_248@hotmail.com">mkane_248@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>PO Box 225</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>This bridge needs re-built and put back in the same location, if you take this bridge out you are delaying our response time to help someone in need which could be yourself! On the road that you are wanting people to travel now is more of a danger there is always rock slides. You are hurting the community by taking this bridge out, think if you lived over there and had to drive all the way around. You guys need to think about the people and EMS and Fire services response time. TIME matters on life and death situations! You wouldn't want us to go all the way around if your mom or husband or such fell over with a heart attack and you was doing CPR on them them minuets might not sound like much to you but they mean a heck of allot!! Also with the railroad expanding it could be a historical site. As Deputy Chief of Bartow Frank Durbin Fire and Rescue Squad you guys are making a big mistake if you take this bridge out!!! Please fill free to contact me for any question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Varner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jessicavarner@outlook.com">jessicavarner@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>Po. Box 243</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>As the Assistant Fire Chief for the BFD Fire and Rescue I encourage you to maintain this bridge as an access to the structures and forest across the West Fork. The alternative access to this area is difficult adding significantly to any fire or rescue response and is the ONLY other access. In a brush fire it could easily trap people or allow inadequate access, allowing a small problem to quickly become a large problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Egan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:degan@nrao.edu">degan@nrao.edu</a></td>
<td>PO Box 2</td>
<td>Green Bank</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>24944</td>
<td>This needs opened... What if somebody on the other side needed medical attention quickly an the medical personal has to go all the way around approx. 1 mile to 1/2 mile longer!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Po box 125</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>Dear sir...I think this bridge needs fixed for the families who live on the other side...If there is a fire the fire trucks have to go up the mountain and then take a road and come back down to the houses by that time the house could burn down...So please fix the bridge...Sara warner...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rick_fl@yahoo.com">rick_fl@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>po box 204</td>
<td>bartow</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>24920</td>
<td>If you don't fix this bridge we will not have a way to reliable emergency services when the other bridge fails that your department has been looking at for the past 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Sipe</td>
<td></td>
<td>7085 stauntonparkersburg park turnpike</td>
<td>bartow</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>24920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Friel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wyczewywoman@yahoo.com">Wyczewywoman@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>674 Rogers ridge road</td>
<td>Bartow</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>24920</td>
<td>The bridge needs opened for the people that live in the road for emergency personnel to be able to get faster access. There is people who live right across the bridge and the ems has to go like 2 miles out of the way to get into them! I say restore the old bridge if possible because it is a historic land mark but if not possible replace it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Rexrode</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drexrode61@yahoo.com">drexrode61@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>P.O.Box 318</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I would like to see a new Bridge built back at the same place, Thanks Donna Rexrode,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>You all need to really consider about taking out the bridge, you all need to realize how many elderly people live over there, land owners and more. You guys think that taking the bridge out isn't a problem and its a big problem allot of people use the bridge as a secondary route, as well as fire and ems. You also need to think about there response times. You need to think about if you was living over there put yourself in there shoes. You guys need to put money back into the bridge and fix it!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Varner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I own property on both sides of the river and it is very inconvenient on accessing our property, making hay, and much more we have to take our equipment extra miles to do so. My husband is the fire chief as well you guys will be hurting there response time if you take this bridge out. What if my husband got hurt making hay and it was a life and death situation you would be upset if EMS had to go extra miles out of there way. You all really need to leave the bridge in it helps allot of the community out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Varner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:varner@frontiernet.net">varner@frontiernet.net</a></td>
<td>Po Box 243</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I am the fire chief over BFD fire and rescue squad you all need to fix this bridge, you guys will kill our response time! We use that as a secondary road as well if we have accidents. I am also a land owner of both sides of the road there, it makes it very inconvenient to travel them extra miles to access my land esp... when I make hay and such. I have allot more to say about this if you guys would like to contact me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I live in Durbin I have family that lives on the other side of the bridge, you guys really need to fix this bridge other than to do away with it. It is very inconvenient without this bridge I hope you consider all the inputs that's getting sent in. This bridge will hurt our community if you do away with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mom2haley@icloud.com">mom2haley@icloud.com</a></td>
<td>638 Back River Road</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>Please consider Alternative #1 or #2. My parents live on Old Rt. 250 and I used this bridge daily up until it's closure. Please consider the fact that when there are heavy rains, the current detour often has rock and mud slides. Having the bridge opened would be a safe detour for when this occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FirstName</td>
<td>LastName</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>MailingAddress</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ZipCode</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Vanorsdale</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bikerdvy95@gmail.com">bikerdvy95@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>P.O. Box 67</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I would like to see the bridge preserved from a historical standpoint there aren't to many bridges like this around and also from a safety standpoint the access is very limited and response time by emergency services is effected. I know there has been times when the road that is presently in use for access has been blocked due to hised rock slides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Greathouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WV</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have been life long resident of Durbin WV. I live 4 miles from Durbin on the Old Cass Rd. The Bridge that is closed now should either be rebuilt or replaced. The road that they are using now is a danger to everyone that travels it, because of falling rocks, it has a high wall of unstable shale that frequently breaks loose and falls into and across the road. No matter the cost to repair or replace the bridge, it's still better than the price of losing a life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Po Box 263</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I am handicapped the bridge made it more helpful for people to come check on me an bring me stuff. The bridge needs opened I have medical issues an could need medical assistance at any time an by going all the way around I could have the chance of something bad happening because they have to drive the extra five minutes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Po Box 263</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>The bridge needs opened. Medical personnel has the worry of getting all the way around to their patients to save them, when they could be across the bridge in seconds. As people very close to me live over there one being handicapped makes myself worry about multiple things like if she had a heart attack she could have been saved if the medical personal could have went across the bridge but she didn't cause ems had to go all the way around!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dross26264@yahoo.com">dross26264@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>11563 Back Mountain Road</td>
<td>Durbin</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>26264</td>
<td>I am not in favor of Alternative # 3. I live on Back Mountain Road and used the truss bridge almost every day until it was closed. The intersection of Rt 92 and Grant Vandevender road is in my opinion very dangerous. You do not have a clear view of traffic coming down the mountain. I have almost had an accident several times because you can not see oncoming traffic. Traffic coming down the mountain may not be able to stop in time if someone pulls out of Grant Vandevender Road onto Rt 92 because you can not see the intersection until you come around the curve and then it may be too late. In my opinion, Alternative #3 is a bad idea. As a tax payer, I believe other Alternative #1 or #2 should be considered. If you are going to remove the bridge then you should consider cutting back the curve to improve visibility. The intersection of Grant Vandevender and Rt 92 needs to be safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FirstName</strong></td>
<td><strong>LastName</strong></td>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
<td><strong>MailingAddress</strong></td>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td><strong>ZipCode</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Richard     | lantz       | rlantz70@gmail.com | 8678 back mt road | durbin | WV        | 44201      | The alternate route you are proposing people to us is unsafe with either building a wall at the bottom of the slope or excavating a safety bench on the slope. Over the past 20 years through different times, due to either freeze thaw and/or water flowing off the slope has cause rocks the size of four trucks to slip down and close the road. This has happened on multiple occasions and a major safety issue because that slope is unstable and you will be putting the traveling public's lives at risk. One death or injury is not worth it.. Then if you remove the bridge and the road is closed the only other access is up to old back mt road and this adds about 10 minutes to the access. If ambulances or fire truck are called to help people this will cause a large delay in respo see time and again possible to cause someone their life due to your decision.

By rehabilitation of the bridge will leave a historical monument in place at a time all structural truss bridges are being removed. This is no different than a covered bridge to residence in the area.

I strongly urge you for the safety of the people and traveling public to rehab bridge or build new one in location, or stabilize the slope that is the issue by soil nailing and shot Crete. |
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

Alternative 1 first choice. Alternative 2 and choice we need a bridge there because its too dangerous to pull out there at the Middle Branch Bridge. I have had a few close calls and I don't like to go that way. It might mean my life.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: J. Arboeart
ADDRESS: 190 Grant Vanderwenden Rd.
Durbin, WV 26264

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County
State Project #U338-250/13-0.31 Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D
September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.

- **Alternative #1** - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- **Alternative #2** - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- **Alternative #3** - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
Mr. A. J. Scott P.E.
Director of Engineering Division
W.V. Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, W.V. 25301
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

- I pick Alternative #2.
- I would like the Bridge to be fixed up
- It has a lot of history to it and it is
- a Short Cut for when you have to
- get to town.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Dick Wright
ADDRESS: 138 Sabine Dr. Durbin W.Va. 26249
ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

I would like to see the Bridge rebuilt.
So I pick Alternative #2. It is handy when
there is a rock slide and the old Bridge has
a lot of History to it so I would like
to keep it and fix it up.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Tammy Wright

ADDRESS: 14640 Back Mountain Rd, Durbin, WV, 26264

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dojcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

I have lived here in Durbin and at my present dwelling for 58 years, I as well as many other people use this bridge daily. The detour you have now is sometimes blocked by mud and rock slides and snow drifts. If your main bridge would fail or need closed for repair, you would need the Durbin Truss Bridge for a bypass. I support Alternative #2 or #3 but please do not remove this vital bridge.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Alan Wright
ADDRESS: 14646 Back Mt Rd

Thank You
Alan Wright

Project Information and Comment Sheets

Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

#3 Replaced the old bridge.
It is too dangerous to push out after the mobile crane bridge. Can't carry the mt. more fast.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: D. Nelson
ADDRESS: Rivier Rd. - Durbin

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project:
- Alternative #1- Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2- Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3- Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
Dear Mr. Scites,

The Durbin, WV Town Council has voted by a 6-0 margin, at a Council meeting held on October 11, 2016, to endorse Alternative #2 to rehabilitate the existing bridge in regards to the Durbin Truss Bridge Project. As the District Supervisor has told us it would cost $300,000 to tear down the existing bridge, why not use that money to fix up the existing bridge?

Thank you for your consideration.

Jeremy Bauserman

Recorder of Durbin, WV

Jeremy Bauserman

October 25, 2016
Town of Fairmont
P.O. Box 30
Fairmont, WV 26554

Mr. R. J. Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, WV 25301
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT:  Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY  October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

Number 3 is NOT a option. The road that we travel now is dangerous. It is also dangerous in the Winter because of the ice that forms out at the end of the road. Put bridge back. Me and my wife travel that road because my wife's sister lives on that road.

(Please print the following information):

NAME:  Roger Tingen
ADDRESS:  914 Big Mt. Rd. Circleville W.V. 26804

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOT Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project
Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County
State Project #U338-250/13-0.31  Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D
September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project:
• Alternative #1 - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
• Alternative #2 - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
• Alternative #3 - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at www.transportation.wv.gov (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

I am the Executive Director of the Pocahontas County Senior Citizen, and as we deliver Meals on Wheels food to two senior citizens who live just across this closed bridge, and to the right, this closeness and possible doing away with this bridge causes us concern. The only access to these senior citizens is the little additional roadway that is being used, but in the winter it is virtually impossible to traverse back up that steep incline which is not plowed until the very last. (Please print the following information)

NAME: John R. Simmons

ADDRESS: 88626 Senior Trail
Markleysburg, WV 26741

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY): Pocahontas County Senior Citizens, Inc.

Project Information and Comment Sheets

Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County
State Project #U338-250/13-0.31 Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D
September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.

- Alternative #1 - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2 - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3 - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at www.transportation.wv.gov (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
Charleston, West Virginia
1334 Smith Street
West Virginia Division of Highways
State Director, Charleston Engineering Division
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

#1 New bridge - I have almost got hit by a trailer truck on several occasions at the only RT to get out of the Marble Bridge.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Dan Arbogast
ADDRESS: 790 Grant Vandeveer
Durbin, WV 26247

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County
State Project #U338-250/13-0.31  Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D
September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.

- Alternative #1 - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2 - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3 - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia  25301

PROJECT:  Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY  October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

This bridge should be preserved! This was the original route of the old
Stanton-Parkersburg Turnpike up to Cheat Mt.,
where Confederate and Union forces met in 1861.

* 6. Support Alternatives # 2 - Rehabilitate the
   existing bridge.

XXX Please also consider another bridge to replace swinging bridge
   on River Rd. - 3 1/2 mile below Durbin.

(Please print the following information)

NAME:  Elaine Hodges
ADDRESS:  3861 River Rd, Durbin, WV 26264 (P.O. Box 155)
ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):  None

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
PLEASE READ THIS!

Mr. R.J. Seitz, P.E.,
Director, Engineering
WVD Highways
1334 Smith St.
Charleston, WV 25301

25301-143434
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

Alternative #3 is not to be considered. The bridge needs to be there because it would save time & minutes for the ambulance and fire trucks to get to those places across that bridge quicker. And it is not safe to pull onto the road the way we have to travel now.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: G Loren Tingler
ADDRESS: 91 H Big Mtn Rd.
Cireleville, WV 26804

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Do Away with #3.

Project Information and Comment Sheets Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment. Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.

Danger
The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project:

- **Alternative #1**: Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- **Alternative #2**: Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- **Alternative #3**: Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

**A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER**
DATE: 10/23/2016

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

(1) Very unsafe pulling out from Court Vanderlider Road due to sharp turn on 1720. Vehicles come all the way mountain very fast including big trucks.

(2) This bridge is the only alternative back out of Durbin going North. Unless you go back to Barboursville or that road.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Daniel & Michelle Arbogast
ADDRESS: PO Box 172 Durbin WV 26201

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOT Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project:
- Alternative #1- Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2- Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3- Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
RJ Sotes, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, WV 25301
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

If there is ever a house fire, it would take precious mins that would be saved by the bridge being repaired. The other is the entering of the main road it is a very dangerous entering or exiting especially there is a curve and people fly down this road. My family and home place is were the bridge is. The house is over 100 years old. So how would you feel if 5 mins difference to save your home would make a big difference in all long. A life also there are no reason for this bridge being there a min here a few mins there can save a life or a home.

(NAME: Evelyn C. Warner)

ADDRESS: Rt1 Box 55
Elkins WV 26241

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY): Project Information and Comment Sheets

Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County

State Project #U338-250/13-0.31 Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.

- Alternative #1 - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2 - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3 - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:

RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at www.transportation.wv.gov (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
 DATE: 
Mr. R.J. Scott, P.E. 
Director, Engineering Division 
West Virginia Division of Highways 
1334 Smith Street 
Charleston, West Virginia 25301 

 PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project 
Pocahontas County 
State Project # US36-250/13-0,91 
Federal Project # ASST-2501(888)B 

 COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016 

Please consider the following comments:

Option 3 is not an option, I propose Option 1. 
And as soon as possible, we can get up the hill in winter when weather is bad, we that live on West River Dr. are not the only ones that use this bridge. People on both sides of that road. 
Durbin residents use this bridge. It takes the ambulance longer to get back and it is too dangerous pulling out of Grant Vondervort’s Road.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Cathy Bennett 
ADDRESS: Durbin, WV 26264 

(Please use the DOT Comment Form) 

And if we have to keep using this detour, we want compensation for going out of our way all the time. (We have elderly folks).

Please send comments to our WVDOT Website at http://www.dot.state.wv.us/I-279/Comments.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
Please consider the following comments:

Option 3 is not an option. I propose option 1.

And as soon as possible, we can get up the hill in winter when weather is bad, we that live on West River Dr. are not the only ones that use this bridge. People on hick with a curb Dublin use this bridge. It takes the ambulance longer to get here and is too slow, cars pulling out of Giant Warehouse at Dec.

Please fill out the following information:

NAME: Curtis Bennett
ADDRESS: Dublin, WV 26244

And if we have to keep using this detour we want compensated for going out of our way all the time. (We have elderly people living here).

Project Information and Comment Sheets

Send comments via our WBDT Website at http://www.wvdbt.com/submitcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open an opportunity to submit a comment.
Please consider the following comments:

Option 3 is not an option. I propose option 1 and as soon as possible, we can get up the hill in winter when weather is bad. We that live on West River Dr. are not the only ones that use this bridge. People on both sides of a street use this bridge. It takes the ambulance longer to get here and is too dangerous pulling out of Giant's Handbook of Road.

(Please print the following information)

Name: Jodi Kent

Address: 107 W River Dr.

Organizational Name: 

(Please find information on Comment Sheets)

Can be found online on WVDOT Website at http://wvy.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, open and then pick football Truss Bridge.
Option 3 is not an option. I propose option 2 and as soon as possible, we can get up the hill in winter when the weather is bad. We that live on West River Dr. are not the only ones that use this bridge. People on back where a said Dublin used this bridge it takes the ambulance longer to get up and back it is too distant pulling out at Giant Warehouse Road.

(RElease the following information)

NAME: Rodney Bennett
ADDRESS: Dublin, WV 26244

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at http://www.wv.gov/transportation under Engineering Projects. Open the file and submit a comment re: Project:

This detour we want compensated for going out of our way all the time. (we have elderly people living here)
Please consider the following comments:

Option 3 is not an option and as soon as possible we can not get up the hill in winter when weather is bad. We that live on West River Dr. are not the only ones that use this bridge. People on back who live on Dublin use this bridge. It takes the ambulance longer to get here and is too dangerous pulling out at Grant Lane and W. Dad.

(Please provide the following information)

NAME: Shelby Speed
ADDRESS: 621 W. River Dr.
ORGANIZATION/COMPANY: 4364

And if we have to keep using this detour we want compensated for going out of our way all the time. (We have elderly people living here)

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOT Website at http://go.wv.gov/IdoComment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then pick Dublin Truss Bridge.
DATE:  

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.  
Director, Engineering Division  
West Virginia Division of Highways  
1334 Smith Street  
Charleston, West Virginia 25301  

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project  
Pocahontas County  
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31  
Federal Project # ACST-2501(003)D  

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016  

Please consider the following comments:

I am definitely in favor of Alternative #2 - Rehabilitating the existing bridge. Everyone loves the beauty of the old wooden bridges. The metal truss bridges are disappearing too fast. I have spent weeks researching the Durbin Town Hall record books. Just as trains changed Durbin, automobiles were not far behind. Keep the truss bridge. It's a part of history.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Jason Bauserman  
ADDRESS: PO Box 10 Bartow, WV 24920  

ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):  
Chairman, Pocahontas County Historic Landmarks Commission  
President, Upper Pocahontas Community Cooperative  

Project Information and Comment Sheets  
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.  
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
RJ Scott, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
WV Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Please consider fixing the existing bridge. I am a mail carrier for the USPS and I have to detour off my line of travel everyday and it takes away from my allotted time I have to deliver my mail on my route. Also the families who need to cross the bridge to get their house really do need it operating. It is a shortcut for a lot of people.

(Please print the following information)

NAME: Carl Greathouse
ADDRESS: 38 Nottingham Road
       Durbin, WV 26204

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOT Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.
Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.
Mr. R.J. Scott, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, WV 25301
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County

State Project #U338-250/13-0.31 Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.

- Alternative #1 - Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2 - Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3 - Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at www.transportation.wv.gov (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

Alternative #3 is not an option. This bridge has
served the families on the west side for many years
as well as the many families from Back Mountain.
It is very difficult to pull out of my drive way
in winter to go up the hill and dangerous coming
back down. It is also very dangerous pulling out
at the old route to main road 250. It seems to
that the family from the west side do not matter, well it
should not matter how many live
on this side. One family is
Durbin, WV 30 on 254 as important as this family,
This bridge would not be
in need of so many repairs, if it
would have been maintained over
the years.

(Please print the following information)
NAME: Paula Wood
ADDRESS: POB 324
ORGANIZATION (IF ANY):

Project Information and Comment Sheets
Can be found online at our WVDOH Website at http://go.wv.gov/dotcomment.

Under Engineering Projects, Open, and then click Durbin Truss Bridge.

You decide: #2 or alternative #2

Thank you,
Paula Wood
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County
State Project #U338-250/13-0.31  Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D
September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.
- Alternative #1- Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2- Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3- Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at www.transportation.wv.gov (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER
DATE:

Mr. RJ Scites, P.E.
Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

PROJECT: Durbin Truss Bridge Project
Pocahontas County
State Project # U338-250/13-0.31
Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D

COMMENTS DUE BY October 31, 2016

Please consider the following comments:

Alternatives #1 and #2 are the only acceptable options for the Durbin Truss Bridge Project. The bridge provides the most direct route to Main Street. All 5 of the residents on W. River Dr. are elderly. Emergency services lose valuable time on the current detour. This additional 1 mile could be the difference between life or death as it takes nearly 4 minutes to travel due to the geographic layout of the road. There are additional residents on W. River Rd. as well. I served as Mayor of Durbin and Recorder as well as Councilperson. Removing the bridge would also abolish the nostalgia of the upper end of town as it (the bridge) has been a fixture in the landscape for a very long time. Residents use it as part of their daily walking routine. Tourists admire the beauty of the water below during foot tours of the town. Alternative #3 is just too dangerous. Turning in an arc pulling out is very difficult due to the curve on 305 St. It's just a matter of time before someone is killed if the detour becomes the normal.
WVDOH Announces Upcoming Highway Project

Durbin Truss Bridge
Durbin, WV
Pocahontas County
State Project #U338-250/13-0.31  Federal Project #ACST-2501(003)D
September 19, 2016

The Durbin Truss Bridge Project is located on County Route 250/13 over the West Fork of the Greenbrier River in Pocahontas County, West Virginia. The WVDOH is evaluating alternatives to determine whether it is economically feasible and safe to maintain the current access on County Route 250/13.

Three alternatives are being evaluated for this project.
- Alternative #1- Proposes constructing a new bridge at existing location.
- Alternative #2- Proposes rehabilitating the existing bridge.
- Alternative #3- Proposes a no build option and removing the existing bridge.

Considering the present closure of the bridge, the existing bridge condition, and the availability of an existing one-mile detour, it is recommended that Alternative #3 be considered as the preferred alternative. This alternative recommends the removal of the existing bridge.

If you would like to comment on the project please mail written comments to:
RJ Scites, P.E., Director, Engineering Division
West Virginia Division of Highways
1334 Smith Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Or visit the WVDOH Website at [www.transportation.wv.gov](http://www.transportation.wv.gov) (under Public Comments then Comment on Engineering Projects, Open Durbin Truss Bridge). All comments are due by Monday, October 31, 2016.

A COMMENT FORM IS ON THE BACK OF THIS FLYER