

## AGENDA

Project: I5719B – U5800 Design Build

Subject: Hydraulics CP4B Meeting - Minutes

Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Project Location: Belmont, NC, Gaston County

LEAD FEDERAL AGENCY	
FHWA: Seth Wilcher	<a href="mailto:seth.wilcher@dot.gov">seth.wilcher@dot.gov</a>
FHWA: Clarence Coleman:	<a href="mailto:clarence.coleman@dot.gov">clarence.coleman@dot.gov</a>
AGENCY TEAM	
USACE: Crystal Amschler	<a href="mailto:crystal.c.amschler@usace.army.mil">crystal.c.amschler@usace.army.mil</a>
USACE: Scott Jones	<a href="mailto:scott.jones@usace.army.mil">scott.jones@usace.army.mil</a>
NCHPO: Renee Gledhill-Early:	<a href="mailto:renee.gledhill-earley@dncr.nc.gov">renee.gledhill-earley@dncr.nc.gov</a>
NCHPO: Luan Cao	<a href="mailto:luan.cau@dncr.nc.gov">luan.cau@dncr.nc.gov</a>
DWR: Beth Plummer	<a href="mailto:mary.plummer@dncr.nc.gov">mary.plummer@dncr.nc.gov</a>
DWR: Faith Hardin	<a href="mailto:faith.hardin@deq.nc.gov">faith.hardin@deq.nc.gov</a>
USFWS: Mark Endries	<a href="mailto:mark_endries@fws.gov">mark_endries@fws.gov</a>
GCLMPO: Tori Dellinger	<a href="mailto:Tori.Dellinger@gastonianc.gov">Tori.Dellinger@gastonianc.gov</a>
NCWRC: Dave McHenry	<a href="mailto:david.mchenry@ncwildlife.gov">david.mchenry@ncwildlife.gov</a>
EPA: Amanetta Somerville	<a href="mailto:somerville.amanetta@epa.gov">somerville.amanetta@epa.gov</a>
NCDOT TEAM	
ADU: Sam Attum	<a href="mailto:sattum@ncdot.gov">sattum@ncdot.gov</a>
ADU: Tamara Njegovan	<a href="mailto:tmnjegovan@ncdot.gov">tmnjegovan@ncdot.gov</a>
Division 12: Mark Stafford	<a href="mailto:mstafford@ncdot.gov">mstafford@ncdot.gov</a>
EPU: John Jamison	<a href="mailto:johnjamison@ncdot.gov">johnjamison@ncdot.gov</a>
EPU: Marissa Cox	<a href="mailto:mrcox2@ncdot.gov">mrcox2@ncdot.gov</a>
Roadway: Doug Kretchman	<a href="mailto:dwkretchman@ncdot.gov">dwkretchman@ncdot.gov</a>
SMU: David Stutts	<a href="mailto:dstutts@ncdot.gov">dstutts@ncdot.gov</a>
ECAP: Bill Barrett	<a href="mailto:wabarrett@ncdot.gov">wabarrett@ncdot.gov</a>
Congestion Mgmt: Elise Groundwater	<a href="mailto:ekgroundwater@ncdot.gov">ekgroundwater@ncdot.gov</a>
Hydraulics: Michelle Berry	<a href="mailto:mgberry@ncdot.gov">mgberry@ncdot.gov</a>
Rail: Jim Harris	<a href="mailto:jbharris@ncdot.gov">jbharris@ncdot.gov</a>
PMU: Nora McCann	<a href="mailto:namccann@ncdot.gov">namccann@ncdot.gov</a>
CONSULTANT TEAM	
Project Manager: Will Moody, HDR	<a href="mailto:will.moody@hdrinc.com">will.moody@hdrinc.com</a>
Deputy PM: Andy Abernathy, HDR	<a href="mailto:andy.abernathy@hdrinc.com">andy.abernathy@hdrinc.com</a>
Hydro: James Rice, HDR	<a href="mailto:james.rice@hdrinc.com">james.rice@hdrinc.com</a>
Hydro: Tom Miller, HDR	<a href="mailto:thomas.miller@hdrinc.com">thomas.miller@hdrinc.com</a>
Env: Vickie Miller	<a href="mailto:vickie.miller@hdrinc.com">vickie.miller@hdrinc.com</a>
Roadway: Casey Harris, HDR	<a href="mailto:casey.harris@hdrinc.com">casey.harris@hdrinc.com</a>
Traffic: Mary Lynn Smith, HDR	<a href="mailto:marylynn.smith@hdrinc.com">marylynn.smith@hdrinc.com</a>
Rail: Riley Birmingham	<a href="mailto:riley.birmingham@hdrinc.com">riley.birmingham@hdrinc.com</a>

### General

- Introductions and sign-in sheet (Keep track of virtual members)
  - Michael Penny – Explained project split
  - Kat– Will pursue RGP 31
  - Crystal Amschler – Asked for clarification that this will be a phased permit which Michael Penny and Kat confirmed . Additional JDs might be needed.
- I-5719B/U-5800 Project – Widening of I-85 from McAdenville Rd to Beatty Drive
- Roadway:
  - I-85 (Mainline)
    - Approximately 4.7 miles
    - Generally widening to the outside minus one area
  - McAdenville Road & Main Street (Y6)
    - Realigning to facilitate bridge replacement
    - Curb and gutter and sidewalk
  - Hickory Grove Road (Y14)
    - No connection to I-85
    - Realignment facilitate bridge replacement
    - Open Shoulder
  - NC7 Belmont Mt. Holly Road (Y7)
    - Major interchange realignment
  - Rail Spur and MUP
    - Replacing RR bridge
    - Adding MUP
  - Beatty Drive
    - Keeping the existing bridge
    - Reworking the ramps
  - US74/29 Wilkinson Blvd (Y7A)
    - Adding MUP
    - Super Street Desgin
    - Replacing Drainage

- Buffers – Catawba River buffers required only on the main stem of the Catawba River and downstream of project limits on South Fork Catawba River
- Majority of impacts are related to the replacement of cross pipes
  - RFP required increasing design storm from the 50-yr storm to the 100-yr storm for major crossings
    - This required replacing many of the larger pipe crossings.
  - All RCP pipes less than 48” need to be replaced
  - All CMP pipes need to be replaced
  - RFP requires all cross drainage to be conveyed with a single pipe with the exception being the box culverts.
    - Doesn’t allow for smaller pipes to be supplemented
  - Pipes need to be upsized for future maintenance – All proposed crosslines include 6” maintenance upsizing.
  - Minimum 25% impervious for pipe sizing
- Still working through potential stormwater basin locations
  - Steep terrain adjacent to streams
  - Limitation on purchasing ROW/Easement solely for stormwater
  - Proximity to water table may be a concern. Will be reviewing Geotech borings in the next couple of weeks which will give a better idea of water table
  - Focusing on avoiding direct discharging stormwater into the streams
  - Flattening ditch slopes to meet grass swale criteria where possible.
- Due to steep terrain, some outlets of large pipes and culverts have high velocities. We tried to mitigate with a combination of junction boxes and additional rip rap. We are anticipating that the rip rap placed in the bed of the jurisdictional streams will be embedded flush with existing stream bed.
- Based on the steep terrain and the smooth steel pipe that will have to be utilized for bore and jacks, burying may not be ideal.
  - Discussion on each pipe as we review plans.
- All pipe/culvert sizes are preliminary and may change.
  - Upon final pipe size determination some of the proposed pipes may need to be shifted away from the existing pipes based on bore and jack pits/offsets
- We have completed our field work, so photos should be available for individual sites upon request.
- We have a KMZ file to look at anything that may be helpful in Google Earth
- Changes from the set provided to the set presented
  - Will update pen table to show only JS streams blue
  - Updated buffer line at Lake Wylie on PSH 20
  - Updated stream name on downstream reach on PSH29
- Based on the impacts we are seeing we are anticipating a Regional General Permit

## Plan Review I-5719B & U-5800:

### Typical Sections

- Comments or Questions?

### PSH 4

- Stream ST – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 60” Smooth Steel Pipe
  - Replacing with 72” Smooth Steel Pipe
    - Currently showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 2.8%, Vel<sub>10</sub> = 13+ fps
    - If buried, need to discuss sills
  - Upstream
    - Primary flow is coming from storm systems from housing development
    - Utilizing RSS to tie in slopes to avoid pump station and impacts
    - Also tying in short segment of stream SBR
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream in the vicinity of the confluence
    - Consider rip rap in stream to the extents?
  - Downstream
    - Tying in Roadway drainage to the stream
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the channel
- Stream SBR – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Approximately 65’ upstream of the culvert inlet
  - Approximately 20’ will have Rip Rap keyed into the bottom as it approaches the confluence.
- Project tie with I-5719A (anticipated advertisement 2026)
  - Noise walls to be constructed with I-5719A; however, shoulder widths and grading adequate for noise wall placement will be provided during I-5719B construction
- **Crystal Amschler – Asked about aquatic passage. Agrees that aquatic passage is not a significant factor here because of condition of stream so she is okay with pipe at grade rather than buried.**
- **Dave McHenry – no concerns with proposed pipe at grade due to poor stream quality and smooth steel pipes are hard to hold substrate.**
- **Rob Ridings – There is a blanket pipe burial requirement across project, but possible to request exceptions for cases like this.**

### PSH 5

- Stream SS – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - JS begins at the outlet of the Existing 48” pipe
  - Approximately 40’ of channel improvement downstream of outlet of 48” CSP with Rip Rap keyed into the channel bed
  - Additional 42” pipe will be tying in downstream. Consider embankment Rip Rap on opposite bank?
- Historic Property Boundary along McAdenville Town limits at -Y6- southern tie
- **Crystal Amschler – Asked for clarification that FHWA is the lead on this project which was confirmed.**

### PSH 6

- No wetland/stream/buffer impacts anticipated

- Re-establishing outfall to move existing ditch away from the building.
  - Intend on tying back to existing before impacts to Surface Water SWA
- Historic Property Continues on South side

#### PSH 7

- Stream SQ – South Fork Catawba River
  - Widening existing bridge to the outside on both sides
  - Impacts from temporary rock causeway construction methodology for bridge widening – modeling included in BSR – no increases up to and including 100-year. Minor increases for 500-year. No structures impacted.
  - Due to shallow rock line and limited water depths in the river, work trestles and barges are not viable construction methods
  - Contractor is looking at rock causeways for construction access-two left causeways concurrently, two right causeways concurrently all within existing ROW.
  - Crystal Amschler – Good with the design because the causeways are less than 50%.
  - We will have drawings at 4C showing the temp impacts.
- There are currently existing deck drains discharging directly into the river which will be retained during construction. The drains that are over water will be plugged in the final condition.
- Tying in proposed drainage to existing drainage features to avoid impacts to Catawba River
- No impacts anticipated for Stream SR or Wetland WD.

#### PSH 8

- Stream SBI – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 36" CMP
  - Replacing with 48" Smooth Steel Pipe
    - Currently not showing buried
    - Pipe slope = 5.3%, Vel<sub>10</sub> = 19+ fps
  - Upstream
    - Not Jurisdictional Upstream
    - Potentially a spring as primary source of water
  - Downstream
    - Tying in Roadway drainage to the stream
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the channel
- No impacts to Stream SBH on this page
- Bill Barrett – small stream at inlet side.
- Crystal Amschler – no concerns about pipe built at grade.

#### PSH 9

- Stream SBH – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 54" RCP to be retained
  - Pipe slope = 3.5%
  - Not currently buried
  - Upstream
    - Tying in drainage before it gets to the stream
  - Downstream
    - Utilizing bank stabilization on both sides of the stream
    - Not calling for any Rip Rap in the bed of the stream.
- Crystal Amschler and Dave McHenry – Good with the design without riprap in the stream.

#### PSH 10

- Stream SP – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 60" CMP
  - Replacing with 72" Smooth Steel Pipe
    - Currently showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 3.1%, Vel<sub>10</sub> = 13+ fps
    - If buried, need to discuss sills
  - Upstream
    - Realigning stream to tie into new pipe
      - Approximately 40 ft upstream
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream
    - Confluence of ditches from both sides
    - Existing crosspipe STA 475+00 is in poor condition. Constructability concerns with wet inlet area and steep grade change at outlet with a bore pit placement. Proposing a lateral ditch conveying flow to STA 471+75 crosspipe where there are more stable site conditions.
    -
  - Downstream
    - Realigning stream to tie into new pipe
      - Approximately 20 ft downstream
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream
  - James opened up the discussion regarding if we should bury the pipe. Could add sills on inlet and outlet. Crystal Amschler asked about replacement of the pipe. Slope will remain similar to existing. With that there shouldn't be any change in the pipe based on existing. It has some material in the bottom. She is inclined to say to put it in at grade since similar to existing. Dave McHenry said no need to bury this one. Rob Ridings deferred to Dave's opinion.
- Wetland WXB
  - Small wetland at the inlet of the existing 30" RCP to be removed
  - Do not anticipate a big impact due to the proposed design. Not likely for a total take

- Bill Barrett asked if we would be changing hydrology of the wetland. It is an existing swell and remain as is. There are direct impacts. Crystal was curious if there was an elevation change or a drainage effect. She said to keep an eye on to make sure it isn't drained.
- Wetland WXA
  - Small wetland at the inlet of the 24" RCP
  - After impacts due to widening and bore pits for new 54" pipe, most likely a total take
- **Total take of WXA**

### PSH 11

- Stream SO – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 8X8 RCBC
  - Retaining Existing
  - Upstream
    - Adding Bank Protection approximately 35' upstream
    - No rip rap in bed of the stream
  - Downstream
    - Adding Bank Protection approximately 30' downstream
    - No rip rap in bed of the stream
    - Vertical bank on left side downstream
  - Tying median inlets back into the middle of the culvert
  - Current culvert is not buried and does not have any sills

### PSH 12

- No Jurisdictional Features

### PSH 13

- Coming up on Interchange with -Y7- NC 7 Belmont Mt. Holly Road
- High risk outlet analysis point identified downstream along neighborhood road between the two streams. Partial redirection upstream greatly reduces flooding risk during large events on these property owners
- Drainage system downstream of existing 60" RCP in very poor condition along SR 2165 Fairway Drive. It has been identified with Division Maintenance, who have elected to keep repairs separate from the Design-Build project.
- Stream SN – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 42" RCP
  - Replacing with 84" Smooth Steel Pipe
    - Currently showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 2.1%,  $Vel_{10} = 12+$  fps
    - If buried, need to discuss sills
  - Upstream
    - Pond approximately 150' upstream
    - Realigning stream to tie into new pipe
      - Approximately 65 ft upstream, just short of the confluence with the dam emergency spillway
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream
  - Downstream
    - Heavy downstream scour at existing 42" CMP outfall. Propose to stabilize with channel improvements approximately 65'.
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream
- Stream SL – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Covering over the stream with new ramp
  - Existing 60" RCP
  - Retaining the existing 60" and extending on both ends with a JB
    - Existing pipe is not buried so not showing the extensions to be buried
    - Pipe slope = 1.6%,  $Vel_{10} = 15+$  fps
    - If buried, need to discuss sills
  - Upstream
    - Steep Rip Rap lined ditch upstream.
      - Approximately 300' from culvert inlet to the tie in point of Stream SL
  - Downstream
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream approximately 15 ft downstream
- Dave McHenry - What is the target discharge for the 60" pipe. The 25 year storm then takes part of the flow to the system to the 84". Dave asked what the flow is at the dam. Division may be looking at the undersized pipes downstream of the culvert. Streams are steep and carrying a lot of water.
- Crystal Amschler – The hydrology of the downstream end will not be impacted as it maintains flow up to the 25-year storm. Diverts the high flow above the 25 year storm.
- Crystal – SL relocation – segment will be a full lost since it is in ditch feature. Stream conditions need to be met. Width, etc. Need a detail for the stream feature and where banks will be. Aquatic passage may be an issue on this one with the new design. Is it currently passing fish. Flatter side of the slope of channels on the project. Bill shared the stream form information. 1 for macrobenthos 0 for fish, crayfish and mussels for SL. Dave says no fish so not worried about passage. Crystal has issues with no passage. How to deal with the upstream reach? Doesn't meet the conditions. No clear answer to address the issue on this one at this time for SL. Continue discussion later and provide direction later. Potential to mitigate entire upstream reach.

*Action Item: Follow up with Crystal via email on Stream SL. Based on the outcome of Stream SL and potential for aquatic passage in to the rip rap lined ditch, need to determine if the 84" pipe needs to be buried with sills.*

*Email from Christal Amschler on 5/1/26*

*After the 4B meeting I pulled the GP 31 permit to review the conditions regarding aquatic passage which I've pasted below for reference:*

*(1) No activity may result in substantial, permanent disruption of the movement of those species of aquatic life indigenous to the waterbody, including those species that normally migrate through the area. Measures will be included that will promote the safe passage of fish and other aquatic organisms.*

*Based on our discussion, the pipe that SL currently flows through would support aquatic passage, but the new design would not. Based on this, I don't see how we can avoid calling any remaining undisturbed features above the proposed pipe a loss due to the change in aquatic passage potential through this system. As such, DOT should provide a mitigation proposal for these waters when a permit application is submitted. DOT should also provide SAM forms and any other pertinent information to justify the mitigation proposal.*

#### **PSH 14**

- Interchange with -Y7- Belmont Mt. Holly Road
- Best opportunity for BMPs/treatment
- Historic Properties
  - P&N Linear Historic District Boundary along railroad
  - Belmont Abbey Historic District along north side of railroad
  - Southern Benedictine Society cemetery Parcel 293
- RR alignment currently being revised – shifting back to the existing alignment and adjusting profile
- Continuation of Stream SL – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - New Crossing due to interchange realignment
  - 66" RCP
    - Currently showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 3.3%, Vel<sub>10</sub>=13 fps
    - If buried, need to discuss sills
    - Approximately 60' channel to tie in lined with rip rap
    - Approximately 50' between tie in and limits of outlet rip rap for the 42"
      - Any consideration to tie the two?
  - 42" WSP
    - Currently not showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 10.7%, Vel<sub>10</sub>=18 fps
    - JS starts at the outlet of the existing 30" CMP
    - Considering realigning the 42"
- No impacts to streams SBP or SM
- Discuss removal of pipe along mainline to provide additional treatment in ditches.
- **Crystal Amschler has no comments at this time but relying on the future conversation regarding SL. James shared that these are high slopes on the pipes.**
- **Bill Barrett– Sheet missing North arrow**

#### **PSH 15**

- Stream SK – UT at Belmont Abbey College – FEMA Stream
  - Existing 54" RCP
  - Replacing with 78" Smooth Steel Pipe
    - Currently showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 1.4% Vel<sub>10</sub> = 16 fps
    - If buried, need to discuss sills
  - Upstream
    - Tying in stream channel approximately 70'
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream
  - Downstream
    - Tying in stream channel approximately 40'
    - Showing Rip Rap keyed into the bottom of the stream
- **Parisa Sarzaeim – Clarify pipe size. Tom Miller confirmed 78" is the correct size; profile is incorrect and will be revised.**
- **Crystal Amschler asked to clarify if the pipe will be buried. James Rice confirmed that the pipe will be buried and will call for sills at each end.**

#### **PSH 16**

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### **PSH 17**

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### **PSH 18**

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### **PSH 19**

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### **PSH 20**

- Mill & fill operation along mainline to begin bridge and replacing guardrail
- Catawba River bridge is outside of construction limits
- Stream SBS – UT to Catawba River

- JS starts at the outlet of the existing 36" RCP
- Replacing with a 24" WSP and 30" CSP
- Showing rip rap in bed of stream for approximately 30'
- Buffers will follow the full pond level of Lake Wylie vs following the stream. Approximate elevation 570.0
- Existing outfall at -L- STA 627+00 RT carried back station at Lane's request per constructability concerns in Catawba River floodplain

#### PSH 21

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 22

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 23

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 24

- Continuation of Stream SL – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Discussed with PSH 14
- Stream SBP – UT to South Fork Catawba River
  - Existing 36" CMP
  - Replacing with 36" Smooth Steel Pipe
    - Not currently showing buried 1 ft
    - Pipe slope = 2.0%, Vel<sub>10</sub>=11 fps
    - Roadway grades have pushed this deeper than the existing stream crossing.
    - Downstream tie is the highest elevation to outlet. The proposed drainage system is flat upstream in order to daylight.
  - Upstream
    - Roadway drainage system
  - Downstream
    - Tying in stream channel approximately 40'
    - Showing a gap in JS
- Historic Property Boundary along Belmont Abbey College
  - MUP along Historic Railroad continues along NC 7 to connect to campus
- **Bill Barrett – Stream might be SBO instead of SBP.**
- **Crystal Amschler – No blue line connecting stream to outlet?**
- **Bill Barrett – might be small wetland in between**
- **James Rice – will evaluate and update plans.**

#### PSH 25

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 26

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 27

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 28

- No Jurisdictional Features

#### PSH 29

- Stream SCF – UT to UT at Belmont Abbey College
  - Existing 4'X6' RCBC
  - Extending the upstream end approximately 50ft
  - Existing box culvert has a partial concrete sill running the length of the culvert ~6in in height, maintaining daily flow. Inlet extension would include extending this sill.
  - Upstream
    - Utilizing Bank Stabilization approximately 25'
    - No rip rap in the bed of the stream
  - Downstream
    - Utilizing Bank Stabilization approximately 25'
    - No rip rap in the bed of the stream
- Lack of positive drainage due to heavy sedimentation at the culvert outlet. Would the Agencies like bank stabilization be changed to channel improvements to restore positive flow?
- **Dave McHenry – will the box culvert extension keep the existing grade or will it be flattened out. We will have that sheet in the 4C plans.**
- **Dave McHenry asked why there is a concrete shelf in the box. Tom shared a photo of the outlet in the meeting. They haven't gotten into the details and can reproduce it if needed? Dave would like to keep the shelf. Lane stated they would prefer to keep same condition for constructability.**

*Action Item: Provide location for the Division to look into the history of the culvert shelf.*

*Email from Larry Carpenter (NCDOT Division) on 4/28/26  
It appears the slot was formed in the culvert during construction (chamfered edge) and I do not think it would be for a utility because its just not big enough.*

*I would think that it was maybe constructed that way to help keep sediment flushed clean from the barrel or to allow a more normal stream channel flow during low flow conditions, which appears to be working. Sort of the same philosophy we used today when sills are placed in the overflow culvert barrels.*

*I would think that the DBT should design the flowline of the extension as the bottom of the slot. Regarding the continuance of the slot in the culvert extension, I would not think it would be necessary.*

**I-5719B & U-5800 Schedule:**

Tentatively looking at 4C in July

### MEETING ATTENDANCE

Project: I-5719B & U-5800 – I-85 Widening from NC 7 (McAdenville Road / Main Street – Exit 23) to east of NC 273 (Beatty Drive – Exit 27) and Intersection Improvements at NC 7 (Main Street) and US 29 / 74 (Wilkinson Boulevard)

Subject: CP4B - Hydraulic Design Review

Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Name	Organization	E-mail
Scott Jones	USACE	SCOTT.JONES@USACE.ARM.MIL
Sam Abbin	NCDOT ADU	sallu@ncdot.gov
Nora McCann	NCDOT PMU	namccann@ncdot.gov
Tamara Njegovan	NCDOT ADU	tnnjegovan@ncdot.gov
Keegan Jerabek	Lane	KRJerabek@laneconstruct.com
NICK SALYER	LANE	NDSALYER@LANE.CONSTRUCT.COM
Matt Miltner	Lane	MRMiltner@laneconstruct.com
Vickie Miller	HDR	vickie.miller@hdrinc.com
Raegan Robinson	HDR	raegan.robinson@hdrinc.com
Dave McHenry	NC wildlife	david.mchenry@ncwildlife.gov
Jon Nance	NCDOT ADU	ext-jnance@ncdot.gov



Teams Attendees	
Name	Email
Headrick, Hannah S	hsheadrick@ncdot.gov
Barrett, William A	wabarrett@ncdot.gov
Kat Bukowy (Guest)	kbukowy@hntb.com
Gracey, Meghan E	megracey@ncdot.gov
Michael Penney (External)	michael.penney@mottmac.com
Cox, Marissa R	mrcox2@ncdot.gov
Rice, James R. (Guest)	james.rice@hdrinc.com
Miller, Tom (Guest)	thomas.miller@hdrinc.com
Endries, Mark (External)	mark_endries@fws.gov
Sarzaeim, Parisa	parisa.sarzaeim@deq.nc.gov
Berry, Michelle G	mgberry@ncdot.gov
Moody, Will	Will.Moody@hdrinc.com
Jim Harris (Unverified)	
Dellinger, Tori	Tori.Dellinger@gastonianc.gov
Crystal Amschler (Unverified)	
Wagner, David	David.Wagner@hdrinc.com
Njegovan, Tamara M.	tmnjegovan@ncdot.gov
Abernathy, Andy	Andy.Abernathy@hdrinc.com
Smith, Mary Lynn	MaryLynn.Smith@hdrinc.com
Sheldon, Chris J	chris.sheldon@deq.nc.gov
Birmingham, Riley	Riley.Birmingham@hdrinc.com
Farrell, Christine E	cefarell@ncdot.gov
Randi Gates, GCLMPO (Unverified)	
Nottingham, Andrew (External)	anottingham@larsondesigngroup.com
Cribbs, Ronald L	ricribbs@ncdot.gov

---