

HO-0020 - CP1 Pre-Meeting - NC 12 from Rodanthe to Oregon Inlet Conduct planning study for the long-term operation of the roadway (Dare County)-20260715_150237-Meeting Transcript

July 15, 2026, 7:02PM

1h 17m 48s

● **Jamison, John** started transcription

JJ **Jamison, John** 0:03

Of your file, so I'll let you do it, yeah, I'll let somebody anyway.

That sounds good. Well, welcome everyone. We could just do a quick roll call if you don't mind. I don't know everybody.

Does that work for you guys, John? Yeah. My name is Lindsay Grobber. I'm with the Project Management Unit. I'm managing this project.

Morgan Rutherford, NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit. John Jamison, NCDOT Environmental Policy. Thank Evie Sachrock with Stantec. I'm the consultant team.

Kathy Brudingham, Division of Coastal Management, Major Permits Unit.

Faith Harden, Division of Water Resources, the Transportation 401 Group.

SJ **Scott Jones** 0:48

Yes.

JJ **Jamison, John** 0:52

Hey, Jake, yeah, go online, uh, Greg.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 0:59

Afternoon, everybody. Greg Bonner, Division of Coastal Management, Major Permit Coordinator out of the Morehead City Office.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:08

Thank you, Late.

CL **Cannady, Lee** 1:11

Hey, good afternoon. Lee Kennedy, work for DCM. I'm the dot field rep for Division One.

JJ Jamison, John 1:11

Ohh.

Yes.

Thank you. Got all our close abandonment liaisons and more. Christine.

FE Farrell, Christine E 1:26

Christine Farrell, I'm with the Environmental Policy Unit.

JJ Jamison, John 1:31

And baby.

Thank you.

HE Harville, Katie E 1:35

Katie Harville, Environmental Policy.

JJ Jamison, John 1:40

That.

SJ Scott Jones 1:44

Scott Jones, Corps of Engineers.

JJ Jamison, John 1:47

And out.

MA McDonald, Alee 1:52

Allen McDonald with Stantec.

JJ Jamison, John 1:56

The fault.

NP Nyarko, Paul 1:58

And this is Paul with DWR in Washington.

JJ **Jamison, John** 2:04

Paul, I'll just, I feel like I mispronounced your name at some point, but you pronounce it in Yarko, is that correct?

NP **Nyarko, Paul** 2:12

You were close out of my, you can't pronounce my name anyhow, but it's Nyaku.

JJ **Jamison, John** 2:13

Those.

Yeah, okay. Sort of all. All right, cool. Thank you so much. Maybe see here and Scott.

NP **Nyarko, Paul** 2:19

Yeah, yeah, I take it.

JJ **Jamison, John** 2:31

image.

SJ **Scott Jones** 2:32

I think you got me already, John.

JJ **Jamison, John** 2:33

Oh, yes, alright, yeah.

No.

And set.

WS **Wilcher, Seth (FHWA)** 2:40

Hey, good afternoon, everybody. It's Seth Wilcher, Precon and Environment Specialist with Federal Highway Administration.

JJ **Jamison, John** 2:48

Alright, Jessica, is that what you said? I think you said, um...

USAC in Scotland, but I could be wrong.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 2:58

Kyle Barnes, US Army Corps of Engineers.

JJ **Jamison, John** 3:01

Just want to make sure your microphone is working because on our end it doesn't show you whether one way or the other. So I want to make sure we can hear you.

Thank you.

All right, well, I can go ahead and kick it off and share my screen, but this is an oldie, but a goodie.

Share this window right here. I know we met with this group or most of the folks of this group back in May? Late April. Late April, May, and we gave a little presentation. Sure. Is my screen sharing working?

Give me one second.

So we've got, you know, this is our project study area from Bass Night down into the Jug Handle Bridge on NC 12. This is a sand grant. As you know, we were given a planning environmental linkage.

Federal Highway Grant to do some free NEPA planning work. And we're here today to kind of discuss the CP1. And I think we've distributed the packet. Hopefully you all had some chance to look at it. I know from all the projects in this area, we've had lots of

conversations and discussions with regulatory folks. Looking at probably the latest time this group was together was 2016 with the 2017 analysis. Go ahead. 2017 was the alternative analysis report. Yep. Yeah, so we've got all of that information here and

the CP1 refresh. So if we want to revisit anything or kind of go through the purpose and need that we developed today, we want to have some informal conversations, get y'all's feedback and some information that we might be able to use as we continue to develop this project. And

Just kind of do some information gathering, get your thoughts. I don't necessarily have an agenda.

but we are open to.

However folks want to proceed on this, I can also share the purpose and need, and we can just go through it together.

Let's see if I can chime in. One thing I'll add is that the purpose and need is just a

refresh of the purpose and need that was signed in 2001.

That's keeping 2002, so...

So when you say request, do you mean, like, is the other one still active and then we're going to add 1 to it or we're going to replace it? Well, to me, when you look back at the old purpose of need for B2500, it's focused on replacing Fodder Bridge. We're no longer doing that, right? We're no longer replacing.

bridge. We're replacing out of the highway, potentially, with some other mechanism to transport in C12, but we don't know what that is. So we wanted to refresh it so that it was truly applicable to what the corridor we're talking about now at this point. We've built

the bridge placement in the past, so kind of move past that.

We could probably talk about that for two hours. I mean, so I'm just focused on these, I mean, and Greg and Lee can interject anytime, but I'm just kind of focused on DCM's obligations under the settlement agreement. And you know, that there was that purpose and need and the life of that was selected.

alternatives that were built, and then the commitment to really go, what I interpret through that same merger process to completion, the additional alternatives. So, and the settlement agreement is kind of written that way. So I'm just trying to get straight and make sure it's, and be clear to everybody. I'm not saying it needs to be one way or the other, but then it's clear.

BG Bodnar, Gregg 6:52

Yeah.

JJ Jamison, John 7:04

what we're doing so that, you know, I can, as TCM's representative, help make sure that we're following our obligations under that agreement. And I think we've got the wording on the screen, I guess, but we have some wording in there to show that we're trying to address that settlement agreement.

Right. But also address current knowledge, current data, current situation on the ground.

I see Greg, you have your hand up. Feel free to speak freely.

BG Bodnar, Gregg 7:34

Yeah.

Yeah, I was just going to say that I concur 100% with Kathy and she took the words right out of my mouth is that, you know, we are always looking at and keeping in mind that settlement agreement. So anything kind of moving forward, if it is connected, we'll have to, you know, keep that in mind. So kind of moving forward, you be thinking about that settlement agreement and what that settlement agreement required for the Bonner Bridge.

JJ

Jamison, John 8:03

And just to expand on that even just a little bit more, the settlement agreement was both for a appeal by SCLC of the camera permit decision, as well as, I guess, DOT's selection of the alternative. I forget exactly what the dot is, but you know, we are, we, they appeal our camera permit decision and we have covenants under that settlement agreement. So we, I just need to make sure that we're following. The.

Yeah.

So I guess relevant to this conversation is we did reach out to SELC and we got a letter with some positive worrying in it. You know, they are encouraged by the effort that we're putting in with this Pell.

Grant, and we had a meeting with them, with Seth, us, and SELC, and they seem to be receptive to continuing to be, you know, part of this process, and they were very receptive for the public involvement part that, you know, were kind of starting up. So, just to kind of...

You know, I know that could change at any moment. We need to be vigilant of the settlement and all of the project history on this, but I just did want to share that with you all.

Oh.

As an FYI, we're going to continue to do that. Could you provide DCM with a copy of that statement from SCLC? I think that would help a lot.

So, we'll have to keep our lawyers, you know, apprised of how things should come along here.

Yeah.

I mean, I do think from reading the previous purpose and need, and this one now, this is a, you know, we tried to be very concise.

with it versus, you know, a much, much longer document, but while still capturing the

same, the essence. This is kind of the verbiage in here to Greg and Kathy's point. You know, we wanted to recognize that.

We're going to build on the previous decisions and honor those commitments. But I mean, aside from the verbiage, do you have any other thoughts on how else to convey that?

I would recommend not maybe changing the wording here, but just in your purpose and need document, go into a little bit more in depth about what you mean by that. It wasn't clear to me, but I just asked that question whether you're refreshing it or replacing it. I would just recommend being real clear in your purpose in the document about what that means to build upon it and refresh it. So there's no ambiguity.

forward. And our lawyers basically told us, yeah, this is a fresh start. You know, all the Bonner documentation at this point is relatively outdated. And so when it comes to the NEPA documentation, we need a new NEPA document for any future action. Now, we're obviously building off old information, which is always possible in the NEPA, but we are able to start with a new NEPA document. We're not just going to do a re-evaluation or, you know, an amended PA or amended ROD or whatever. Again, that everything is just...

Open this point, so I guess that that was one of my other questions. So, there will be a new NEPA document. Do you know what kind of document there will be? No idea. Will it come after the NC12 Sam plan? Oh, yes. OK, so this is you're not missing any document as part of this. Probably. We don't have to produce a document, and also we're not in project development. It's A Pell study, so it's a planning study. The Pell study will have that, you know, Pell to NEPA pathway, and that will be a discussion item for...

this group as well, so that we're all aligned. Yeah, they may have a recommendation at the end of it that, you know, NEA Fonzi would likely suffice or something like that, but it's a recommendation.

So, what your thoughts are? You're deeper into this than I am, so...

And that is why we started over with the different TIP number. We don't bid much to be 2500 C or D or anything.

See.

And Seth is being really quiet, but the Federal Highway.

is our lead. So if you have any thoughts or comments there, feel free to chime in or trump anything that comes in.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 12:55

Hey, John, sorry, Will Beatty was just walking by looking for Donnie, who's not here, so I got sidetracked for a second. What did you say?

JJ Jamison, John 13:02

No worries. Now, I was just asking if you had anything to add regarding the sort of history and the goals of the Bell study. We were just saying that, you know, this is not going to end in a NEPA document, that we may have a recommendation at the end of this Bell study that, you know, that it's likely to be any A Fonzi action in the future, but
We're not gonna have a neat document.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 13:26

Right, right. Yeah, I mean, it could range anywhere from a CE to an EIS, depending on what kind of recommendations occur. And, you know, ideally what this grant does and this PEL study does is when that NEPA effort does begin in earnest, that it'll go a lot faster because a lot of...
The groundwork will be laid as part of what we're doing here.

JJ Jamison, John 13:50

I don't know.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 13:57

I think whatever someone just said, I couldn't hear that. What was that?

JJ Jamison, John 14:01

There's some people in the hall waiting, passing by, so you brought your back.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 14:03

No.
Okay, good, good.

JJ Jamison, John 14:18

And Kathy, do we cover all your questions up front? Up front. Feel free to feel free to

continue this. Yeah, I have some comments on the purpose of me, but I think so, on like where we're going with this, I think that makes a lot more sense to me.

Do we want to start with a certain point in this packet? Like, we tried to, you know, be specific to the verbiage, so...

David.

purpose and need and then each of the kind of each of the purposes out and bolded and then what needs they addressed in a paragraph below and kind of repeated that. in a way that's our goal was to be concise and comprehensive. Obviously, sometimes that's hard to do, but as y'all read through this, is there anything that you feel like jumps out at you that might have missed?

Okay.

So jumping in, I think it's great. I had a couple comments, but I think it's really good. I really appreciate all the thought that you did put into it.

worked on it. Yes, yeah, that's true. So kind of just some, I guess, big picture comments. I noticed up at the top, the description of the project is to conduct planning study for the long-term operation of the roadway during major storm events.

And then kind of when you go through the description, you're, it's not, it's more talking about operations on a daily basis and making sure that the road is open and, you know, usable, not just during major storm events, but also during day-to-day operations. So I didn't know if you could.

if the description is locked in, or if you could change the description to more closely match what you have in your purpose and needs statement. You could just remove during major storm events. Yeah, I mean, I don't know if that's, is that the description that goes with the grant or is that something that you can do with it?

This actually came out of whoever named it in the step. So, actually, I don't think we know who. Yeah, I don't think we know. Probably some.

Yeah, paper pusher downtown stiff unit that set up. Yeah. We can rename a project. So if we feel strongly that we need to drop that frame at the end of it. Yeah, so when I first read that, I thought, well, this is how they're going to respond if an inlet breaches or, you know, sands, the road gets undermined. But then when I was reading through it, it seems more like emergency response, tourism.

You know, or they say things. But that is just our formal step project name. We can call it whatever we want on a day-to-day basis. And we have, well, we've had the

NC12 SAN study, we've had the Pell study aspect of it in different places. So we can. We don't have to put that formal description on everything.

Faith, you had said just getting rid of the during major storm events. Does that solve it for everyone?

That's good.

Near and short term, have you had to have the long term? I don't.

Seth, does the state description have any bearing at federal highways pretty recently?

Worry about the naming and the terminology we use there.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 18:13

That's an excellent question.

Yeah, I think at the end of the day, it's...

The step I would like to think is probably a George Hoop's question, is that yeah, I like to think it could cover both the planning and then the eventual project development.

And Kathy, you're kind of touching on something that came up in our internal review before this meeting and that like we, some of the text talks about the plan and some talks about the project and there are going to be goals for the plan and what comes out of that. And then there's a whole separate list of goals that are for whatever project or projects come from the plan. So it gets a little tricky in how we're wording things. So we originally had some things about the plan within the purpose of need that we kind of had to yank out. So you're touching on something we've already talked about, but you're catching another spot.

where it's a little bit of an issue here in the actual step description. So let me put that on my list of things to do to ask George about that.

JJ Jamison, John 19:24

And I think, you know, an example of that is we tried to put the purpose in this section. This is what matches, you know, the one-pager up there. And then we tried to also expand on what specific this effort.

Versus the.

Potential project.

But hopefully, we've been successful in that. There may be ways to clarify if you guys were noticing anything.

I guess while we're on that page, I did have a suggestion to define what is near-term

versus long-term.

And are we looking at, I mean, remember this is the plan, are the long-term potential improvements, something more like a bridge in the sound where the near term is more the short bridges along in the existing corridor? I don't know if that's what you're thinking in terms of near term than long term.

Yes, yeah, because it's also, you know, with available funding. So, you know, the I just have this the recommendations for a based plan that would have, you know, the near-term solutions that could be programmed, you know, in a reasonable amount of time, and then those longer-term solutions that that would require.

you know, a more, you know, dedicated effort to get the funding programming.

So, we have been talking through with with the postal modeling and you know, trying to look at different alignments, defining what dates we're using, and it would kind of was it 2030, 2060?

Yeah, it was 2040 and 2016. I was just about to try to look at that too, but. And then 2100 as the long, but we've tried to be consistent with what was used in previous studies and what was in coastal monitoring program as near and long term. So I don't know, is this the place where those dates would go, or is do we not want to define that? Yeah, I mean, I don't know. I think part of...

of everything that we're sorting out, Kathy, is what those dates are for the near term and long term. And looking at the coastal modeling, how much the shoreline is moving, where those hotspots are really going to be vulnerable and in what time frame and kind of back into it that way a bit.

So, is it Catherine and our that's doing your modeling? Yep, she's working with with modelers at Stan Tech, but then we also have what we're calling Scientific Advisory Committee, and they are, you know, folks out of ECU, Duke, Chapel Hill, UVA, sure I'm forgetting the place or two, but...

So a nice kind of, you know, consortium of super brains that are going to be nothing. It sounds good. Yeah. I'm assuming they're using the CRC's long-term coastal erosion rates, but I guess I'd make a plug. They're not. They're all aware of what those are, but. Yeah. I'll make sure, but I think we've seen that in the.

I think that was something we used for Bono Bridge. I think it was 2050 is the timeline that we were looking at and shorelines that would not be threatened. I mean, projects that would not be threatened by erosion in the year 2050.

That was really illuminating what you saw for some of those potential Causeway bridges in the alignment would be like 9800, 98 to 100 feet out in the ocean by the

time. Right. Yeah. And that's what she, Catherine has shared with us the 2016 and it's a, you know, it's an interval, but even.

You know, just, yeah, some of those look pretty daunting. I don't want to be driving on that, trying to get off the island. I have a bridge in the ocean.

Of the near-term versus long-term thing, I would be hesitant to define, try to find those personally, just because I would.

I think it's just gonna be a part to other than.

In my mind, the correlation of near term could be the next 10 years because we have our 10 year student and this project doesn't show up in that 10 year student. So we know that we don't have any plans to replace anything out there in the next 10 years. So in those first 10 years, anything near term would be

An emergency repair, basically, or uh, on an as needed basis kind of thing, that's that's the only.

Thing that comes to mind for me is to how to define that.

Otherwise, we're going to be totally taking a stab in the dark, which are provided by this.

All terms being anything beyond the 10 years, it's not program.

I don't work in planning, but this is my guess.

The alternative analysis have used looked at certain units, so I, you know...

If this is going to be something that's further out in 10 years, you don't want it to date itself in the beginning, but that.

Not necessarily have a...

Can you take them credit?

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 25:09

Yeah, I was going to say that, you know, while it sounds good to kind of define things, and that generally can be a good idea, it also can kind of hem you in and you may lose flexibility in a way you didn't even imagine. So I'm personally okay leaving it like it is.

JJ Jamison, John 25:28

Yeah, I'm okay. I'm not okay with that.

All degrees.

But I do think in general how we're evaluating the alternatives are going to be with those dates in bind us. Yeah. Yeah, conceptually, if we have to do something very

quickly, this is what it would look like, you know. Right.

But that's our end goal is to, you know, come up with a document that's gonna help shape future programming, so don't have to be so.

Schedule some doctors.

What else we got?

So, is it to me?

All right, this is, I think, I think pretty minor, but you talked, I think the project study areas for Bass Knight Bridge to Rodanthe, and then in your statements, maybe intentionally, you talk about NC 12 and Dare County. So I don't know if that's intentional because whatever we do for Bass Knight Bridge to Rodanthe will help NC 12 and Dare County.

Or if you want to clarify that this plan is only looking at the section from Bass Knight Bridge to Rodanthy.

So this is the community. Is this it?

Oh, actually, I mean, in the actual purpose of needs statement, it is reliability on NC12 in Deer County and promote regional connectivity by providing consistent daily and emergency access. So, of course, there's other areas in NC in Deer County for NC12 that are threatened that I don't think will be addressed by this study, but maybe

I don't know if you want to be more specific.

Yeah, we could simply say on NC12 in this study area.

No.

And you'll have your study area map, so that would be.

Illustrated.

We heard a lot in the public first of all the meetings about how it affected everybody on the island and beyond the island. So we were very broad in our terminology, right? So we were trying to invest the bigger county and region, which is probably why they're county. It was worded that way in there.

Yes.

You're welcome to keep going. Yeah, you're being nice to everybody. The core is being very quiet. I know everyone's being so quiet. You're at the start of the show.

Well, here's a big biggest question. At the last project team meeting, I think Michael Flynn, I think he's from the National Park Service, was talking about wanting to incorporate or suggesting to

incorporate some kind of ecological restoration into, I don't know if you met the

purpose and need, you certainly met the plan. And so I want to propose the idea of can ecological restoration be, maybe it's already in the purpose and need statement, can it be added, but it could potentially even be within.

Built into one of the needs, you know that that's one of the goals is.

And I think it's in there where it talks about how maintenance of the dunes is disruptive to the ecology of the barrier island, but I don't know if it could go so far as to put that into.

I think we're, as a department, we're hesitant to put that in a purpose statement simply because we're going to do restoration, but typically from a mitigated perspective, not from an upfront perspective.

But I could, in this particular case, I could see working into that.

That piece right there, talking about resilience using vulnerability.

That's a need anyway. I'm not sure about a purpose, but I can see talking about it in the needs.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 30:11

Yeah, I mean, I think it would need to be tied tied somehow to the transportation mission of dot, right? So it may be in the form of resilience or mitigation, but we have to maintain that tie.

JJ Jamison, John 30:11

Just me on top of that.

Well, maybe you could think of it as, you know, I know that they also made a statement the last meeting about the difficulty in obtaining federal permits to go outside of their easement and maybe incorporating ecological restoration would kind of be more of a partnership with them on that would maybe more likely lead to a quicker compatibility determination.

That's been a consistent theme coming to the Park Service site. I definitely think it merits how we can, you know, look at how we can make that into here, but yeah, keeping in mind of the transportation focus. And wanting to be careful that we're not pushing something on the Fish and Wildlife Service that they don't.

Want in their refuge?

You know, they're the land managers there. And as much as the National Park Service has their interest, the Fish and Wildlife Service is managing that property day-to-day out. They may have different interests, different needs.

But to that point, John, what about putting in something that would be more like, I'm just going to spitball, but like, you know, facilitating the development of mitigation solutions or something like that to help address ecological restoration?

Something.

I can see that, yeah. Okay, we'll put something in and you guys can, we can work. So I guess it would be a different kind of, like it wouldn't be wetland mitigation or SAP mitigation. It would be mitigation for impacts to the refuge.

Oh.

I think they required that for the Rodanthe bridge, because they had to go outside of the east to land the Rodanthe bridge on the north side. Yeah. And I think that was like part of that was removing part of the mitigation for that impact was removing the paved Rd. and removing the sandbags.

Yeah, trying to restore the natural habitat there and allow for natural processes and all.

But what if we added solution should allow natural island habitat and processes?

Without disrupting, does that?

I mean, this is, I think we were, this was a different, this was paragraph we wanted to be like.

What do they say, vaguely specific and specifically vague, to kind of get at what we were saying without necessarily...

That being like identified as the target, you know, but you know, to your point that the road itself is inhibiting.

Maybe not for processes to some degree.

Maybe, yeah, I'm hesitant to talk about.

Solutions should allow natural processes. I almost want to say solutions should meet the resilience goals of the National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service as the land managers.

Picture.

What if their goals though are to have no develop?

ws

Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 33:48

I just saw Paul made a comment. He can't hear anymore, but I can hear everybody, so.

I'm not sure what's happening with Paul.

JJ Jamison, John 34:01
So, we did your fault.
People, OK.
And other people here beyond.
Yeah, I think that's a good be on set that.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 34:16
Yep, y'all are loud and clear for me.

CL Cannady, Lee 34:16
Up.
This is this is sleep.

KB Kyle Barnes 34:19
Yeah, this is Kyle. I can hear you.

JJ Jamison, John 34:21
Good.

CL Cannady, Lee 34:22
This is Lee in the Washington building. I believe Paul's in my same building, but I can hear.

JJ Jamison, John 34:24
Good.
Okay.
Looks like Paul dropped off completely, so maybe he's not back on. It told Paul he didn't release office. Hey, yeah.
Okay.
I don't know. There's just too many ways to communicate with people anymore, isn't there? Yeah, I'm messaging Paul. That was a good idea. I'm not sure if he's in the office, though. So I think this may be his working update. That might be part of the problem. Maybe he can log off and log back on. Maybe it'll start working.

CL Cannady, Lee 35:07
Yeah.

JJ Jamison, John 35:08
Do you unplug it? Plug it back.

CL Cannady, Lee 35:14
Yeah, Paul, if you can hear, just come down to my office.

JJ Jamison, John 35:26
So, and I don't want to put words in the park services or Fish Pox Mouse, so they'll be at the CP1 meeting and they can certainly chime in on that too. I don't know whether we want to address anything in this moment in the needs section or we just want to kind of put a pin in that and bring it up at CP1 to see what their input is.
Any thoughts on that from anybody online?
Okay.
Quite a bunch. Is everybody watching the World Cup game? Is that what's happening?
Is Paul back on?
No.
Yeah, it's on.
It's just listening to the sounds of silence.
Well, if you can hear us, feel free to chime in, listen in the chat soon.
I don't think he can. I'm gonna try to get him to join on this phone.
Tiny screen time.
OK, good. OK.
It.
So, we'll put that as a discussion item.
That's a random thought here, maybe, but...
This place back at the old concurrence forms and make sure we didn't have two separate places for Fish and Wildlife. One concurrence, one for the refuge that one for logical services. Can't recall off the top of my head.
So, will they be signing the the refuge? I don't know. Off the top of my head, I can't recall what they did in previous. I feel like they did, but I know Dennis Stewart was

always there for most of the meetings, but NPS and Fish and Wildlife Services said in the past that they won't sign. That might change.

And they there is some on their part, I think, in this case, because we're not in project development, and

They might want to see a NEPA document before they can feel like they can sign, yeah, but we'll we're still talking through that with them.

Yes, there was official wildlife line and the island line. OK.

Intel.

Well, you were, you were only have wrong, Kathy, because then starting with the revised CP2 form in 04.

It looks like piano got dropped.

Set.

But yes, it's half and half. I would have been around when we went from the 70 mile bridge in the sound.

Not that.

Thank you.

So I guess going back to the settlement agreement, there's some obligations for DCM to make statements in favor of the phase 2A alternative. And I'm not doing that now, but what I am asking is I just want to assurance that none of this purpose and need

eliminates that as a feasible alternative. Like when I was reading about the Fish and Wildlife Service requires corridor access for species management, the NPS requires corridor access for visitor services, and then there's the Oregon terminal groin. fishing station.

I just...

Like I said, I just want to make sure that we're not eliminating the ability for the phase 2A alternative to be an alternative in the future.

And that one starts actually at the like the New England. I haven't.

Actually, that's the settlement agreement. OK, and that was that was in your alternative study, but there's a closer. OK.

This is the one. The settlement says you guys need to speak. Yeah, we'll speak in favor of it. Okay.

Why not the Connect? Why does this piece not this piece?

No one. That's just where we were at at the time. I think the phase two alternative was closer. I feel like this.

The wider, the more stable portion of the island is.

Maybe there, right? It's A vulnerability.

Seems like the worst problems now are between Bass Knight Bridge and right the visitor center. Yeah, that's what I'm getting at, so thank you.

UCM shall provide a written statement of its support for the study of the phase two extension alternative and use best efforts to help dot secure merger team conference.

Selecting.

The.

So, I don't think, at this point, you know, obviously there's nothing for, so are you comfortable with with that being on everybody's radar? Do you would you feel better if it was articulated somewhere? What do you think? I don't personally, unless Greg wants to pipe in, I don't think it needs to be articulated.

As long as we have confirmation that this purpose and needs statement doesn't eliminate Dennis potential.

BG

Bodnar, Gregg 42:05

Yeah, this is Greg. Yeah, I agree. Things might change.

But I think at this point, yeah, I think that's a good direction.

JJ

Jamison, John 42:31

Thank you.

Just a little typo. If you could just change DCM public trustees to Kim up. Kim must be at the agents.

The.

S.

Was.

Phase 2A. Alt A. That's what they tell me very well at this point.

It.

Anybody on the line have other thoughts there for doing this?

I had two more, two more things, not related to the purpose and needs statement, but just kind of like, help me out here, Greg. I was just going to mention how there's, you know, the CRC has rules and there's the Coastal Area Management Act that has requirements related to ocean front setbacks where development needs to be outside of the oceanfront setback, or it can go in front of

the Coastal Resources Commission for variance. So the situation where we permitted that New Inlet Bridge with a very unique permitting scenario, it started as an emergency.

and therefore ended up being eligible for one of the exceptions in our rules. But that was a very unique scenario. So I've been talking with Lindsay about possibly coming to one of the Coastal Resources Commission meetings to give an update. And there are aspects of the CRC's rules that may not be, this project may not be consistent.

With, so it would be good to get.

Keep them informed, and so if there is any, if they choose to do any kind of revisiting of their rules.

that there would be time.

Well, how was that, Greg? Would you correct anything I said or add to it?

If you're talking, you're on mute.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 46:18

I was. Thank you very much, Kathy. Yeah, so I think we've got, we've kind of got an informal October time frame right now for that commission meeting for dot to give their, to give a kind of 1 over the world to our commission so that they kind of know what's going on. And I'm sure they'll probably ask for updates throughout that time to make sure that they are apprised of what's going on. And yeah, any issues that may come up with consistency, with rule consistency and things like that could possibly be brought up at that time and the commission can make an informed decision at those points.

JJ **Jamison, John** 47:09

I have a question that is maybe based on ignorance, and I'm just curious. So right before 3.2, the last bullet point on page 9, it talks about more resilient long-term approach, blah, blah, blah.

Oh, I'm sorry. No, the second, the second bullet point where it talks about the Oregon and the termsal groin. The bottom bridge pier requires access for fishing.

I understand the maintenance part, but what's the required access for fishing coming from? When they replaced the Bonner Bridge, they left a piece of the old Bonner Bridge in place as a fishing pier. And so, and there's a parking lot there. And there's also a Oregon Inlet Coast Guard station that's actually owned by the aquarium. So I think they're adding in.

a need to maintain public access of some sort to those features. Gotcha. Okay, so it's more than just fishing. Yeah, so a lot of people fish at the pier, but also at the pier has other people where you can access the parking lot and the coast guard station. Gotcha. There's multiple issues there. And the pier, it was not originally intended to be a fishing pier.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 48:10
Yeah.

JJ **Jamison, John** 48:17

It's literally in the core size, it's part of the terminal groin. Those last 1200 or so feet of the old bridge. That's right in here. Yes, that up to the left, that piece of, you can kind of see how the terminal groin comes around there. And it's essentially, core considers it a quote unquote training structure.

for the inlet as part of the terminal drawing. And so we had to leave it in place under Corps of Engineers' departments. And they were also reasoning how close the shoreline is getting, because fishermen got so used to fishing out there that Park Service, their county, and others were to maintain fishing access there.

Gotcha. OK, yeah, that makes sense.

But that's one of the reasons I was asking about, I mean, how do we have a sound side? Eventually, maybe have a sound side bridge while still that aspect of the purpose.

I'm not asking for, I'm not asking for the answer to that right now. I just think it's, I think the and we need to have that in our purpose of need because.

Refuge.

we believe will demand some kind of upgrade access to the land there from our roadway. So whether it's literally an off-ramp or refuge access or something. So we have to, yeah, we can't just

go out in the water, we have to kind of stay close to land somewhere or provide a little bridge spur onto the island or something. This is where those, the lines on the map from the settlement are a little too vague, a little too broad, and they're just lines on the map and we've got to take it a little farther than that.

Yeah.

I think I was reading.

We just got.

Connector G.

connectors G&H were adjusted so they join with the Oregon Inlet Bridge where the superstructure changes box girders to beams. So I think.

OK, that's.

But.

I would assume if you did something like this, we would have to maintain all of this at the same time, like at least this.

Chuck.

Right.

The way that the purpose you need is.

Play down.

Yeah, potentially.

Or, until the other connections.

It.

OK. Or approach somebody approach this group and SCLC to amend those lines and. Side and then.

Wherever land there, rather than tying him in the building there.

And I'm not sure if those connectors at the northern stretch.

That determinative in a settlement agreement, I think. Yeah, I can't recall. Most of the language is more related to the phase 2A.

Yeah, I wonder why that's interesting to view.

The other thing is, you know, being out there in the field, this area is a road quite a bit right in here.

No.

So.

Highlights.

Already scouring.

It's been that way yet for many years. That channel keeps trying to that direction rather than staying out the middle in them.

I guess you know, the southern terminus of the new Bass Night Bridge was constructed in the way that it could be added onto out into the sound.

Oh, this guy?

To manager, yeah, but yeah, yeah.

It's last 12 or 14 spans or something like that that are...

Not disposable, but yes, there was a term for it. Yeah, I can't remember the term

either.

When it comes to the CRC rules you were talking about and the worries about the... how this, how we may or may not be able to meet the CRC rules.

Obviously, we don't want to just go in front of the CRC and like learn that first hand in October from the commission. Like, is there?

Information that y'all can feed the team to, so we can better understand some of those rules.

Right. And then you probably order in the legislature, there's some bills going through about ardent structures. So some of our bills relate to setbacks and some relate to ardent structures.

At that, obviously, it works also, right?

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 53:44

And I'm assuming, this is Greg, and I'm assuming as we kind of move forward too through the processes, those things will be brought up when they're being reviewed for consistency.

JJ **Jamison, John** 53:58

And just because it's not compatible with the rules, dot can ask for variance from the CRC, which you've done before.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 54:01

Oh.

JJ **Jamison, John** 54:06

And if it's gone through this process, then it would be likely that DCM would staff and support them in grants. It doesn't give you any assurance it's going to be granted, but...

That's how we followed some of these things previously.

Any other DCM comments, questions? I just had more of a curiosity question moving forward about your alignment alternatives and your software. If you've been thinking about a way to represent the CAMA coastal wetlands per the definition of CAMA coastal wetlands. We have the that GIS layer.

In there, and then we were actually just thinking about more of the, like you mentioned, the ocean front setback and how to kind of put that in there. So, yeah, so

the wetlands are just the GIS layer at this point, but the other, like the ACM wetlands GIS layers and...

We're the thing that Morgan and I have talked about this before, I think. The way it's in Project Atlas.

That's not, those aren't necessarily wetlands as defined by camp.

So, back 20 years ago, Bradley BCM had a project where we were much more active in all wetland issues for the 20 coastal counties, and we developed this NC Cruise data, which includes both bottomland hardwoods and other types of for for wetlands and doesn't have a specific cam of coastal wetland.

category. I think it has like an estuary marsh category and estuary woodland category. So that's just something to be cautious. Yeah, be cautious about, because coastal wetlands are really a subset of all of those things, subset of the estuary.

And.

And you would want, and we have field representatives, Lee, Kennedy, Stephen Lane, that could go out and do some spot checking with you or review the data that you're using. There's been previous, Paul Williams probably has access to previous delineations that were done out there for other sections of Honor Bridge or spent a lot of work out there.

Yeah, but just be careful that we have a very specific definition in our rules about what qualifies as a coastal wetland, and we don't allow very many impacts at all, and consider them stringently protected.

And it will also check them.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 56:54

Yeah, and this is Greg, and that definition is more around

JJ **Jamison, John** 56:59

Ch.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 57:01

inundation and species and wetland species. So that's why Kathy had mentioned where that delineation can be very beneficial as well or confirmation of the delineation.

JJ **Jamison, John** 57:16

I know we have this, these habitat classes through that are digitized through the coastal monitoring program. Probably just need to make sure that we're representing, like we're figuring out where all the data is coming from and we're using the ones that they. We do have.

On Connect, we've got like a spreadsheet with like a this is the data set start came from, so we can we can go back and check, and I'm trying to remember if we've reached out to anybody DCM directly. It's been a little while, so I don't have to go back to clip, but yeah, and I also say we're we're enlisting Kathy Herring because I... I know there was talk about the SAB and how it changes from season to season to year. So she's got a number of different.

data sets for that layer and she's digitizing in 2025. So we'll be able to kind of use those and figure out which ones are the most stable, I guess, in terms of.

Ohh.

Not sure, I need to check in with her.

Status of that, but yeah, and I think maybe you all saw Charlie's e-mail. I don't know, I don't know if we said that too, or we didn't. I guess he missed the last project team meeting, but he's the habitat manager for Division Marine Fisheries. They tend to take the lead on SAV impacts and mitigation. And he sent an e-mail out. If you don't get it, if you didn't get it, I can provide that.

to you just with the kind of things that they'd be looking for going forward.

I wonder if we could kind of, for the CP1 meeting, if it's not going to take the whole time, maybe we could go over purpose and need and then have that information and kind of just do like a working session. What do you guys think of this? Yeah, we can have all this in the interactive mapper and, yeah, turn layers on and off.

Make sure we're looking at, we're all thinking of the same thing. Yes, the right. Make sure our source data is thumbs up.

We had a very in-depth project with the Mid-Curtuck Bridge on SAP. So I was talking with the project managers there were Jennifer Harris and Missy Baer for Turn Black Authority.

But they can tell you the...

What it was like to have to talk about safety impacts and mitigation.

Very difficult, and Kathy Herring can tell you too. Very difficult topic. So, like when you talk about where the areas are so stable, that just opens up a whole can, because then it's like, are you just trying to avoid the stable areas, or are you trying to avoid all the areas, or which areas were stable last year versus next year?

It was the first project I listened to when I started, and I was like, "I don't liar off!" Did they figure it out? Like, did they figure out a good methodology of how to characterize? There was a lot of compromise and a lot of bring to the screen, yeah, and then not a lot happened.

We didn't O.K. I don't, they fixed it for that project, yeah, alright, but there was no standard study that, but...

Kathy is kind of the expert on the call, but she'll be perfect. Yeah, yeah, she's safe and Tyler Stanton.

Any other questions or thoughts from?

Anybody?

When was the next meeting scheduled? I know it was on the document, but...

August.

Wanna say 1918?

That is the CP1 meeting then, obviously.

The 19th, the right 1:00.

If we're kind of done on the CP1 conversation, I was just wondering if I could, just looking back over the notes from the 2017 alternative, there was a couple of things I was going to ask about if no one minds.

Kathy, you made a comment in here that we drop connector B from the options.

I guess I'm kind of wondering if, or do you think some of the thoughts are still in play here? Like, I don't, you know, I'm not sure we need to be like...

Presenting connector D as something as a possibility, if you've already, yeah, I don't, I don't remember making that comment. I don't remember what connector D is, but are you saying D or D? I mean, things just sound like D's in dog. I think he didn't have money to move forward, right? Things just kind of stopped in 2017.

That seems to matter.

But.

Yeah.

And there was, you know, definitely.

ACM comments on making sure that things, there'll be no dredging. You know, we kind of just want to make.

Figure out some of the thoughts.

Likely still the same from yes.

So one thing you got to think about is not just where your alignment is going to go, but the construction methodology. So with like the modern Bass Night Bridge, we

just talk a lot about construction methodologies, how even to get access like to some of the more shallow areas.

Are you going to be jetting the files in or driving the files in? Yeah. I'm guessing that connector D may have been dropped because it looks like it probably would have impacted a lot of SAB and coastal wetlands.

Yeah, a little bit more than six. And not to mention which it would be touching down in an area that probably would have been in the potentially in the ocean during the design year of 2050.

And the idea of raising the elevation of the road with dredge material, my thoughts were that would probably be a non-starter as well. But just don't get out there.

So, okay, Greg, can you hear the conversation?

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 1:04:12

Yeah, I was kind of breaking up a little bit, but...

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:04:14

So that she's asking about raising the elevation of the road with dredge material. Would that be something that would be?

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 1:04:16

A.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:04:21

we would advise at this point not to pursue, or would we say more that, you know, any, I mean, any alternative can be studied. Right. Yep. And then at some point, we'll decide on which alternatives to be studied in detail and taken forward. Right. I don't know if that would be.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 1:04:29

Yeah.

Yeah.

And yeah, and I mean, it really kind of depends on what, where the fill is going. Obviously, if the fill is going within, you know, SAV habitat or coastal wetlands, there's probably agencies you're going to have issues with those. So, you know,

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:04:39

I can't tell, not two words.
Yeah.

BG **Bodnar, Gregg** 1:04:58

It's a large blanket statement and there's a lot of nuance to that.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:05:03

And then you'd also need to probably be looking at the impacts from the dredge spoil borrow area, like where are you getting it? Yeah, I was just going to say that. And how are you transporting it to your site?

Also, from my understanding, transportation can be one of the most expensive parts, so...

Finding a close spot.

But I thought you're looking to be innovative, and you know, I don't, I mean, I don't, we don't wanna say no, don't study, right?

But also don't want to, you know, bring things that have already been vetted as like, yeah, we...

Later, that's not even something we look at considering, so I want to be respectful of the conversations that have happened.

That maybe you could bring that to your science advisory council, because I don't think that would.

Keeping their coastal modeling.

Then I know there's 150 feet from the Marsh Islands, restaurant shoreline.

That's kind of seems like a bit of a rule of thumb if it is going sounds fine, but I did see like notes in here that.

The 200 feet was.

like not also not desirable. So I didn't know if you had any thoughts on that or I mean.

I guess we probably be.

using that 150 as criteria in the quantum for analysis. Is it 150 for SAV or coastal wetlands? Well, what I'm saying is Park Service says the boundaries extend 150 feet from the estuarine shoreline.

And then the refuge considers the Marsh Islands.

refuge land. So we would think, you know, 150 feet kind of rule of thumb. I didn't know, you know, and I'm not sure how much you guys even remember from 2017, but I just didn't know if.

200 foot came from somewhere that we need to kind of consider more than that 150 or.

I think it might be their proclamation boundary. I would ask them that question.

Okay. Yeah. Ask them what their boundaries are and what types of activities they would allow at their boundary. Certainly there were an anti-jug handle bridge would have been within those areas where it took off and touched down. Yeah.

For coastal wetlands, we really just look at the impact.

direct impact to the wetland, whether it be fill, excavation, or even potentially shading in areas that might be very low to above the coastal wetlands, and temporary impacts to coastal wetlands during construction.

DMF might have some criteria for the SAVs.

Being, being a certain distance outside of the SAV minutes.

Hey, Walt, I really appreciate everyone's time and.

open mind and sharing thoughts. You know, happy to stay and continue discussing with anyone. I don't know if John or Amy.

Seth, do you have anything to add?

Any pointers for the CP1 meeting?

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 1:09:08

No, nothing to add at this point.

Show everybody's feedback today.

JJ Jamison, John 1:09:15

This isn't really something to add, but just you were discussed having some kind of like AGOL map or some kind of interface where you could turn on and off layers.

That would be great. Cool.

A map nerd, like I just, yeah, I think it's useful and it would definitely help to on our side, just conceptualize everything in one spot, yep, for CP1 or something where we could like get your usernames and add you to the map.

Yeah, yeah, I don't really have a timeline.

I don't think it would be necessary to have before CP1, yeah, but I'm happy to give you a username search, however emails, however you need. OK, yeah, I only know

enough about that to be dangerous, but let's see what I can learn. Did you figure out how to get us access to the NC Connect? We had that conversation earlier about like...

When I try and click on the NC Connect, I get this document has not been shared with you. I also had that. Like the same thing for this meeting. When I click on NC Connect, it says that the document's not been shared with you, but then you had attached it. So I was able to use the access for site works. But I've had continued issues with NC Connect.

And do you have a username and password and the ID? I do for the state, yeah. I mean, it's not a dot employee, but I mean, Morgan and I have talked about it. Yeah, so if you click on...

So you go to 8000020.

Click on that, it gives you that, or when you go into like the external, um, well, I don't know if you want to join, keep, yeah, after we end, or maybe, yeah, more in this projects.

So when I clicked on the invitation for today's meeting, it gave me an option of the attached PDF or I could follow this link on the NC Connect site to get to it. So I clicked on the NC Connect link and got this site has not been shared.

Yeah, usually that first link up asking about this, I'm pretty sure it's linking it directly to the project management files they won't have access to, right? Why not?

Hey, everyone, sir, I don't have to discuss across.

OK, so it needs to be on, like, the external collaboration session. OK, but that's why we offer the extra alternative, so that's open to.

Right, and never had any issues with experts. Right. Works great. Yeah, the only agency that has access to most of our files is Federalwide Way, because they audit our program. Okay. So maybe for the CP1, we can make a copy on the external collaboration site. If we load stuff through Atlas Workbench correctly, it automatically populates an external collaboration.

Really? Other merger projects that I haven't had that issue, so...

Those controls that are marked is going to.

There's something.

Also been able to let them know that you sent me months ago that connects to the pre-construction external site that lists all the projects. That does work for us. My whole team has started to use that now. So.

Yeah.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 1:12:38

Hey, our friends Scott and Kyle with the core have been really quiet. Hopefully that's a good sign.

JJ Jamison, John 1:12:41

Yes.

Yeah.

KB Kyle Barnes 1:12:46

Just taking it all in.

WS Wilcher, Seth (FHWA) 1:12:48

All right.

SJ Scott Jones 1:12:50

Yeah, I would echo that, Seth. I do appreciate the discussion from everyone, and I appreciate Kathy bringing her comments today. They've been very helpful as well. Over.

KB Kyle Barnes 1:13:01

Read.

JJ Jamison, John 1:13:04

But I'm not gonna put you on the spot too much. I really don't like being in the spotlight. I don't know if that's opportunity. You have to delve into your own personal art house. You can call me anytime, by the way. Yeah, I mean, I've got my notes.

Spencer.

History documented, probably 'cause the SCLC did a complete discovery and we had depositions, so they've also been through my files, get right over those goals here, remember a lot of things you documented about, yes.

Well, maybe we can catch halftime, right? Nothing's happened in the first half, so you're good. OK. Not a single score. Do you think Doug? I was going to make a joke, but I think you're the only one. One time, Alice Gordon and I, do you bring Alice

Gordon? Yeah. OK. Alice Gordon and I scheduled an important meeting about. Probably this project during the final four. Nobody was happy. No one told us to cancel it, but England scored it. No one was happy with that. No, they're in second-half. Anthony Gordon. All right, have a good evening, everyone, and see you in months. Bye.

 **Kyle Barnes** 1:14:27
Thank you.

 **Scott Jones** 1:14:30
Thanks.

 **Jamison, John** 1:14:31
That's on my birthday, so what's that? Happy birthday, ohh, happy birthday to me.

 **Jamison, John** stopped transcription