

I-2513 BD Commitments Meeting-20251015_080249-Meeting Recording

October 15, 2025, 12:02PM

2h 48m 45s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription



Headrick, Hannah S 0:23

All right, we'll get started, y'all.

Oh, hang on.

So got a bunch of people here in the room and obviously bunch online which run around the table and do introductions.

Don Jamison, the dot environmental policy, all of you spoken to him, Patrick management unit and CVP Christian Cofa project management unit with dot West. Carter project and I community dot big Garden DWR 401 transportation committee. I'm sure all that and I'm gonna file a survey to improve John Williams, RKK Tyler Santonio survey, Speedo Michael Churchy and city of Tea, Department of Coordination and permitting. I have to cook. OK. OK. Chris Robb. Arc K. Matthew Payne. Archer Wright. Dave Moyer. Archer Wright. Kevin hed.

And policy Solomon, Mukesh.

Happy to you.

All right.

And online. So we got a bunch of people.

I will try to run through everybody.

Brooke Anderson with TOT hydraulics.

Y'all feel free to unmute and say hello if you want to check your mic, but you don't.

Amy and Nino with DWR out in Asheville.

Mark bakerstaff.

Mark, remind me who you're with Division 13.

Yeah. Thank you.



Biggerstaff, Mark A 1:53

Yeah, Division 13.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:58

Byron Holden.



Byron Holden 2:01

Up with the RKNK Archer right JV.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:01

OK.

Alrighty, I'm Chris Ridenbark that's duplicated himself somehow.

Russa Cox.

With environmental policy.

Edwin Fenner with dot alternative delivery.

Tori Fowler Transystems working for Division 13, Jared Gray dot dau biosurbase.

Greg Hall.

The lighting.

Any harvest environmental policy?

With dot Permal analysis ecap.

Jeremy keen.



Jeremy Keene 2:48

Yes, Jeremy Keene with our KNK.



Headrick, Hannah S 2:52

Morning Todd Lapham with dot alternative delivery.

Lori Beckwith with core morning Lori.



Lori Beckwith 2:59

Good morning.

Good morning.



Headrick, Hannah S 3:03

That cook.

Also here in the room, Dave McHenry with Wildlife Commission.

Er, Dave.

Make the money him with Division 13, Pete Stafford with RK and K.
Mitava quadri.

 **Quadri, Mujtaba S** 3:27
Yeah, NCDOT lighting.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:30
Good morning.
Sarah Connor with our K&K.
BZ.
Right. That's the 13. Yeah. Thank you.
And Holland, with Fish and Wildlife service.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 3:47
Morning.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:49
Did we get everybody covered?
I think so. OK.
John Williams, do you want to address while we're here?
And so the I-2513BD is the I-26 project in Nashville.
I should be familiar with that.
We have advanced to the point where we're deep into design. We're running through commitments.
We Senate commitments tracker out.
It's the way that we build to track this because there are over 300 economists for this project, so we needed some way to organize spreadsheet. You guys should have received that.
We also in the process of going through those commitments have found that there were a few areas that were.
We're having hard times working through them.
We need your help in being able to work through those.
We sat on an agenda for today. The the first part of it, there's four floodplain commitments in particular that went out that we received some feedback on that we made some adjustments through that part of the conversation.

Chris, can you go ahead and share your screen can show to that part.

And then.

We also want to briefly update us for Schwab's service on conservation measuring two or three of those where we're coming to you very soon and have conversations about.

Things that we're identified in the project manage tracker, we've got temporary Causeway scenario that may actually tie into the first item.

We'll see how that function is out.

That topic was information.

 **Lori Beckwith** 5:28

I'm. I'm sorry. Excuse me.

Excuse me. I'm sorry to interrupt you.

I I can barely hear you and I've got you turned all the way up.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:36

I'm sorry.

 **Lori Beckwith** 5:36

Are you near the? OK. Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:36

I'll go ahead.

I'll project that.

Yeah, I'll project a bit louder.

So the the temporary Causeway issue was I think Perk identified AT4B4C somewhere in there. We've had some conversation on it.

We're gonna continue with that today.

And then the final is strategic communications plan. That's to do with river safety and disruptibility and things along those lines.

So with that, I'm gonna turn it over to Chris Robenbach, who's gonna walk us through the modifications that we're proposing for the club.

Plain related commitments.

Chris, you've got the floor.

OK.

So just to recap, these are four that.

There were concerns and really came down to constructibility. I think each of these.

Things on the screen now. I believe the agencies.

I know they saw one version of this.

I'm not sure if they seen the version that has the little comments at the bottom we simplified.

A backup. We made an original recommendation or request for each of these forwards.

And then, like John said, some of the agencies had questions and concerns about them. So we rewrote those.

And that's the version that's below.

So you've got the original from the Bo and then the version below that is our second revision requested changes and then for those that are.

Do you know if the this version that I sent with the comments made it back?

I think Bori had a question about.

I think there were some questions.

I don't know if it's been fully OK, OK, so.

The the version that we got on screen now we do have a little explanation if that helps.

So not sure if the best format to go through this if if those have had if everybody on the call has had a chance to review the the revised version or do you want me to read that or if you want me to just wide and let you.

Read that.

The the comment.

For this one, I don't believe there were any concerns with.

Our requested revision to what is now 36.

Row 36.

Of the project commitments are renumbered a little bit.

Now that changes were made just the formatting of the amendment track to the town was mixed.

We did get added a few roads, so again, row 36 now.

I don't believe there are any.

Uh, any comments back on our proposed changes?

Hi. This is Amy Nino with DWR.

I just have a question for you about this.

About this commitment, can you just discuss like when you consider you know, an equipment to become flooded, is that you know when water level reaches the cab or is there a specific point in the you know in either the drill rig or the crane where you're considering that?

Equipment to be flooded and when you would move that off of.

The Causeway.

In advance of flooding.



Headrick, Hannah S 9:03

Yeah, I'll do it.

Sure. Right now the Causeway is at an elevation above the 10 year flood, if I'm not mistaken.

No, but in the permanent condition I'm looking at Mr. Cook.

But if we know that there's a storm coming and the water was to rise to over top the existing Causeway, we would be removing the the equipment.

To Causeway.

Yes.

So just to clarify, sorry.



Annino, Amy 9:34

OK.

Thank you.



Headrick, Hannah S 9:38

Just to clarify, anyone at all.

Sure, if it's gonna let, let's just be careful because we we it will, it will be above the normal water surface elevates which is NCD, your environment about one or two feet above normal water surface.

So if he does use the dictate that teams provide, something that's won't be of a storm events.

So the exorbitant amount of rocket would take to even go to cover the 10 year form, but the adding about 10 more feet of fire, which fully blocks the entire river just by the mere sake of the slopes to go down the river.

Also.

So we can we can be there for normal, our service flow and we can't really calculate the one year two year. We don't have places to do that, but the 10 year does over top, but it can't withstand like you know a very, very tiny reign of it.

But to be honest, it's it's any rain comes through there.

We just have to be careful, but I I can't comment on archae right.

Is there?

There's equipment, but we there is a base.

I'll make it simple, I mean.

It can correct me if I'm wrong but.

We have plans in place to monitor weather if we have fear that our equipment's gonna be flooded, it will be removed from the river.

We don't intend to let our equipment be what I think the original question is. What is flooded, right?

And sounds like flooded.

Is anything above the elevated top allocation that worked as well? You know it's it's tracked heavy with cranes is what it is?

So you know a little bit of water over topping and where the traps are at, that's not gonna create an issue with equipment or environmental.

You can't into the fuel tank systems or anything else.

Fuel tanks are probably.

For a love for a ground elevation is so there's quite a bit of elevation before you get into hazardous chemicals there, so a little bit of overcopping if we calculate it wrong is not gonna create. I think any issues if we know a hurricane or a major storm.

Is coming.

That's gonna be a different situation and we we'd be looking at removing equipment that helps.

I just wanted to clarify that the question was about, you know, potential waste getting.

It's gotta get up three or four foot above.

What the Causeway elevation is before I think there would be a risk of any kind of contamination.

That would be a pretty serious event.

Thank you.

Colin.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 12:09

Thanks. So is the the reason for this change? Just that it is expected to be like overly burdensome or impactful to remove that equipment.

In in accordance with that original commitment.

And sorry if that was already explained, I've been trying to keep up with all these things, but what?

Like why?

Why does the equipment need to be left out there in the first place?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 12:35

My short answer would be it would extend the duration that we would be out there putting things at risk, right? If we're removing the equipment every time it rains, you know something that would take three weeks is gonna take three months.

So I think we would be incurring.

It's about getting out there in a reasonable time frame when we don't think we're gonna have weather and then getting back out of there.

As quickly as possible.

If that helps.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 13:02

Yeah, I guess so.

I mean, I mean, I don't think I even fully understand like what all equipment is involved or how like how involved it is moving it back and forth.

So maybe that's part of my confusion.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 13:12

And we're talking very large cranes, which is I don't want to call a major undertaking, but it's not like a 5 or 10 minute ordeal.

It is like a day long. If we decide to to remove the equipment from the Causeway.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 13:30

OK, that helps my understanding.

I didn't know if it was just something that gets like driven out there and driven off. So thank you for explaining that.



Headrick, Hannah S 13:37

No problem.



Youngman, Holland J 13:37

And and so like it would and y'all are saying it would take a pretty major rain and flood event to actually flood the equipment when it's perched out there on the Causeway.

Like beyond just our kind of flashy like heavy summer thunderstorms for instance. I mean, the river can come up pretty quick.

So I'm also just trying to understand like what kind of flood it would take.

To flood the equipment out there and y'all are saying it would be something pretty major to make that happen like a major rain event.



Headrick, Hannah S 14:09

That's my understanding from the contractor side.

So A10 year event would overtop the Causeway and I think what what David's saying is that before it got to the point of damaging the equipment that that would be removed.



Youngman, Holland J 14:27

OK.

All right. Thanks, y'all. Appreciate it.



Headrick, Hannah S 14:36

Was the original question that needs to be answered, I guess.

Any other questions for 36?

Obviously these are all kind of similar but.

What you're looking at now is literally catching up this there were a few questions that came back for what we proposed for this this version.

Not sure if they show up for those that didn't see the the updated comment.

And Laurie, I think that was your question.

The way that this was reformatted and just didn't have an explanation.

So we we minimized too much in our response. So I apologize for that.

 **Lori Beckwith** 15:34

Sure. I mean I I will go back to my question.

Let's see.

And you have to remind me because I know I saw two different.

Plans two different versions of the plans that varied, but.

Which updated permanent drawing.

What? I'm so I guess what you're saying is with the you modeled 1A1B1C and 1D.

And there's going to be a rise, but you'll minimize that.

So remind me, what is the rise?

Because again, I looked at a bunch of different plans.

For one, A1B1C and 1D.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 16:20

The rise in normal water acceleration or storm event or what?

 **Lori Beckwith** 16:22

Yes.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 16:23

What are you asking? I'm sorry.

 **Lori Beckwith** 16:28

Hang on.

Water surface elevation. Normal water? Yeah.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 16:35

OK.

So base flow, water surface elevation with the temporary work pad platform which is only out for a couple weeks.

Goes up about two to three feet and still stays about a foot.

Now below the top of the call the work platform.

 **Lori Beckwith** 16:54

OK.

So what is that?

What's the effect on any buildings upstream?

Any structures that?



Headrick, Hannah S 17:09

There's no effect on structures because you're still inside the banks.



Lori Beckwith 17:15

OK, all the way up, all the way up. You're good.



Headrick, Hannah S 17:20

Yes.



Lori Beckwith 17:21

OK.

That's good for me. Thanks.

Well, but then I go back to the we still have to work out the actual causeways, but yeah, OK.

Thank you.



McHenry, David G 17:41

Hi, this is Dave.

Since you are the previous slide or hydraulic information.

I bet so.

A10 year Storm event and 1B it won't raise water surface elevation barely at all. I guess. Is that right?



Headrick, Hannah S 18:01

Well, it it does go up anytime we put anything in the river, the water source elevations go up.

We're just showing what it would be for the 10 year water surface elevation.

With this work temporary work platform in place.

But you can see that it's still within the confines of the river itself. If you look at the bikes.

 **McHenry, David G** 18:17

It.

So you're going from 10 year water surface from 1969.4 to 1969.5.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:29

The 19.

Yes, 1969.41969 point 5.

You're talking about pretty miniscule there. The unobstructed flows on the right and the restrictions on the left.

 **McHenry, David G** 18:43

And that's a cross section.

So yeah, so the 10th above what?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:46

That's correct.

 **McHenry, David G** 18:48

Barely anything. OK, thanks. Thanks, Matt.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:52

Yes, Sir.

And what we're showing here is the worst case scenario, right?

This is like the three-week.

This is duration one week.

This is only one week. Yeah, but phase 1B.

Good.

All.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 19:15

OK.

This is kind of an like annoying.

I guess regulatory language one and I just put the definition of action area in the chat.

I guess I'm just getting a little bit hung up on saying that it's gonna minimize arise, minimize a rise in the 100 year stormwater surface elevation outside of the action area.

I mean.

Technically, the action areas in the area that's going to be affected directly or indirectly by the action, so.

Maybe I'll.

Maybe I can stare at this.

Not right now while I'm while I'm talking to people, but like maybe a slight rewording, just so that it's not indicating that there's going to be any sort of impact outside of the action area because that just kind of conflicts with that definition.

Does that make sense what I'm saying?

How? That's just like slightly problematic with the definition of action area.



Headrick, Hannah S 20:21

I understand what you're asking.

I'm not sure.

Right.

Well, the, I mean the action area that we use, we've looked at what was with the Bo just that figure and it was basically the Ballard jerk, the full 2513 study area.

And it may have gone beyond that, but it definitely went outside our project limits.

I'm not sure if that helps, but what she say it is if there's impacts outside of the action area, that becomes the action area that the action area roads. OK, so you can't.



Youngman, Holland J 21:04

Thanks Tyler.



Headrick, Hannah S 21:06

Impact that outside of Action Center, right, I think I think the intent is that we have done the best that we can to minimize roz's period regardless of action area next to the bridge upstream. We've done the best that we can to minimize.

Ars, I mean, and that's what the whole purpose of the work platform being there only for a week and then pulling back a week, pulling back a week and installing a trestle bridge so that we're not leaving rock in the river in perpetuity during construction.

That I think that's, but we can try to write this any way you'd like on. We're just it's kind of hard because Tyler's right.

It's anywhere it's gonna be arise, but we've done our best from a construction standpoint to keep that rise as low as possible.

Well, if you looked at the study, could you say study area?

Yeah, but still I think this is one of Laurie's questions, but it's got back to the term minimize because that doesn't really define.

I don't.

I don't know if you can get to the level of saying insignificant.

I don't know how to word Smith this too much, but we want to get it the way that it's accurate and as what they're looking for in computer.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 22:22

Maybe just take mention of action area out of that sentence. I don't.

I mean, I don't know if that's leaving it then too vague and I'm sorry I'm not trying to get in the weeds on wording.

It's just that it that's kind of like this sort of contradictory sentence is all I was trying to point out.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:37

That's what I was just saying to Chris.

We could remove outside the action area and then change it to design to minimize the rods of 100 year storm elevation.

Does that sound OK?

 **Youngman, Holland J** 22:49

I mean that suits me better than the way it's worded now.

I don't know if that is if that works for other people though.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:59

Yeah. Yeah, that's right.

I saw a couple hands thrown up in the chat.

Did anybody have a comment on that particularly or?



Cox, Marissa R 23:08

This is Marissa.



Lori Beckwith 23:08

So.



Cox, Marissa R 23:09

That was gonna be my suggestion. Is just to remove that outside the action area because if we have to keep in mind that these are commitments that are in the Bo. So while we have input from other regulatory agencies. It has to fit in the context of Holland's regulatory purview. So yeah, it needs to come out.



Lori Beckwith 23:34

This is Laurie. Hey, can you guys?

Model it and then have.

A show it depict it on over an aerial about.

What the rise in water elevation would be depending upon the storm event. Can you do that?



Headrick, Hannah S 23:55

We we already do that.

That's part of our requirements for FEMA, for our plans to be submitted.



Lori Beckwith 24:01

OK.



Headrick, Hannah S 24:03

I can promise you you're probably not going to see very much variation because the 100 year basically runs from the railroad.

All the way past Riverside Dr. currently.



Lori Beckwith 24:12

Yeah, and that's great.

I'm sorry, I I understand that.

I just for our records, if you could just include that with the information you submit for the modification request, then that would that would go to taking out the action area and making this more.

Not as specific then.

Then we could just refer to that and say, Oh yeah, look here it is.



Headrick, Hannah S 24:35

The timing wise it's that will not be available when we submit the permit mod request.

Can we commit to providing that later when it is ready?

We could have some reference to what Matt was saying that it would be a we're we're we're close to about a .2 foot rise, .25 foot rise right now in the 100 year. But we are still working with NCDOT on our commenting on groups and.

I'd be hesitant to give you something that's accurate right now, but maybe literally .05 foot off in about two weeks. And I know that sounds scary, but I wanna get correct information.



Lori Beckwith 25:11

OK, if you.

Yeah, if you could put that in writing and and this will go, this goes to something we're going to discuss a little bit later and I've already commented to dot and they probably let you know, but this is going to have to go on public notice, so.

What I always tell people is when things like this go on, public notice is.

Make it as easy to understand as you can because there are going to be people reviewing this that are not engineers.

That are not transportation experts, and I would think you get comments from the Outfitters more than anything, but so whatever you submit to explain this, make make it as as easy to understand as you can.

OK.



Headrick, Hannah S 25:59

OK.

Thank you. Just curious.

Would be the full 30 day notice. If there any chances with qualified for a 15 day.

 **Lori Beckwith** 26:11

I don't know.

Scott and I talked about this Scott Jones, and I talked about this last week and and we both agreed it would need to go out on public notice.

We didn't talk about whether it be a 15 or a 30 day. Well, we could talk about that and I'll let you know.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 26:25

OK.

Thank you.

 **Lori Beckwith** 26:30

The the reality just to add on to that, the reality is.

You know, there may be comments.

We've got to give people an adequate time to comment, and especially depending upon when you submit this. If this is over like the holidays or something.

Then that would probably lead us to not do a 15 day.

But like I said, look about it and if you can give me some guesstimate of when you plan to submit the permit modification request.

Whenever you figure it out, that'd be good.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:05

Michael on that, but and we're really the only thing.

Obviously, we're we're coordinating these now, but I think that the pending.

Comments on the and we are going to rename.

Whatever we're calling it right now, but the integrated plan I guess is what the next name will be.

But what was the strategic communication plan? Which was the River safety plan and the Construction demolition plan combined?

We'll we'll clarify that a little bit.

We're hoping to have those.

Responses addressed and sent to dot Friday.

And the I think the other pieces in parts of what would be required for the permit mod request is or kind of being finalized and those will be provided probably this

week too I think.

So I don't know if you have a you in a ballpark guess.

I would.

We would submit it.

Yeah, very soon.

Hopefully she's in the office.

Agreed to the point. Good point.

 **Lori Beckwith** 28:15

What do you mean?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:15

Hi we're hoping that our federal partners will be able to review something.

 **Lori Beckwith** 28:23

Right.

All right. Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:40

Up to 30 other.

Jasons with the first one that we talked about, but.

Not sure.

If this minimized version.

Is a little more clear. Amy and I had some questions about this.

Just asking some clarification.

Can you go into a little more detail on what the secondary containment tails?

Sure.

I guess thing to talk about would probably be a 55 gallon drum.

I'll break oil or or something like that.

You can Google online or go to the World Wide Web.

There are a number of different secondary containments that we use.

One looks a lot like a pallet, but it has a pavement area within it.

So if the drum or something was gonna leak, it leaks down into, we'll call it a tub. But it's designed to.

So we can use forks and move those materials around.

So typically we'll have drops that are usually not 55 gallon by like 30 gallon drums. Or it would be oil before oil.

So that would be the secondary containment. I like kidney pools.

Mm-hmm. OK.

Sorry, Henry.

Sort of, but it looks like a pallet.

Yeah, it looks like a really deep pallet is what what they look like, right?

So it it can contain whatever is leaving out of, but I can.

And will this be on Causeway?

No, no, no, oswe.

Things will most likely it would be a truck would drive out there and they would service the equipment and the truck drives away.

OK.

So this would be more up on you know.

Majority of the project and where we're gonna be constructing our layout is in the floodplain.

But what we're gonna build a service pad, so it's gonna be concrete, and then that will be stored on top of that.

So even additional protection. Amy, do you have any more questions on this?

 **Annino, Amy** 30:55

No, that answers.

That pretty much answers my questions. Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 31:03

Good, good.

Allen Howell.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 31:08

That was helpful because I had the same questions and then that explanation was helpful.

Could some of that be added to this new measure like?

I guess the example is provided for the spill response materials, saying spill blankets and fueling diapers, so maybe something similar could be added to help describe that secondary containment like the little pallet pallet pool or or whatever it's called.

And then the I think you also somebody just described like a concrete pad that was gonna be built.

Anyway, if if there are like just a few more.

Kind of examples of what those measures are gonna be if they could be added to this to this commitment, I don't know.

I think that would be helpful for whoever's reading over it and just trying to understand what the actual commitment and measures are gonna be.

Is that possible?



Headrick, Hannah S 32:02

Can we speak?

It's possible.

We can throw some examples in there.

It's not a one-size-fits-all, right? I mean.

Dual storage is typically in a tank that has a double wall system, so it comes with a secondary system.

You know, if we're talking about small quantities, the palette example works.

So you know, there's a number of different measures we would use depending on the materials and what we add, but certainly we can add a few examples if that's helpful.

That we set up like such as. Yeah, sure. OK.



Youngman, Holland J 32:36

Yeah, and added such as would be helpful. Thank you.



Headrick, Hannah S 32:47

Any other questions to row 39?



Annino, Amy 32:54

One more quick question.

This is Amy. So like granted it would take a pretty big storm event for, you know, water to reach out on the floodplain, but ends that type of event. I mean, I would, I would assume you'll be mobilizing unmobilizing these hazardous materials and moving them out of where.

Floodwaters could reach is that something a contingency plan that NCDOT develops

when they're storing?
Hazardous materials within the floodplain.
100 year flood plain.



Headrick, Hannah S 33:30

Maybe that was a two-part question, but I can only answer half of that.
Yeah, we have storm.
We have.
You know, we have contingency plans for storms.
Back to the previous example, you know that's why we would store some of these materials on pallets. That makes it easier to move those around or or to relocate those.
So I think there's a second part to that question.
I'm not qualified to answer.
Either.
Your portion about standards for dot spec, I'm not sure.
Well, I think what she's saying is let's just basically include these in an evacuation plan. Just make sure they're spelled out as much as the equipment is.
That we would have a plan to remove it from the 100 year floodplain should they be threatened.
Simplifying it too much.



Annino, Amy 34:17

No, that's that's that's perfect way to kind of summarize that question.



Headrick, Hannah S 34:28

Some more language, including the plan.
Just that as you have included in your, we would also move move any additional materials.
That's I'll point out there's a number of other businesses and buildings and whatnot in that flood point that have a lot of other materials.
So you know remote or totally vacating the flood plain.
I don't know what is reasonable or practical but.
We can certainly remove our materials.

In the Bible or hurricane and whatnot.

The major, major it would, it would take a significant amount of overtop.

 **Annino, Amy** 35:16

And I I realize that I just wanted to ask, you know, what kind of contingency plans are just to make sure there was one for a really significant event?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:19

Ping.

Sure. We secure all our you know, we have emergency action plans that we call it where we outline exactly.

You know, it's it's more of a work plan. When we got a hurricane coming, here's all the activities that you need to do so.

That would be included with that and security or removing materials.

So I think we have an action plan for that and we can actually state that because we continue document.

Anything else for row 39?

Who are perhaps one of the flip flame related.

This was just temporary storage of.

I think I guess the byproducts was what caused concern initially.

Too.

Just a little additional detail, what that could include.

Good, Helen.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 36:52

OK, I'm a big fan of the the such as and so it has such as.

Surplus rip rap. But and that doesn't sound like that.

Terrible. But then the word construction byproduct sounds potentially worse. And I'm basing this on not a lot.

This is this is me asking ignorant questions but like what are some other?

Potential materials that that could be stored within.

The 100 year flood plain.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:28

Dirt.

I did not write the byproduct statement, but yeah, the only thing we're really gonna be storing there temporarily, as we said, we have the the rip wrap for the temporary causeways that will have to be, you know or if you study our action plan or the plan some.

Of it goes in the river. Then we remove that as soon as possible when it's not needed, and then it goes back into the river.

That will be stored.

In the floodplain, when we're excavating for the foundations for the temporary bridge and the permanent bridge, there are spoils which?

In the river, I think we all know the river is rock, so it would be natural rock. There may be some soils that would be stored in the floodplain.

So we're talking about natural materials.

You know, I don't think.

I don't envision a like I said, I didn't.

I didn't write that term, so maybe we could change that.

Wording a little bit if if that's beneficial about fill material removed by product and say fill material, sure.

Don't care.



Youngman, Holland J 38:37

OK.



Headrick, Hannah S 38:40

What we don't intend to fill there, but it would be when we excavate for the drill shafts or the foundations for the bridge, they're spoils that come out of that hole.

Those are natural materials.

They would be stored there for some point in in time, and they're not going to remain burnt. I think that's the reference, right? So.



Youngman, Holland J 39:00

OK. And then?

Thank you for for like spoils that are getting piled up somewhere.

Is there some sort of containment for those like the silt fencing get put in around the spoil piles?

I'm just trying to envision like what all this looks like and how it how it's gonna hang out there.



Headrick, Hannah S 39:23

We'll have a dot approved resident control sabotage plan to work with people in the field as needed, because sometimes these piles are there literally for like an hour or two, but sometimes they're going to be there for weeks, so an RKK will have field personnel monthly to assist.

The contractor to make sure that we're abiding by both environmental regulations.



Youngman, Holland J 39:44

Thank you.

Yeah, maybe.

And again, this is me probably obsessing too much on the wording, but I'm either gonna bring it up now or when it's time to modify the Bo.

So again, just the this kind of examples in a little bit more detail to help your everyday reader such as myself like understand what these commitments are really getting at.

So yeah, instead of construction byproducts, maybe just adding the examples y'all cited of like what these materials would actually.

Be and and that way it just is like a little less.

I'd say like for me reading it, it's just a little less concerning knowing it's just gonna be rip wrap and spoils from the river because before asking this question I didn't know if it was gonna be like construction byproducts.

I didn't know if that meant like old fuel or whatever, just like more hazardous materials so.

If if that could be clarified in this commitment, I think that would be helpful.



Headrick, Hannah S 40:46

We can do that.



Youngman, Holland J 40:47

Thank you.



Lori Beckwith 40:49

Hey, this is Lori, I've got.

I had an original question about why is it necessary to borrow a waste? Not desired, but why is it necessary? And if I understood correctly, some of the examples you gave were you would for temporary waste.

If that's the case, it should say temporary waste in in the in the commitment. I didn't.

Hear any any examples about borrowing? I mean excavation for the project itself isn't isn't borrowed.

So I I may have missed all that, but basically why is it necessary for you to borrow or waste other than temporary waste in the 100 year flood plain?



Headrick, Hannah S 41:41

So I might have this poke when I said borrow, but we're building the bridge over the 100 year floodplain.

So currently the plans do not include putting any fill in the 100 year floodplain so.

Maybe it was just my statement while trying to answer your question, but.

Laurie, do you want us to break that sentence into two different sentences, one focused on the borrow waste and one focused on the temporary construction?

The byproduct piece does that make the most sense for separate far?



Lori Beckwith 42:15

Well, well, how would how would that?

How would that read? Cuz it sounds like you're not gonna borrow at all in the 100 year floodplain.

From what I just heard.

And you're only gonna do temporary waste. Is that right?



Headrick, Hannah S 42:26

I think that's correct.

We could probably word that way so that the original version from a borrow standpoint stays.

Intact and then we can.

Temporary waste. Why would we need a borrow, do you think?

 **Lori Beckwith** 42:42

So I mean, could it read something like area used?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:43

It's, you know, well, it says it would not be.

So OK.

I know everybody's paid, but really what it comes with is this was the original language for the total I 2513 project.

 **Lori Beckwith** 42:57

OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:57

We on I-2513BD do not have borrow in our segment.

So we're trying to fit.

 **Lori Beckwith** 43:03

OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:07

Our specific project into the total commitments.

So I think that's there's a lot of that threaded through the comments that we're getting is, yes, we understand it's, but 2513 is much larger overall project.

So if do we need to be specific to 2513 BD?

 **Lori Beckwith** 43:23

Here.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:25

I don't think so.

I don't think that's the intent.

Everything we're talking about today is specific to BD, so don't you don't worry about the other sections being affected.

OK.

So that's but these changes to be.
But but it's points modifying the DOP, yeah.

 **Lori Beckwith** 43:40

So.

So. So just for this, I mean what I'm thinking is you could either say it or just take it out like there will not be no borrow in the 100 year floodplain and any waste, any, any waste that would happen would be temporary and would be minimized. What?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:56

Create a.

 **Lori Beckwith** 44:02

About something like that.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:04

What is?

What is your definition of borrow?

What? But I need to understand that.

 **Lori Beckwith** 44:10

Borrow is when you excavate for material, for construction or for other purposes. It's not when you just excavate because you've got to put bridges buttman in or something like that.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:21

And what do you do with borrow?

 **Lori Beckwith** 44:24

You use it.

You use it for, yeah.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:25

Yeah, yeah, you you dig material out.

Say there's a a little hill. You dig the hill out and you fill in a lower area, right?

 **Lori Beckwith** 44:35

Correct, correct if you if you need to dig it out anyway though for like the bridge abutment and you use it for construction somewhere else, that's fine.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:36

OK.

 **Lori Beckwith** 44:44

That's I don't have to let borrow because you're doing it for a reason. For to construct.

You're digging it out for a reason for construction, but if you just dig out an area because you want to fill in a lower area that's borrow.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:00

OK.

We're we're on the same page.

I just want to make sure we were using the term.

In the same manner.

So how do we?

Right center.

 **Cox, Marissa R** 45:13

So I just wanted to circle back.

I'm not sure who said it, but I do think it is important to remember that these are commitments in the Bo for the entire project, not just BD.

 **Lori Beckwith** 45:26

Right. And so that'll be a question for me for any phase of this project is why is it necessary to do the 100 year floodplain borrower waste so?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:34

Hey, can I comment on that from a hydraulic standpoint when we model these Breakers, sometimes we do use both plates for bar and that is approved by FEMA to do so.

FEMA does not care if we cut down their bloodline.

There's no commitment that FEMA's never use their flood plain for borrow material, so we can't make that commitment for other teams.

We just know that our team is not using flood plain material for our bill purposes.

But Chris and Marissa, right?

We can't make that claim because other teams may fight to that end of their hydraulic Molly can need that for agreeable to get an O rise or minimized SFC.

 **Lori Beckwith** 46:13

I don't tell you other than I mean, I guess Holland may be looking at amending the Bo each time. If that's the case, I don't know.

Colin, what do you say?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:25

But it's divisive.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 46:28

I mean, if there's just a way to write this this particular commitment.

I don't know if it makes sense to write it in a way that like gets it each section and how they may be different.

I mean, that's my only thought.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:41

Get back to the intent of the common what I think our team is trying to address, so that does apply to all projects. If you read the wording areas used for borrow or construction byproducts such as temporary surplus between causeways will not be located within waters of the.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 46:43

I don't.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:56

US, which is the intent and concern of the agencies until we are hopefully coordinating with you guys on today, the intent of FEMA is the floodplain. FEMA regulates the floodplain and they don't have a concern for that general.

I'm saying very generally they do not.

So is there a problem with the fact that we have?

I mean, we tried the address it that we are no longer impacting waters.

The US will borrow material to go into dredge or welling.

So is that still appropriate?

Is that OK?

 **Tina Swiezy** 47:34

Sumat, are we intermingling the word borrow and excavation?

Because excavation is removing fill, I mean removing land.

And taking it somewhere else.

Borrow is when you go get.

That's a whole nother thing.

That, and I understand kind of a question.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 47:58

I think I think you're you're. I think it's the same thing.

 **Tina Swiezy** 47:59

So.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 48:01

I think the the fact that it says areas used for borrow, which means you're excavating, to use that material.

So the intent of our team and the intent of this, this commitment is that we are not going to go in and take dirt within the waters of the US and use it for our operations to produce fuel.

Is that correct, Matt?

So that that's the intent of the statement.

But there may be other teams, even though ours is not. That may decide. OK.

There is a gigantic hill in the floodplain. If we remove that floodplain on that hill in the floodplain, we can use that to build up our bridge above it.

I'm making a theoretical example here and then that actually lowers our water surface elevation as well, which is a benefit to the project 'cause. Now we've added vents and it has increased.

So if we remove this hill.

It makes it better, but we're not gonna do it in a jurisdictional area.

The terms of waters of the US.

So with.

Would adding something just to state of like our Michael are good with us wording this how this relates to specifically B&B?

Starts with that we're specified by the section. OK.

Marissa.



Cox, Marissa R 49:35

I think you guys were just agreeing to specify by section, but my suggestion was that since this is for amending the Bo and Holland was OK with adding.

Some additional like information clarifying what byproducts are changing that word, I guess.



Headrick, Hannah S 49:51

Hello.



Cox, Marissa R 49:52

I'm not sure why we're not just doing that.



TS Tina Swiezy 49:56

33.



LB Lori Beckwith 49:56

Because because one of the reasons why and I put this in my e-mail is because at the CP3 decision we we looked at floodplain effects.

This was not mentioned at all that this was a possibility.

You talk about FEMA.

That's fine.

At what point did they make their decision?

Did they make their decision before a permit evaluation or after it's after? Correct.



Headrick, Hannah S 50:19

It it depends. We honestly can't comment on other teams.
It can be before or after.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 50:25

OK.

So here's the thing. I guess if it's, if it's before, you can go ahead and let us know and we'll consider that in our evaluation.

But what I said is clear.

We talked about this at the meeting.

God, this was years ago and this was one of the factors we looked at to come to the the length of decision because there were two alternatives that were very close I think.

Smith Mill Creek was one of the issues.

And then actually effects on a floodplain and and we went with the one that supported.

That went with fewer floodplain effects.

So if you can all tease this out because I realize like it seems like you're getting frustrated if you can tease this all out and explain it really well, then go ahead and do that.

Explain about the lead.

I'm kind of stuck on the lead for decision about how we made that decision and why you can look back at the meeting minutes. I can tell you what I recall, but but yeah, you need to do that for me.

TS **Tina Swiezy** 51:29

What? What do you mean by impacts to the floodplain?

Just being in it at all and touching it or causing the rise that we've been talking about.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 51:41

We looked at all kinds of thing in Ferguson and all that.

TS **Tina Swiezy** 51:46

Right.



Cox, Marissa R 51:48

So Lori, just just so I can understand your concern are you is your concern with the change from us talking about the flood plain to talking about waters of the US in this specific commitment for the Bo or is your comment a bigger picture comment regarding the Mer?

Process and not really tied to the Bo.



Lori Beckwith 52:09

It's a bigger it's a bigger, it's a bigger conversation.

I appreciate that you changed it to waters the US versus wetlands and that's good.

But yeah, it's a bigger conversation.



Cox, Marissa R 52:21

OK.

So it's just a separate issue like are you?

I guess I'm just trying to get us past row 40 so.

Are are you OK with the revised version and just asking us to look into?

Decisions made during leadpod that are separate from this or you feel like they conflict with us.



Lori Beckwith 52:47

I feel like they conflict right now, unless you can explain it that they don't.



Cox, Marissa R 52:52

OK.



Lori Beckwith 52:53

And if you can explain that they don't, then fine, I'm fine with it. If you can't explain it, then it needs to be looked at more.



Cox, Marissa R 53:06

Just to clarify for everyone, I can't explain that right now, but it sounds like we need to look into it.



Headrick, Hannah S 53:11

OK.



Lori Beckwith 53:12

Sure. I mean, I don't.

I don't know other than Michael, Jeff and I.

I don't know how many people on this call were actually in this EP3 meeting for this.

So Derek Weaver was leading it.

This was years ago, so yeah.



Cox, Marissa R 53:28

No sure I understand.

I guess I was just trying to separate the two.

Because I don't know that I was in that meeting, but I I did work on the on the BA.

And so I was just, I guess I was trying to separate the the amending these few things for the Bo from potentially a separate issue. But it sounds like.

They are intertwined in your in your opinion.



Lori Beckwith 53:51

Yes.



Cox, Marissa R 53:52

OK.



Tina Swiezy 53:53

So in trying to separate it out, I guess it's the definition of borrow and byproducts.

And my my question is, is in the let, but I don't. I don't know what that definition is.

I think we've talked about byproducts.

I I don't.

Did we add that or was that in here from the beginning that phrase?



Headrick, Hannah S 54:13

That was in the original.

 **Tina Swiezy** 54:15

So and and I'm not sure. Maybe somebody understands what that means, but to me, if I read this from scratch.

It says areas used for borrow or construction breakfast will be not related.

Located within wetlands.

That's that for me.

That's one statement, and that would be waters of the US, right?

And then it says or 100 year base flood elevation plus a foot of freeboard which is the floodway by definition, right, Matt?

Not the flood plain.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 54:51

I think I think that that is the blood plain and then an additional foot on top of that.

 **Tina Swiezy** 54:51

Correct.

OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 54:59

So the the problem that the team had was that when Tina's getting at is that we we we will invariably have to store like Dave and Matt said dirt and rock in the floodplain.

 **Tina Swiezy** 55:00

So.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:13

And that's why we just wanted to make sure it was OK that we do so because we have nowhere else to store it when our floodplain runs from the railroad across the river and all the way across Riverside Drive.

 **Tina Swiezy** 55:22

Just by putting in the foundations, you're gonna be in there doing stuff.

So that was my concern. Just to clarify that we're gonna be in there doing stuff and when we're done, we're gonna clean it up.



Headrick, Hannah S 55:28

That's correct.



Tina Swiezy 55:33

There might be truck ruts, right?

We're gonna clean things up, and we're gonna move dirt around to clean it up.

It's a dry floodplain. We're not gonna be in the wetlands or the streams, and you're gonna clean the the project site up.

And level it out and do whatever you've gotta do to make it.

Be stable.

Back to where it was before and then we have this other thing where because of the hurricane, you all know what the site looks like right now.

And I think I think when we leave the site, everybody's going to want it to be cleaned up and look proper.

So that's why I'm just trying to make sure I understand the borrow part.

There's going to be stabilizing and and leveling and cleaning up done out there.

And just I don't know how to get that in the Senate so that it doesn't conflict with your lepa stuff.

That's what I'm trying to just trying to make sure that we get the ability to do what we need to do to to leave the site proper.

Without saying that we're not going to do anything within the floodplain because we know we we are.

If I messed it up and made it more complicated.



Lori Beckwith 56:42

Yeah, that's fine.

That's not what borrow is, and that's not what waste is.

If you're gonna just. Yeah, yeah. Stockpile some material temporarily and then take, you know, move it out of the floodplain or use it for something else.



Tina Swiezy 56:48

OK.

 **Lori Beckwith** 56:56

That's fine.

That that's not. That's not waste. And borrow again is not excavating to put in a structure or as part of the construction process.

It's only when you take that material could you wanna fill something in with it.

So I don't think you need to address those issues.

At least for the waste part, if that's what you're talking about.

For waste.

That's all you're talking about for waste is stockpiling temporarily.

That's not waste, at least as far as I'm concerned.

So I don't know that you have to address that.

It's just normal construction stuff.

 **Tina Swiezy** 57:30

Thank.

 **Lori Beckwith** 57:30

Activities.

 **Tina Swiezy** 57:33

So does that give then?

Do we need to change it at all other than changing it?

I'm asking everybody, but to the waters of the US does that.

Are we good or do we need to do something else, Chris or somebody that where we were trying to edit this?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:55

I guess it comes down to.

If everybody's in agreement with what Lori was saying of what is waste, I think we were trying to. We were interpreted this as.

And and Marissa might can help with this byproducts.

We took that to mean, I guess, multiple things.

So I don't know.

Kind of ask for the departments thinking on how how to rework this and again back

to other.

Sections. If it's going to be them or not. But if Lori if you're saying that what we're proposing is our two examples of temporary rip rap and temporary spoil and you would consider that waste if you were to do a compliance inspection and see that in the flood.

Other than changing that to orders, leaving you know changing the orders, the US versus wetlands, then we we could leave the original.

 **Lori Beckwith** 58:56

Yeah, I'm fine with that. If you want to. And if you want to put temporarily waste or stockpile, you know you can put that in there instead and just say, you know, areas used for temporary stockpiling of byproducts.

Something like that.

There are a lot of ways you could address this.

My my, what I talked about though, with Marissa still stands about the lead for decision and and having an explanation or you know, going into detail about that. But there's lots of ways to work on this to make it work.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:28

But.

Fix my desert.

Thomas still has his hands up.

Use the resident engineer. You got a comment or you're good?

 **Veazey, Tom** 59:47

I think I'm good.

I was just going to reiterate the point that I think if this is what Lori's trying to say, we can meet this commitment.

This is a statement that we would typically use in construction, like to say when you submit an actual borrow or waste site that you can't, you can't utilize the site because it's it falls within these guidelines of wetlands or floodplain.

So to the point of temporary, that isn't generally what we would look at as a issue based on this statement.

So that's all I was gonna say.

And Laura, correct me if I'm wrong on that.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:00:21

No, I think we agree as long as you just make it clear, you can just reword this comment to make it clear that it would be just be temporary stockpiling and take out the waste period or say we aren't going to waste in this area, but again like.

Said like someone said earlier, a number of people did this.

This is the Bo, and it's gonna apply to all the different phases. So you need to factor that in too.

At least from my, I guess the Section 7 point of view from the permitting point of view, you know we have more flexibility we we can.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:53

OK.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:01:01

But I I don't want to make it difficult for Holland.

But I I think this can be worked on numerous ways.

To make it work.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:14

We'll we'll work with the department and come up with.

A.

A.

An altered version of this that hopefully will meet everybody's expectations.

Anything else on this one, or have we covered everybody's concerns?

OK, smiley, anything.

We'll we'll work on these revisions.

And.

It's ready to transition to the next topic. I'm gonna say by any other options.

My topic is brief.

I'm sorry to give time for anybody else to say. Are there any other questions?

OK.

So my topic is brief.

It's a short update on US fish and wild conservation measures.

Holland there were two or three commitments that had to do with us coming back

and coordinating with you, coordinating with Sheryl Miller, Cheryl Knapp.

I'm sorry.

I'll go on.

I'm coordinating with Cheryl, and we're gonna be coming to you fairly soon.

One of the measures, for example, has to do is prevegetation reforestation.

And we're in the process of developing those plans coming to you in according to you very soon.

That was kind of it, I think that.

There we have a really snacks on that.

So that was just a brief update.

Do you have any questions on that?

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:03:04

No, no questions.

I mean, that's good to know that you're working on it.

I will put in a plug for considering native riverkane planting because I do that every chance I get.

So I don't know if that's something that Sonya's radar in terms of native riparian planting.

Figured I'd mention that.

And of course, we can talk more about it whenever we meet.

I'd noticed in the agenda that there is mention, I guess that so that was row 52 of the commitment spreadsheet.

Right, dealing with the native riparian planting is that that's what you're referencing, correct?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:03:40

Yes.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:03:41

OK. And so I'll just be looking out for y'all to touch base and and that discussion to start.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:03:47

Yes, sometime in this next month or so, we'll be connecting with you on that topic.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:03:48

OK.

All right, that sounds good.

Yeah. And then it looks like another row was called out dealing with I guess issues with the culvert trespassing.

Is that something that you were also gonna touch on or is that someone else who's who's leading that one?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:10

I'm not sure why that was actually on the agenda. This is Cheryl because we had emailed a few months, maybe even a year ago, about that. And during our surveys for the the pre and post bolancy we, you know look for evidence of truck pass within the C.

And we haven't seen any.

So unless you all know of of people going inside the culvert.

In necessitating the need to.

You know, keep them out, I guess.

We have.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:04:44

OK. No, I was just gonna ask the same thing.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:45

We have.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:04:48

That's that's my. That's what I thought. OK, thanks.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:49

Yeah.

Yeah, that's my fault because I didn't update the spreadsheet that got sent out to you with that information.

So that one we believe is being pulled has been fulfilled unless something comes up,

it's it. It's done.

Yep, it's not like ongoing.



Youngman, Holland J 1:05:05

OK.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:05:06

Yeah, yeah.

Ongoing would be the right way to put it.

OK. So that that was just a brief update there. The next topic has to do with the Causeway.

Maverick, that special Matt Cook. That is the floor.

All right.

So I guess the starting salary provided answers to the questions of several questions that have been raised during 4C and some others that we thought would be beneficial help agencies with our calls, our platform, Causeway Trestle, bridge layout. I don't know if we want to go through every single one of these.

Or if you would like us, if you would just like to let us know which one you still like to discuss at least about pages and then I can before I do that, I'd also like to show just one more time to remind everybody what we are doing.

This is the principle river.

This is our current permit drawing.

We are still permitting a temporary surface water impact for the area in the Prince Broad River underneath all four of our bridges.

There is a small permanent impact right here that's due to.

Apply, but that is a separate issue than the British.

That's the standard how the British system. I'm gonna progress really quickly here to this is our work pad detail and this is just a general detail these some of these elevations were tops may change, but then we've always have free board above the normal water surface elevation.

And then to get into the actual drawings themselves, we have added additional drawings for the request during 4C that this is we've added the time frame for each of these.

We've also made sure that you can see pretty clearly the different stages and line up the stages a little bit better. So this was the first stage. This was a 5 month stage of

setting the initial Causeway next to the river and then this is when we start.

Adding the temporary work platform.

That goes out into the river and this is only.

At this one worst case time frame approximately one week.

That this temporary work platform's in place and the temporary work platform is only there to build the temporary trestle bridge so that we can make sure that we pull those river impacts so that we are not locking more than 50%. So the approximate one week D.

That looks like this, and you'll notice here as well that our base flow, even with the the temporary work platform.

The baseball is still does.

Not even ever talk the temporary work platform during that one week period.

Moving on to the next one, like through buses, maybe we've shown how we pull that back and this is another secondary week. The platform has to be there so that we can install the foundation for the Trestle bridge.

And so we're going to be immediately pulling that rock out as soon as the trestle bridge for that segment has been built.

So additional one week moving forward here again you can see that now we've opened it up to almost 30% open and again our water service elevations for baseball are well below top of the Causeway. You can see this trestle foundation has been installed. These two need to.

Be installed.

Moving to the next phase, again, this is approximately one week that now you can see it will zoom in and let me know if I'm going too fast.

I'm not sure how fast the screen's updating.

I apologize if I'm going too fast.

But the treasury foundations for the outermost 2 spans have been installed.

We're installing the third set.

This is again only one week, so we're only looking at approximately 3 weeks for this entire section.

And this is the profile that goes with it.

And now we're up at almost 4243% open with the base flow still below the top of the Causeway.

And after that three-week period, we have now pulled it back so that we're installing the remainder.

Of the temporary work pad and this is what will remain in place, because this is we're looking at more of a three month and I'm going to go ahead and move forward.

So now we are back to almost 60% of for the river.

And that's hopefully walking through and and please stop me if I've gone too fast and go with this.

I know we went through it in 4C, but I want to make sure that you know we're addressing any concerns about the actual construction.

The rest of the construction, as you see here.

Additional work pad platform comes out, but we've had to extend it into the river in this portion here.

That's about a two mile duration, but none of these are approaching anywhere near the 50%.

And if they are, you can see for instance, right here. This is a 10 month period of direction where we have a.

Four platform Causeway on the opposite side.

But we have still provided 54% open for the river flow.

That's phase four.

The Chesil Bridge is still in place.

This is phase. The next phase, then we it's just moving the rock.

Notice there's almost nothing on the right side of the river as you're facing downstream, we've added a three month duration here.

And this is another phase that's a team up phase. We wanted to show that we were still providing more than 50% opening.

Trussel Bridge is still in place. Instead of rock or, but this is still at a 51.2% open. This is only a two-month period that it's at this constriction, but it's still greater than 51%.

Bob.

Final phase, we've removed all rock on the left side.

We're back to just the right side and this is a much greater area open and this is a three month period.

And we've also just to remind everyone, we provided the boom links.

That's why we need the links and widths that we do for these work pads and causeways and trusses bridges just because we physically cannot reach out to install some of the interior vents without putting these links in.

They're not arbitrarily set. They're set that you can see here. Depending on the phase,

we can actually reach to do the work.

That being said, I can flip back here.

Whatever you want wants to ask questions and we can further clarify, but we're happy to answer any questions about the construction process.

I have a hopefully brief question about phase six, phase six of.

City seven, phase six, right here, OK.

Could you go to the side profile?

Sure.

So I was just curious what the logic is behind having the left side 'cause maybe so much higher than the right.

Setting guards over the railroad.

Didn't you see the railroad bridge right here? Mm-hmm.

So we have different constraints there.

For the railroad specifications, it's primarily due to the railroad, and so it's the railroad and elevation challenge on the left side or just the railroad itself.

Just the railroad.

We have to get murders set over compo, the railroad so you can see the bridge is higher there for the three eight elevation.

It gets. I could go into a lot of detail, but it goes into those.

The radiuses that Matt pointed out where the crane was right when you get higher and farther away.

Crane sizes go up and we're trying to stay within.

We'll call it mobile crane.

It's about a text screen.

Yeah. Thank you.

Anyone have any comment? Oh, Dave.



McHenry, David G 1:13:24

The base flow elevations for some of the phases.

Is that like a 7 Q 10 or something like that for a fall time low flow or something? Or is it?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:13:39

I'll come back. Give me one second.

Our base flow is is basically your water surface elevation, normal water surface, your 10 year and any storm events go above those base flows.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:13:52

Yeah, but it's your normal water surface that, like a a statistic from a fall low flow period. Or is it a spring time?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:14:00

Oh, it. I'd have to double check. Dave. I'm sorry.

We've got that on our BSR, our our team went out and surveyed.

We've also checked it versus GIS and some of the average blows. I'm sorry I can't give you an exact number on that, but I'm I'm thinking could give or take a output to put on any of that.

It's such a wide river and your depth is really not exorbitantly peak that it it does have a place on the seasonal variation variation.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:14:26

Yeah, yeah, I was just curious. 'cause somebody. I can't remember who it saw a comment somewhere about, you know, like the trestle clearance. And you know, if that was a, you know, this time of year 1959, it might be, you know, a foot or two in. March, April or something higher and I'm just trying to get an idea.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:14:48

Dave, I made the comment in the.

Strategic communication plan. And I was gonna ask, are we gonna go over that plan also or do you want comments about the trestle bridge now?

 **McHenry, David G** 1:15:00

Sorry.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:02

If possible, would like to go through the Causeway comments and responses. And yes, if we had time that would be great, but.

I guess can we continue with the Causeway for now?

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:15:18

OK, I'll, I'll. I can tell you what I think is, Dave, are you finished or do you still have more to talk about?

 **McHenry, David G** 1:15:25

I'm sorry I got I got ahead of things.
I'm good.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:15:33

OK, so I understand that you you want comments now correct about the Tressel bridge, the Causeway and all that, is that correct?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:40

Yeah, please. But the calls wait constant, yeah.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:15:42

OK.

Well, one of my questions after I read the strategic communication plan.

I looked at some other stuff, talked to Scott a little bit.

Was the trestle bridge, and if I read it correctly.

Let me see here.

I said for example, there's only 8 feet of space between the NWS and the bottom of the trestle bridge.

Correct me if I'm mistaken.

And there are causeways on each side of the bridge during certain phases.

What will happen to safe passage during high water events?

How will safe passage lane be established once the trustful bridge isn't constructed?

What will be the effect of water flow due to the numerous wrestle peers and all that?

I mean, you saw my comments, I think so.

Those were concerns I had.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:34

Yeah, we we did receive your comments and we're still working on those.

I don't know if we well, I think that we'll have safe passage.

To the left side of the trestle bridge at all times.

That the anticipation is not that there be passage under our tree.

So bridge, that's not a safety that that'd be a safety matter for anyone that we're gonna have the beacons that have been requested and the safe passage lane to the left of the tree.

So bridge, they would never be going underneath it.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:17:03

Matt, can you show the the profile again, just so we're talking about reviewing what you're talking about?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:03

So.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:17:13

So I think we're talking about phase six again, right?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:13

Yeah, keep going.

Perfect. Yes.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:17:19

Here's the question this one.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:20

Here we go 4/6.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:17:23

Either one where the water just goes underneath the Tressel Bridge.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:27

All right. So OK in this portion.

Yes, the the I was thinking the constricted portion that they should always be side.

We we provided here 1967 for the low flow.

I'm sorry for the low, low side with 1959 with approximately 8 feet of clearance.
But normal water surface flow.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:17:49

Right, this is the one I was talking about, yeah.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:51

OK.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:17:55

And my questions apply to this.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:58

So during a high water event, we're gonna have.
River users.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:18:05

Good.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:18:06

Good. I mean, and you would still have Clarence underneath?

Yeah. If the water's up six or eight feet, probably not gonna have river users out there, bunch.

But if it's up three or four feet, it's only four feet or so of clearance underneath the trestle at that point.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:18:20

Right.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:18:22

And Outfitters might still be putting people on the river, or private citizens might be putting themselves on the river.

The Outfitters operation, once they reach the river, reaches a certain flow.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:18:29

Yeah. Yes.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:18:36

Should yes.

It's their policy. If you go to their sites, right?

It says once you reach this flow or ceasing operations.

So Laura, your comment is, is that we need to have a clear strategy for how we're going to address.

Whatever users that while we have the the trestle covering the the main flow of the river.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:19:04

Yeah, that's one of my questions.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:19:12

And that's something we we, we shared Wildlife Commission's concern about contingency.

You know what if?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:19:23

Like like for instance a Portage location or something like that.

But you want us to include.

Yep, the client signage Portage location communication plan, we can put that in the industry too.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:19:41

Yeah, I'm sorry.

What are we?

The duration on this is it.

Ten months. I can't see on the screen.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:19:47

It's 10 months.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:19:48

OK.

Thank you.

Ten months. Yeah. And this is the kind of thing.

I would expect the Outfitters to comment on.

So it's detailed that you can make, you know, the put in the take out the Portage options. All that would be great.

Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:06

That we would.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:20:06

And I would I would point out that the top of the Causeway is almost to the top of the banks, which is a good thing from a Portage standpoint.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:07

We can definitely have that.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:20:17

So maybe that that is part of the discussion.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:20:32

Yeah, I'm glad Lori mentioned Portage.

I probably missed it, but that'd be good having a plan if it's not in there, you know, at least have an accommodation for for the people that do try and get through there and may not be in a kayak or canoe, which is probably most of the people.

But you could get occasional jumbo person.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:54

Not at normal flow. No way.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:20:54

So.

Not talking about normal, but you know in the springtime some people might put, I don't know.
Just.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:21:04

Now you see all kinds of stuff out there, you know that.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:21:07

Yeah, yeah.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:21:08

Crazy.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:21:11

But thanks.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:21:14

We'll add we'll add the strategic plan.

To be renamed.

Yeah.

 **Biggerstaff, Mark A** 1:21:21

This is mark.

Bigger stuff.

I just had a quest or a thought come up.

Do we know what the load cord of the trestle bridge versus the load cord of the existing railroad bridge, how those compare?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:21:33

I did not know that all fan. I'm sorry we could find out.

 **Biggerstaff, Mark A** 1:21:40

Something look at.

It's fairly low. I don't think it's as low as the trestle bridge, but it's in the same ballpark I think.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:21:47

But that's what Michael's pulled up on his thing. 'cause. I can't pull it up online and start right now, but there are bridges in this area that are pretty low.

Now a lot of relative, I mean, but they're not as high as the ones we're constructing by any means.

They're they're much lower than those.

In other words, river uses will have problems on other bridges.

It's also before they get to this bridge.

Other bridges are crossed little bridge.

Yes, yeah, yeah.



Lori Beckwith 1:22:19

Do what now?

Would you repeat that please?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:22:23

It looks there's a couple bridges upstream and downstream, the railroad bridge and Craven Street that appear to be the same height, or perhaps lower than what this will be.



Lori Beckwith 1:22:34

Yeah. Can you check on that cause to make sure it's accurate? And I would, I would still say you still need to explain it for this one.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:22:38

Right.

Agreed. Yep.



Lori Beckwith 1:22:46

Thanks.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:22:48

We can.

We can add it.

Yeah, we'll check them out.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:23:00

Was there another phase that was like this?

So it would be for this one and phase six. Is that Emma making that up?

Just so we cover everything.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:13

Phase six is back open without a trestle.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:23:16

But OK.

So there's no trestle there for that one.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:17

Yeah, correct.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:23:19

OK.

Very good.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:21

I. Well, no, that's not true.

No basics is.

That's the constricting point in Chase six. That's correct.

The Tresla is a for the duration. Until we're done. Yeah. With the. Yeah. I'm sorry.

Matt's right though.

We we were just trying to check to make sure our river open area was the 50%, the elevations, the trestle elevation doesn't change though like the construction. So that'll remain.

 **Tina Swiezy** 1:23:42

Right.

That other cross section is on phase four, so it covers both scenarios.
This is for a different situation. Got it.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:23:50

Right.

So that so the trust will be up for more than the 10 months it would be set duration of.

This construction, all all those phases, all phases.

Yeah.

Are there any questions about our questions?

Or our answers.



Lori Beckwith 1:24:31

I didn't hear that.

What would you say?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:24:34

Then, if there's any questions concerning our responses to the questions.

The five page document where we try to provide answers.



Lori Beckwith 1:24:43

Right.

I would say.

I for a public notice, I would like to link to something like this if depending you can certainly say no, you don't want them to, you don't want us to, but I think it would.

It's always helpful to like overexplain stuff 'cause that then you cut down on a bunch of comments and misunderstandings because that could take a long time because what'll happen is I get certain questions, I'll refer them.

Unless it's specifically about permitting, I'll refer them to dot.

And then you guys have to handle it?

And sometimes there's a lot of back and forth.

So again, it's best if you over explain in your public notice some things.

So I would like to link them to something like this and I would just say if I remember correctly, there are numerous places where it just refers to the plans.

If you can, this is a suggestion. If you can actually put some of the information in text

under these these categories, that would be helpful, but up to you.
And like I said, if if you don't want me to link to certain things in the public notice,
just let me know in in the request and the modification request.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:57

To be part of the permanent modification request.
So we in the the draft cover letter now we refer to this. I think we recall it White
Paper initially, but we'll we'll change it to to coincide with this but.
We we wouldn't have any objections to to this correct?



Lori Beckwith 1:26:17

OK, great.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:26:19

Dave and raised.
Dave, do you have anything?



McHenry, David G 1:26:28

Oh, thanks.
Yeah, well.
It was 3 foot water surface drop right base flow and during 1B that one week
duration.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:26:39

3 foot during 1B. Let me look.



McHenry, David G 1:26:43

Just checking.
I'm trying to remember back when they did Long Shoals back 20 years ago.
Upstream of there they they it was pretty well constricted in the river there and it was
I think it was. It was pretty high. I remember kayakers.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:27:02

Hey, are you talking about the the river profile or the water surface elevation?



McHenry, David G 1:27:06

Water surface. It's going from unobstructed flow is 1959 and then, but when you put the Causeway in it's.

Where is it?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:27:17

1961 yeah.



McHenry, David G 1:27:19

1962, yeah, so.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:27:21

Yeah, that's right.



McHenry, David G 1:27:23

So 3 foot drop from the upstream head down below. So it'll be it'll be ripping pretty.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:27:28

Yeah, I see what you're saying.

I see what you're saying. Yeah, between the calls.



McHenry, David G 1:27:33

Yeah. OK.

So it's pretty good drop.

Roar, but only velocity changes like double s.

No, under double, I guess. No triples, sorry.

Yeah.

Now I'm just trying to remember.

I'm trying to remember back to. It's been a long time since I saw Long Shoals and it was a pretty good flume they had there that.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:27:55

I remember I did that one too.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:27:58

Oh, did he? OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28:00

That was a 5 sequence we did.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:28:03

That was before a lot of this stuff came into play about river user safety. If I remember correctly, something got dropped on a kayaker so.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:28:11

Yeah, that's what I heard, yeah.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:28:14

That's why a lot of the stuff came.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:28:14

But.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:28:16

Came to be what it is.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:28:18

Yeah, I just try and get perspective trying to look through the cobwebs, it exciting for a little while.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28:26

But I mean to that point, this plus the Woodfin wave is just downstream in here.

That's getting built right now.

It could very well be an attractant to kayakers. Need to be aware of that.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:28:44

Thank you.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:28:49

Are there any other questions?



TS Tina Swiezy 1:28:50

And and I would point out that's only going to be there for a week.

So remember that.

Unless the guys on the river know exactly the week that it's going to be there, they might miss their excitement.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:29:04

We're probably going to advertise the week that I think that was kind of the not with that intended, but to help show that during this three-week period.

That our condition can. Yes. John Jameson will be on hand with them both at 7:00.

Were there any other questions on the Causeway?

Responses to the questions.

Or even any further concerns about the temporary construction layout.



LB Lori Beckwith 1:29:50

Now, if you'll just answer the questions I had and the the comments in the strategic communication plan, what, what what it's called right now.

Because I had a number of questions, if you'll just answer all those in some response, that'd be great.



TS Tina Swiezy 1:30:05

Do we want to talk about him now just to get through them?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:30:05

OK.



TS Tina Swiezy 1:30:08

We have a little bit more time left.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:30:10

And just just confirm to what can you share the photos of the 22 responses, 23.

Sure. Yeah.

So we're just confirming nobody else had any comments.

For these and then yes, we would love to move to the to be renamed communication Plan.

OK.

Thank you.

But Laurie, we we're working on these now.

He wanted to.

I don't know.

There are a couple that we can tell you that a lot of them are just gonna be revised as you as your comments stated, I think it'll be called integrated plan for communications and river user safety and construction demolition, something along that line.

So that addresses your. I think part of your first question.

A few of these and this this kind of carries into one of your a couple of your comments, a few of these are not relevant for B&D.

So we.

Will when there are.

Topics that are under our sections, we're going to do a separate description to break ours out so that it extinguishable prong for the others, but kind of the crossover between two different questions. But I think our responses or our revised version will address those hopefully.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:32:08

Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:32:10

You're welcome.

I process this one we don't.

We're not cutting fears, so this one will be within the BDI.

Think the next one as well.

Yep, that we're not cutting existing minutes.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:32:28

That's right.

And I guess this is where it gets kind of confusing.

Because.

This this plan will be used for future phases.

And.

It's I guess you can't speak to that.

It's it's kind of difficult 'cause. It's like a living document and I'm so I'm trying to address everything I saw and I'm not sure when the appropriate time to address them would be. I guess something like this would be for the future phases and the construction to decide.

That.

Is that the right answer?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:33:08

It it would be so for the ones that are beyond ours would be for AC, which is I guess under construction or soon to be under construction and then a lot of these would be for the C-section.

Those like Harmony green, for example.

So it's it's a lot like the project commitments.

It's, you know, written to cover the entire project.

Teasing out individual.

Section. It's just going to be challenging.



Lori Beckwith 1:33:39

Right.

Right. So I guess dot then doesn't want to address some of these future sections because they don't know yet what the, what the conditions will be.

That's so then you can just remove that comment, but it's a good thing to keep in mind for later phases for dot.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:34:04

Yeah, you want to pass it along to him, see if there's any that we now know that we could we could remove and some of those that are like a couple hers for specific cutting at what elevation? I think it just said he's really right. Yeah and.



Lori Beckwith 1:34:34

You know, come to think of it, it might be handy.

I'm trying to remember, I don't remember.

It may say this, but if it doesn't.

Put in this, put in this, whatever this plan is called at the end that.

Certain parts that don't apply to this phase may be revised.

Depending upon the construction conditions or however you would phase it, does that make sense?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:35:04

Disclaimer.



Lori Beckwith 1:35:06

Yes.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:35:07

Yeah, that right.

That that'll something that alludes to the preliminary phase that's still pending.

This plan may have to be revisited, something like that.



Lori Beckwith 1:35:18

But not for this phase.

For this phase it's good, but for future phases, certain parts may change.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:35:25

OK.



Lori Beckwith 1:35:26

Something like that.

And that also makes it clear to any future regulators who might work on this or the common agencies what's going on.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:35:44

OK.

Lori, some of your questions.

Yeah, the draft of this was submitted before you saw the the updated Causeway and

Flood lane. So that's why there's a little bit of lag between what you see here and what we provided last week.

So we'll we'll update this to address those and this will be one that is actually saying the reference maybe that of the document.

This is the hydraulic analysis which we just talked about and then I did.

I did want to touch on this briefly just so everyone's aware we we are working through the rises on the hydraulic modeling.

We have submitted something to NCDHT.

They've helped us out a lot and we've submitted something actually to an independent set of eyes to do a model as well.

We're incorporating comments from several different engineering firms and we're going to be resubmitting this model.

Well, two DOG on October 24 and just due to timing and the review process with dot, we will not have official information that says like I said earlier in the meeting, this is our Raz. This is what we're anticipating. However, we can always provide that in an.

E-mail or additional information to the agencies.

As we finish it, but we we are currently about 1/4 of a foot across.

We're not talking Pete, and we're continuing to refine that down even more.

So I want to make sure that you're OK because you'd said before approving, you know that this type of information calls on face before we can approve any plans.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:37:48

So again, if you could.

Uh-huh.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:37:59

And that's part of what's called coordination that truly we are not hiding it. We're just still working on it and trying to take it a lot of different factors and and minimization techniques. But we can give you that information as we get it approved by dot if that. OK.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:38:15

Right when?

Do you know when you'll have it?

Do you have a good idea when you'll have it?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:38:25

Maybe two months hope within a month to two months at most, because it it's a it's a stage.



Lori Beckwith 1:38:25

The final product.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:38:31

It's DN TS approval.

Then it's our safe blood plane compliance approval.

And then it's NC blood plain mappings approval.

So there there's lots of stages.



Lori Beckwith 1:38:39

OK.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:38:41

So I'm being very ambiguous.

I apologize.

I mean, it could be a month for dot.

It could be two months for SSC.

It could be three months for say, for plan compliance.

I'm not sure.



Lori Beckwith 1:38:50

Sure. So here.

Here's what I suggest for the what you submit with the with the modification request is you you explain that.

You, you know, estimate what you think it'll be or whatever you feel comfortable doing.

And then you explain the process.

And then I can also put that in the notice and then.

If it comes time to issue the permit.

Mod approval and we don't have that information is frankly it's gonna be up to.

My boss, whether or not he's OK with moving forward, I mean I can explain all 'cause

I have to do a long memorandum for record for something like this, which could be

20-30 pages and I'll explain this and and he will decide.

I mean, I can talk to him about this later. Later, after this meeting, when he's back next week, but.

Yeah, just explain it, summarize it for the public notice and then summarize it for the permit mod.

We'll move forward. Does that make sense?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:40:00

OK.

Sure, we can do that.

18.

We didn't have any other, I think questions about your question, Gloria.



Lori Beckwith 1:40:38

If you can, you go back to the first page that the cover page 'cause. I'm gonna refer to my comments about the trestle bridge again, down at the very bottom right there.

So it sounds like you're gonna have some kind of Portage option as opposed to trying to.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:40:38

For the.



Lori Beckwith 1:40:57

A safe passage lane once the trestle bridge and is in place, and then you've got the causeways on each side.

Right.

Isn't that what we discussed?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:41:08

I think we we talked about both, right.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:41:09

Just now.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:41:12

Very normal water level. They would have safe passages designated and then under abnormal flows. Yes, we would have a Portage option for what that occurred.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:41:12

Talking about what?

OK.

Oh, OK so so.

I guess just address that a little bit in your plan, what it will look like when the when the trestle bridge is in the causeways on each side?

What your plan is for that.

Would it?

Would it?

Move would it change during the different construction of of what you're doing overhead and all that?

Just just go into detail about it. Let's see.

And I was wondering about what the effects of water flow would be due to the all the trespassers I.

I wasn't sure if you looked at that or not.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:42:02

That's that's been included.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:42:04

I'm sorry.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:42:05

Those were included in our analysis.

 **Lori Beckwith** 1:42:08

OK, OK. So.

All right. That's it for me.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:42:21

OK.

Good day.



McHenry, David G 1:42:32

I just won't mention on Page Six you had the thing about a link to the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission where the boat.

It's it's an invalid link.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:42:43

OK.



McHenry, David G 1:42:43

But I think that just refers to boat access areas.

Anyways, I know you're revising this, but just want to point that out.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:42:49

No, thank you.



McHenry, David G 1:42:50

It doesn't do any help.

On the boat safety plan, thanks for mentioning that Portage stuff.

Lori.

I just have one other thing to add. You're gonna have a.

A boat available, I guess. If somebody gets pinned on something or whatever.

I just it's just minor, but I just recommend you have it in the water you know.

Or ready to use.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:43:18

Open.



McHenry, David G 1:43:18

Kind of obvious, but if it's somewhere on site not available, it might.
Be hard to have.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:43:25

We don't have a safety vault.

That's part of our safety plan. I will tell you normal water level. A boat won't float. So anyway.



McHenry, David G 1:43:36

Well.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:43:36

That's safety boat type, but yes, we will have a safety boat on site.
The requirement.



McHenry, David G 1:43:43

Yeah, yeah, I understand. Shallow. But, you know, people do come through in high water sometimes, so.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:43:49

Yes, we we have it there for our employees as well.
Yeah.



McHenry, David G 1:43:55

And your observers, I guess you said.

I guess maybe a craving St. when you're setting girders, you're gonna.

Try and tell people not to go through with that period, I guess.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:44:07

Yes, that's part of our safety. Our river user safety plan that is already been developed.

And we stayed, I guess at the 4C conversation came up that the department couldn't close the river.

Yet completely. But all we can do is.

With the signage that we talked about earlier.

For the a three-week duration probably.

Update that to say something like during this time period.

Strongly discouraged? Who would notify all the the Outfitters and what not, but.

Organize the trip through there.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:44:50

Right.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:44:51

Yes, we we do have a plan.

Just keep in mind the only time that that Channel would be blocked with girder setting is only over that metal span.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:45:02

Gotcha. Yeah. Yeah. I guess if you don't.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:45:04

The only one.

Yeah.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:45:08

Basically, you have some way Craven Street or somewhere with a bullhorn trying to stop people, too, if they're just coming downriver from upstream.

Right.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:45:19

Correct.

 **McHenry, David G** 1:45:20

Yeah. OK.

And just.

That's all I had. Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:45:28

Thank you.



Youngman, Holland J 1:45:35

In the, I guess it's the project overview on.

Page 3.

And it's the third paragraph. It mentions that there are two federally protected species.

So it mentions Graybat and Appalachian oak to so in 2023 the the Bo was amended to include.

Additional species.

So Indiana bat.

Northern Longy bat and then tricolored.

That which is a proposed species and little brown bat, which is a petition species, those all got essentially added.

To formal consultation.

So there was an amendment to the Bo.

So I mean, I don't know how really important that is in the context of this strategic communication plan document, but I guess for the sake of accuracy.

Those additional species could be added.

I just wanted to mention that it's.

It's also something I've noticed in the.

What is it? The project commitment spreadsheet? Like a lot of the commitments call out that they're for Graybott and appelkto and maybe that doesn't matter.

I don't really plan on getting too hung up on it, but I just wanted to point out maybe for that general update, the additional species were added to the Bo or there was a new Bo done an amendment done in 2023.

So just wanted to mention that and maybe that could be updated.

That's all I got.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:47:07

OK.

Thank you.

If any other questions about.

The document that is document integrated plan, I think it will come with a longer title attached to it, but any any other questions about it?



Youngman, Holland J 1:47:36

Sorry I so I did.

I went through this document and did my.

Make some comments, but that was yesterday and so it seemed a little late in the game and also none of my comments seem super important, but I did.

I figured I'd mention in terms of the civic groups, probably including American Whitewater would be a good idea.

And then I had other comments that were starting to get into kind of like.

I don't know.

Nitpicky commitment territory. And so I I don't.

So I guess bringing them up in this meeting seems pretty.

Like doesn't seem like a good use of time because it seems like this document isn't really intended to serve as like a commitment document, and that the.

The spreadsheet with the commitments laid out is probably more where like I should focus.

So what do y'all think about that? Like, does me prowling through the strategic communication plan?

And and like picking out stuff about like minimizing.

Bug ratings for light plants like is that helpful and necessary here, or does it make more sense for me to just focus on the actual commitment spreadsheet?

Just asking 'cause, I mean I've been.

I've been skipping between all those different documents, the commitment spreadsheet.

This communication plan document that my understanding is that it's more focused on river safety.

And then the demolition plan.

And then, of course, there's all the all the Causeway documents. So.

Yeah, I guess I'm just putting that question out there like I don't.

I don't know that it's really productive for me to spend time in the strategic communication plan like picking through things.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:49:31

Good. A lot of head nodding in the room.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:49:31
Anybody have thoughts on that?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:49:35
So and good question. The the grandfather to this plan or one of the ancestors to the plan I guess.
Included a lot of the commitments and our goal was to separate the two.
So exactly the way you phrased it, the commitments are in the commitment tracker and.
Those were viewed from this to eliminate any crossover or or.
Anything being outdated so the John add to it. I think the commitment tracker is an ongoing bidding document.
So anything that was revised from the the amended Bo is in there now as well.
But right.
So any comments that you have or questions you have go ahead and provide that feedback on the Provident comments tracker as like a separate feed I guess.
We'll address that.
That's not like a good plan.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:50:38
OK.
So don't like I don't really need to worry so much about the strategic communication plan.
I should just kind of focus on the commitment tracking spreadsheet, is that? Is that what you're saying?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:50:49
Please yes.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:50:51
OK.
Thank you.
And then are are we gonna kind of switch over to talk about the the commitment tracker?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:50:53

Ellen.



Youngman, Holland J 1:50:58

I don't know if I'm calling it the right thing.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:51:02

You are. Are you done?



Youngman, Holland J 1:51:02

The spreadsheet.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:51:05

Yeah, if if nobody has any additional questions for.

The integrated plan then we we've got a couple minutes left.

There is a there's another meeting in this room at 10, if everybody's aware.

OK, let's move.

Go for it.



Youngman, Holland J 1:51:23

No pressure, OK?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:51:25

OK.



Youngman, Holland J 1:51:26

Well, the so I guess maybe maybe just my like main question with the commitment tracker.

Will the document be kept or is it already being kept as a living document on like a connect site that all the agency reps can access?

And I I've probably asked this before, so sorry if it's already been shared with me, but I'm asking again.

Just a a place where.

Like me, core Commission water quality, like where we all can get to this spreadsheet

and reference it and it's being updated in real time.

Does that exist?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:52:02

So if there's a link in the chat right now and it is under external collaboration on the I-25 thirteen parent project, which all agency partners who have a login can access. If you can't let me know.

It is also LinkedIn a PDF because you can't link a link.

In external collaboration.

But there is a PDF that says commitments in each sub project.

So the BD has the PDF that links back to this.

AC has it.

It's all in the same place, but John Jameson placed the link in here.

It's being updated at more times that it makes sense to update. I don't think it's been updated since September because we're working through some of these fine-tuned wording, but it will have a date at the top corner when you open it as to when it was most.

Recently updated.



Youngman, Holland J 1:52:57

Awesome. Thank you.

And then OK, I know we're we're running out of time.

I'm just kind of curious to like is there?

One main contact person.

For the spreadsheet, is it still Tori, or are there several people who are?

Kind of keeping up with the commitments.

I mean, it's a lot of commitments.

There are a lot of.

There's hundreds of rows in here, so I am just curious like who if I have questions who I should be getting in touch with regarding commitments?



Headrick, Hannah S 1:53:23

If you would direct those to Tori and myself.

We'll get. Make sure it gets to the rest of the team.

We're leading the the effort.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:53:35
Is that is that John talking?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:53:35
And.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:53:37
I'm sorry. I. OK. All right. Thank you.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:53:37
That is.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:53:42
I see like a tiny person waving on my screen.
OK.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:53:47
Camouflage.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:53:47
Yeah, that's that's good.
I don't.
I did have a couple more specific questions, but I don't know that it really makes sense to start digging into those.
So John, maybe I can put some of those together for you and Tori and just send them in an e-mail. Would that make sense?

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:54:01
That would be. That would be great.

 **Youngman, Holland J** 1:54:04
OK.
Thank you.



Headrick, Hannah S 1:54:06

Thank you.

You have two minutes left. Anything else?

This has been pretty productive.

Think we made some headway and we we're planning for maybe going forward on the 45th topics we talked about today.

Thank you everyone for your participation. I hope you have a wonderful day.



Youngman, Holland J 1:54:35

Thank you.



Lori Beckwith 1:54:35

Thanks you too.



McHenry, David G 1:54:36

Thanks.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription