

# R-5869-20260409\_100813-Meeting Recording

April 9, 2026, 2:08PM

1h 20m 43s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:13

I'm working with from the environmental policy unit.

Hannah Hedrick, environmental policy.

With DWR, Paul with DWR tracks with the NCDOT.

Jackson builder bot.

I'm Brooks Brad. On the project development engineering for Division One.

Kim Gillespie interview.

Kathy Bruningham, division of coastal management. Kyle Barnes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Gary Jordan.

US official Federal High administration.

John Jamison dot EP.

Equipment. Good dog proposed.

All right then, if I call out your name online.

If you could be so kind to to introduce yourself starting with Lee.

**CL** **Cannady, Lee** 1:16

Hey, good morning. Lee Kennedy Division of Coastal Management, field Rep for Division One.

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

1.

**CT** **Cao, Luan T** 1:26

Lingala Historic reservation office.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:30

Ethan.

**ES** **Ethan Sommers** 1:34

Eat the summers. I'm RPO.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:39

Maybe.

**HE** **Harville, Katie E** 1:41

Katie Harvelle EPU.

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

OK.

**JT** **Jay Twisdale** 1:49

Jay Twisdale TGS engineers supporting the hydraulics unit.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:55

Jessica.

It's just Jessica Kim.

She's a pH. D on West Coast Time right now, so she may be.

**JK** **Jessica Kim** 2:09

Sorry it's a little hard to hear all the sudden the conference room.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:17

Alright.

Are you still having trouble hearing us?

**JK** **Jessica Kim** 2:22

There we go.

Now I can hear you. Jessica came with PHP. Sorry about that.

**PJ** **Park, Jinyoung** 2:34

OK.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:38  
We can barely hear you there.  
Uh, you were breaking up a little bit.

**PJ** **Park, Jinyoung** 2:47  
Jingyang Park chiotek NCEOT.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:51  
Thank you, Daniel.  
Arsa.

**WW** **Wilson, Travis W.** 3:00  
So.

**SP** **Sarzaeim, Parisa** 3:00  
Aristo Sarzai from DWR.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:05  
Thank you, Scott.

**WW** **Wilson, Travis W.** 3:11  
First, I would recommend I would go online.  
Yeah. So like this will be.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:17  
Got it.

**WW** **Wilson, Travis W.** 3:18  
This is one of the items.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:19  
If you're talking, we can't hear you. But.  
Scott Scott Jones. Army Charles.

**SR** **Smith, Charles R** 3:34  
Charles Smith hydraulics unit.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:39  
Avaneta.

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 3:44  
With EPA Region 4.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:48  
Mark.  
Uh, that's Mark Staley roadside environmental.

**SK** **Staley, Mark K** 4:00  
OK, I can barely hear you.  
I can hear the people on the phone.  
Good. I can barely hear anybody in the room.  
I didn't even know you were calling me until I heard my last name.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:10  
I'll be sorry about that, Mark.  
Let me change the microphone setting and see if it's any different.  
Mark, can you hear us better now?

**SK** **Staley, Mark K** 4:18  
I hear that.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:22  
Let's stick to that.  
What is that?  
Why can't that some relax?  
Sort of everyone.  
Thanks mark.  
And Travis?



**Wilson, Travis W.** 4:42

Travis Wilson, NC Wildlife Resources Commission.



**Headrick, Hannah S** 4:48

All right, before I kick it over to the project team.

As a lead, this FHWA have any opening?

For statements.

Nothing particular.

I'll see how things I'll I'll try them in as we get.

And I'll take whatever project came for presentation 'cause I miss.

Did I miss math with the cord I see?

Is it just Scott with the cord and no, just me, Scott.

Oh Yep, my bad.

Yeah, I've got the maths project.

I've got Division One all right.

I'm still sorting the Johns out down there.

No, that's fine.

All right, all good.

OK.

OK.

So are we all good online?

Can you guess me is better speaker change?

Give me a thumbs up.



**Jessica Kim** 5:41

Yeah.



**Headrick, Hannah S** 5:42

All right, great.



**Staley, Mark K** 5:43

Yes.



**Headrick, Hannah S** 5:45

All right.

So I'll get my screen share here.

Thank you everybody for joining us today.

We are here to talk through.

The R 5869 project.

And this is concurrence .1.

This project is US17 upgrade from Edenton St. Edenton Rd. St. to north of Williams Rd.

This is in Division One performance county, near Hertford.

And again, we are here to go through concurrent .1.

So we'll get started just with some project background, some of those in the room have heard this field many times and some haven't heard it yet.

So we'll give you a brief overview just of what the project is in terms of NCDOT step and a little bit of its history.

So again, it's the upgrade. the US 17 corridor to Interstate standards as part of the future I87 corridor.

And those extents basically from Edenton Rd. St. to the South to Wiggins Road to the north.

And as programmed in the step now there are three sections.

5869AR5869-B and R5869C so A&B are the two interchange locations.

Those influence areas are shown on the map here and then C is the rest of the corridor to connect those interchanges to one another and complete the extensive the project.

So it is 3 separate projects in terms of funding and schedules, but at this point we are reviewing them as an entire corridor to meet that.

Purpose in need that we'll get to here in a little bit.

Any questions about the project in general OK.

Before we get into any of the alternatives or things that are the real technical details, I wanted to just lay out what we have established as the purpose and need for the project so that as we talk through the the technical elements that's in the back of your.

Mind as this is what we are here on today.

So the purpose of the project, which is inclusive of all three of the SIT projects that I just called, is to improve mobility and connectivity on US 17.

From South of US 17 business to North Wiggins again county, this is in support of

the NCDOT STC plan to upgrade the larger US 17 corridor to Interstate standard.

And that corridor does extend from Williamston to the Virginia border.

And this will help promote economic vitality of the corridor.

This is needed to comply with the congressionally approved future I87 designation of the route and it is a key corridor in the regional economic development strategy delivering projects to the ports of Virginia and local markets.

So that is our.

Current draft.

Of the purpose in need.

So again, just keep those points in mind, umm, as to you know, we need to make some edits or if you're you're good with it as we walk through the rest of the information here in the presentation.

And feel free at any point to jump in.

I've obviously got slides to facilitate, but ask your questions as needed like.

A little bit of background on the existing conditions within the study area we're looking at.

It's currently a four lane shoulder facility with a median 23 foot grass median and a post speed limit of 55 mph. Because of that median, there is.

Some.

Right in.

Right out driveways, but for the most part, your major cross streets have full access.

In terms of going straight across the facility and getting on and off, there's also the bridge over the Perkins River that is existing today.

Is part of the existing upgrade existing alternative?

There are two different structures built at two different times, and they do have different elevations and that kind of may not be the next day. We've done some work about.

The replacement options for that and the fact that they're different elevations, does kind of play into some opportunities or constraints on on how that would eventually be replaced.

Based on 2023 inspection reports.

The northbound bridge is in pretty good shape with a sufficiency rating of 95.

However, the southbound bridge is at a 73.

It's about 60 years old.

It does need some rehabilitation.

And so we would expect that at least replacement of that bridge would be part of the the C project that that is the rest of the word order.

So what are we looking to do?

So the project as programmed in the step is to upgrade the existing alignment to Interstate standards and so that is that is where we started. And we have two options there.

And right now the step shows an interchange at New Hope Rd. which on the image here is just below where you see the windfall. The town of Windfall. And so there would be an interchange at that location. And then also an interchange at.

Harvey Point Rd. which is South of the river and as part of that interchange, Winfork Rd. becomes a great separated.

Crossing no access to 17 at that point, but we would have access across with that great separation.

However, as we were.

This project was worked on in the project delivery phase before 2018-2019 when a lot of projects slowed down and as that project was shut, was suspended.

There was discussion about should we evaluate an alternative, a bypass alternative, excuse me.

To ensure that we aren't precluding any alternatives from the new process and so at this point we also have a new location bypass that goes West of Hertford.

As one of our alternatives.

I think I skipped 1B, looks not bad.

Alternative 1B, which is still upgrade existing.

Is to instead of putting the interchange at New Hope Rd.

Is to move it slightly N to Wiggins Rd.

That's the the blue lines that you see here and that came about as we were going through some constraints and some preliminary environmental review because there are a number of competing resources specifically.

The area surrounding New Hope Rd. Basically between old neck and the river is a historic.

District.

Along the entire frontage of US 17, there. So we knew we'd have some impacts there and avoiding that completely might push them into more wetlands and streams on the other side, there's also an opportunity that we saw near Wiggins Rd. interchange, where there's some state owned land that.

Currently, an NCDOT maintenance facility that could be potentially used.

As right of way.

To support the the interchange construction, as there's discussion of maybe moving that facility.

So we saw an opportunity here to.

To consider 2 alternatives in terms of where that interchange north of the river lands.

Any questions about our alternatives?

And again, these are at the defined alternatives to move forward.

We'll hold that off for all two or CP2, but just to give you some background on what we're expecting this to be, so we can talk about our study area and establishing that.

So I have a number of questions, but I don't know if you want just.

To could take us on side path.

Do you want to finish your presentation first?

I mean I I guess I was just gonna talk a little more through these.

Just you can see where the.

Blue on the the north side of the river there represents the historic district.

We're close to that.

And then you can see the wetland areas as well.

Those are two primary competing resources here.

The only difference?

Again, in A&B is the location of the interchange. You can see the one just South of Windfall.

Title there and then the other one moves a bit further north and aborts a little bit more of the historic property and and then looking at the bypass alternative.

We are going to new bridge crossing.

Across the Precin River to railroad crossings.

And.

You know, it's all on new locations.

So it'd be fresh disturbance of previously undisturbed land.

So I think maybe if we wanna go and talk about your questions here before we get into the study area with it, if you wanna raise those now, yeah, they'll probably all be interwoven. OK, all the discussions.

Just to clarify some Kathy Brittingham coastal management, based on the information you provided, the project will require.

Most likely a cama major permit or the areas that would impact Cama AEC's and then

a federal consistency review for the areas that don't end.  
So there are a lot of coastal resources in your project area.  
So you know we have.  
We'll be this will be a big project for us.  
So for that reason I was looking at it pretty closely and let's see.  
We're gonna begin, I guess. And one of my questions is that.  
But there are already TIP and by the way, I forwarded some of these questions to dot  
for everyone's knowledge.  
So it's not coming out of the blue. I didn't want to kind of ambush anybody and.  
Make them, you know, be a surprise.  
Yeah, but yet the existing TIP numbers are 4458 and are 4459 for the interchanges.  
So that has that.  
Those were I I did some research into that and those came from the feasibility study  
as you mentioned. So the feasibility study.  
That was done was approved in, I believe it was January of 2018 and the step that  
came out in July of 2018, those step number shifted to the R5869AB and C.  
I don't know.  
I wasn't able to find a copy of the one that had it listed as as the step numbers from.  
From before the change. I'm not sure if the corridor portion was part of it before the  
the change in the step.  
And so I don't know if anybody else here has background on that, but I.  
The step number.  
That are referenced in there.  
I think they're those numbers because they came out prior to the state that all  
number I'm using, OK.  
So I guess that's the reason that's a question is because those would address the  
need at the interchange.  
And when I was looking through your packet, of course the efficiency ratings for the  
existing bridge on US 17 are quite high, especially in the course of the 11. And in  
looking at the purpose and needs statement, I was kinda looking for data to support.  
The need. OK, you know, typically we see data in the purpose of need packet related  
to system linkage or connectivity or traffic analysis.  
Sure, future traffic projections.  
And so traffic is not an issue.  
It is not a capacity.

We have a forecast. It's not.

It's not gonna be capacity based.

But in terms of the system linkage it, if we need more.

Language in there we can, but it's.

The corridor is identified as a future Interstate and it does not.

It's designed does not meet those specs and so the project isn't about widening, it's about bringing it up to those standards and compliance with the legislation that the note that designates it as I 82nd and so along with that would be the two interchanges would come first.

In terms of funding and construction and then?

The connection.

Between the two would be the seat portion.

Umm so.

If we if we need to explain more about the history of what used to be called STC corridor. Oh, we could. We can dig more into that.

It is mentioned in there, but maybe more.

Talk about that.

So one of my disadvantages is that in doing this for a long time, so a lot of my memories, John.

Morgan and understand are from repertoire this 10 or 15 years ago.

But my memory was that the designation of a corridor like as an STC was not in and of itself enough of a need for the project to be the board.

And I don't know if that's changed or if I'm not remembering that correctly, but I I feel as though.

There still needs to be demonstrated a.

Transportation need, in addition to meeting that legislative mandate so that that's kind of a policy question, which I didn't have an opportunity to look into very carefully. But I guess I'd like it if anyone can speak to that about or anyone online with their experience has any kind.

Of recent experience with a purpose of need statement that's relying on the legislative.

Identification as opposed to presenting the actual traffic data.

We have many projects across the state that that are driven by combination of legislative requirements like that and also strategic corridors like.

Trying to get some samples.

None of them are coastal, of course, so DCM has not seen them most likely.

But yeah, Kenston bypass everything along.

US 74 along the southern part of the state. Shelby bypass all the way down to Wilmington.

A lot of those projects are.

Upgrading that corridor, you know, 74 is already 4 lane, a lot of places, but we're making upgrades to 74 at, you know, getting rid of that grade interchanges, things like that, and that's all driven.

Not so much by traffic or safety, but by that corridor upgrade mandate.

So there's a lot of projects like that and it's not unusual for us.

I know we've done several larger projects in recent years that that did have similar purpose in these with us and the purpose of these statements don't go into the detail.

About the traffic.

Need per say just that's right, because it's not a.

It's not a traffic requirement.

It's not a since it's not congestion based, I think the.

The conversion to Interstate and the application of full control of access is where.

Your ability to make it a higher speed.

And you know you're separating.

What is the strategic corridor? This is a hurricane evacuation.

Around me, that's part of it.

But if it's in the freight plants, things like that.

And again, if I we need to delineate those more clearly, I think we could do that.

But I think it's it's really when you it's to get that Interstate standard from a design perspective to support the way the corridors intended to be used, which is as an Interstate.

As opposed to having you get your full exit ramps where the deceleration is happening.

Simply off of the three lanes as opposed to a maybe a pocket right turn lane that's gonna be at an at grade intersection that get in the way of the purpose of the strategic corridor.

And and I'll talk with all that.

Questions been asked yet, but we inherently have to do this piece by piece. You know, we don't.

This is not the 1950s.

We're not building interstates on our 200 miles of time. We're upgrading to interstates.

You know interchanged by, by interchange and section by section.

Yeah, 5 and 10 miles at a time, so.

That's just the way we we have to approach it these days due to funding and other constraints.

Federal Highway may have some additional vaults on all that.

I don't.

You're saying it perfectly.

Is that?

Are they still?

Yeah, and that I've raised the point.

It's really not ADCM decision really. So as long as all everyone's comfortable with that.

It'll be I raised the question, yeah.

And you know, we if there's desire to like I said, delineate that further in documentation.

We could do that or make this this meeting as the record of that.

Team guys.

I'm looking at some of the language about strategic corridors that I'm sure they probably will, but that could be pulled in just to make it more clear.

Yeah, that feasibility study you looked at that was kind of a lot bumped up in there together with military logistics and picking products to support and hurricane evacuations.

So it's kind of rolled that up so but yeah.

I guess I mean the the purpose.

Well, the purpose of the purpose of Nate, of course.

The set a solid foundation for the project.

So I'm looking at when we do process a camera permit application, there's gonna be potentially a lot of coastal resource impacts that we're looking at.

So we'll need to have a robust purpose and need to justify the impacts those other impacts, absolutely.

Very much respect the the need to protect and and have that that defense of why you are why are you are permitting impacts to the resources.

Yeah, not very much.

Makes sense?

But since we're a merger, you're gonna have such good avoidance minimization documentation.

Well, I'm OK.

It's gonna make it easy for you.

No, I definitely support merger.

It makes the permitting process so much more streamlined.

Would you say there's any kind of economic development need to this?

So yes, I do think there there is.

I can show you.

Screening.

Economic prosperity is one of the three strategic corridor goals.

That system connectivity, mobility and economic prosperity, so to speak, to that on the South side.

The area off of Harvey Point Rd. which is where that second or the interchange is this area to the South is.

A designated as.

An industrial.

Economic development park.

They're actually making some headway on.

Tenants that are going at that location.

So I think there's interchange and Interstate access for that would be a direct result of the interchange there. And then I think the, the other portion would be.

Just the connectivity that it provides.

To those the ports in Virginia and the.

The reliable Interstate usage for that freight delivery.

That answers my questions about the purpose and being OK.

Did anyone else have any questions?

Great question.

I just wanted to double check where the Harvey Point Rd. indicate that as municipal boundaries, there's a Gray area in there.

On the I guess on both sides, but the majority of it's on the north side of Hartford Point Rd. adjacent to river and that's where the I know there's sand mines and things in there right now is there is like proposing to do anything bigger commercially in

there.

That interchange into.

Yes, I know we don't necessarily have to have that information in purpose indeed, but the just identifying what.

You know any type of economic development or things like that might be?

Future planning that we can see, you know, through upcoming concurrence points.

I have these things saved somewhere. I think something about this Google Analytics.

There is.

Yes.

It's all right.

I was just waiting.

It just said municipal boundary and I didn't know.

Sometimes you see it as industrial park or things like that, and it's in no in the area pretty good.

It's right now there's just a large sand mine there. And usually when you dig all that up, there's not a lot of places to put any industrial buildings or anything else that was proposed, so.

Or could potentially go there.

I wasn't wasn't sure that development of that area being that close to.

One of the.

Alternative interchanges that we're gonna be looking at.

Are are they actually?

Designated as something but yet.

It's not really gonna be there.

So like I said, there's no major sand mine in there right now.

And that's why I'm really.

Well, it says municipal boundary and I wasn't sure if it was designated like an industrial park to kind of answer some of the question on the table right now with.

For future economic development, or just in that purpose and need statement, that's, you know, one of of several points that.

Where's the mine you're talking about?

It's on the north side of the river.

It's right there near that interchange just down at the intersection of Harvey Point.

And light colored areas aside that areas, so it's in the light colored areas, not part of that. And in the the industrial park area is the Gray area, OK. And that's what I'm

trying to find.

Yeah, industrial parks.

They're tied to municipal boundaries because industrial parks want city water. City sewer, right?

That's where the name of structure going to and I.

Just some quick Googling, it looks like at least at one point that was geared toward being a marine industrial worker. So having water based ties. And obviously if there's a sand pit already move dirt around and get the right permits. And I guess you could have a test.

Some sort of water facility, but.

Yeah, I don't know what all is actually happening there.

OK.

Yeah, I don't that we're closely tied to anything happening there either.

I've been feeling that over here.

OK, that's always good for.

OK.

Clemmons County marine.

Park.

This is a super quintupling, but it's at least gets across like I've seen.

And this is, you know that I think this looks like it's dated 2023, but.

There have been a couple of news articles about movement on this development,

OK.

Again, have them say somewhere.

I just don't wanna be on the end, but yeah, if this helps to answer the IT was just the the what was it municipal boundary versus it being a industrial park?

I didn't know municipal boundaries meant that it's just part of the town for some kind of other development, right?

Things like that.

Or was it truly like an industrial park floor?

Larger scale business or transport store things like that, where you'll see larger vehicles and tractor trailers, things like that utilizing this area more so than just local traffic, right?

And I and.

The I'm I'm thinking the municipal boundary is likely annexation for utilities to support it.

But from from what I've read and understand it is industrial, it is not.  
Going to be like a riverfront beach type of of usages. It's it's more industry.  
Oh yeah.

The land mine is located in the unshaded area.

And that is OK.

FedEx Ground, East Coast Steel and Hartford are currently in the shaded area.  
OK.

Thanks, Scott. Yeah, thanks Scott.

The other discussion points.

Oh yeah, so moving on to the study area, looking at, it looks like the study area is really, really tight to the existing highway.

And you know, when we're looking at the study area during merger, we're looking at. Including a large enough area to encompass potential impacts of the whole project, sure. And that would include any construction access, staging areas, potential utility relocation.

And.

Well, looking at that, it seems to me that it may be too tight to may need to be wider. OK.

So on upgrade existing at least we can start there.

So we do have 300 foot buffer, so 150 feet off of the existing center line. And so for the upgrade existing and then we buffered out around the areas where we expect an interchange to go.

Because those are pretty well defined.

There are.

There been a couple of express design.

Iterations of both of these.

The Harvey point and the New Hope Rd. interchanges that have gone through some vetting to where?

Those are.

Likely.

Going to be the configurations that we would expect to see there now if we need to expand specifically around interchange.

Areas we could we could maybe do that, but I think in terms of upgrade existing.

We're, we know we're gonna have to do a best fit in order to minimize wetland versus shippo type impacts and balance those.

So maybe if you're the 100 foot on 150 feet off either side, maybe that bumps up a bit, but I think it'll still stay pretty tight to the existing because it is an upgrade.

On on current location.

And then in terms of the the bypass, we did some environmental desktop environmental reviews of of what was out there and really try to just thread that needle with considerations like crossing.

Making the interchanges and the rail crossings as per particular as possible and then. We'll just try to.

Do the the best fit that we could for now, right? So.

Is it more the bypass that's giving you the heartburn or the upper extremity?

But I think it's more of a question for ADOT and construction. And then if there's any other agencies that are looking at potential additional alternatives that they would want to add. But you know, if we're going to agree to the study area today and it turns out in.

Future you need to.

Expand it. Mm-hmm.

And here we we're going back to revisit it.

Sure. So I guess.

In, from my point of view, it's better to make the study areas broader.

But of course not too broad.

So that you're not having to reconvene the team.

Yep, to to revisit and revisit that and then in terms of the cumulative and secondary impacts analysis, my understanding of that is we're looking at all the potential cumulative secondary impacts, not just the ones that are in the study area.

So I don't think.

I don't think you need to broaden the study area for the kilometer secondary impacts.

Those will be looked at whether they're being done. Period, but.

That that's kind of my comment regarding the scheduler.

So I think if we.

Want to?

Look ahead in the process.

A little bit.

If what?

What we're gonna do in what we would do at CP2 would be presenting potential

impacts to.

Like based on the desktop review comparing some impacts and and deciding which of the alternatives are gonna go forward.

I think if we change the study areas, I just think it needs to be consistent between the two and then that would just change to their relative to one another, right.

In terms of we're comparing bypass.

And the upgrade existing so.

I mean, I guess I kind of leave that up to.

The.

To to do T or federal highways on how much?

Width needs to be in there so we don't feel like we're locking ourselves into exactly this alternative. I think is what you're getting at.

Right, yeah.

Or that you if you find out you need a a barge mooring facility downstream that that's in your study area, so that you don't have to revisit.

For example, sure.

It's always a bit of a cache 22 process to how big to draw your study area and and how small how you keep it tight or do you make it too broad at this stage.

Is it like Goldilocks seem like this?

We we're taking a good stab at it.

We certainly have bad projects where we need to come back to the murder team and say, hey, we've passed the study area a little bit because it we had to expand it for a while and or yeah.

Something for instruction or whatever it may be.

But yeah, we don't love doing that.

But also you know, we can't precede everything right now.

We also don't wanna study the entire county.

Yeah. So it's we just do our best to, I mean, even if we have a big study area, I don't think that means you have to do detailed study on everything within it.

What I think if we the study area we set today, I would think would be the study area that goes with the detailed study alternative.

Right for T&E species and delineations and your archaeology and things like that. So. That's. I do think that it would play into the detailed study alternatives in their the level of surveys and whatnot that we do.

But that would be what I would give out to my teams in terms of doing their infill

work would be the study area.

From that, we agreed to.

Unless we need to expand it, in which case we come back and have to do that.

But it wouldn't be a smaller than what this study area is.

Yeah, I I didn't hear anyone from DMF on the line today.

Maybe they joined, but I I know Travis is out there and I, I will say just looking at my desktop GIS Google Earth layer there are SAB beds at both sides of the river near the existing bridge shown on my GI.

My GIS now that may not be up to date but.

SAB surveys would be something that I think would be.

Recommended.

Travis, do you have any thoughts on that?

**WW** **Wilson, Travis W.** 41:15

Just specific to the SAV comment.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 41:18

Yeah. Or any comments that you have, but would you agree that they that we would want to see SAB surveys?

**WW** **Wilson, Travis W.** 41:19

Ary.

Yeah, most likely.

But kind of to get back to the study area.

Conversation I had. I had provided that same comment.

In written comments on the start of study.

Just you know, and it's the new location bypass alternative specifically.

Where I kind of felt like.

That was pretty much a narrowly defined corridor, almost pretty much an alternative selection.

As far as the width of that study area, I do think dot could benefit from widening that out if.

In case adjustments need to be made in that alignment.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:12

Do you know if you're you have a?

Thinking of.

Corridor and on both of those and it's saying 300 to a 1200. That's that's a pretty big difference is that area showing the 1200?

Is it showing the 300?

The the orange here is going to be Jessica. If you could check in the GIS real quick just to see while we're talking about it.

If you have that available.

I think the the 1200 is more where we're at.

For bumping out for interchanges. Mm-hmm. And going down high lines.

This looks more than 300 to me, but maybe it's more like a 500. I can look at that answer.

You're gonna add just just seeing was the study being did the study reach out to those larger links, you know 12 hundreds and 12 thousand 1200 and 12112 hundred 1000?

I think the I think the.

The 1200 was more.

Where we're expanding out for the interchange areas, but 300 foot buffer was our.

Our starting point is our like.

From the primary corridor would be at the 300.

Are you saying that the 300 and 1200 are both shown on here?

Because it's just where the road widens itself.

OK, OK.

So it's not like there's two different versions.

So for the new location.

Are are you saying that apart from the?

Areas where you have the interchanges that that is 300 feet.

I'm asking Jessica to double check that before I say yes, but I'm pretty sure. Yes, we're showing 300 feet.

I know historically we've had.

You know, corridors much wider than 300 feet? Sure.

Yeah. I mean, kind of as I almost a standard.

I'm giving GIS opened right now, so I'll be able to answer in just a just a minute or two.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:38

And while we're waiting, I was gonna ask about that little bumped out on the top end of the river there. Here.

Yeah, it's because because of the interchange here, I think there's a realignment.

Of this road that leads down to some residential and.

1/2 plant maybe an electric?

Saw that.

Like how tomorrow.

Yeah, like tomorrow electric.

Also, this just occurred in May, so you said something to the fact that to be able to compare you know apples to apples, you wouldn't have the widths be the same. But if you've got a 300 foot corridor on existing, much of that is already developed because.

You already have Rd. there, whereas your 300 feet on new location.

And none of that is.

And that's that's the point is, we're showing less disturbance on upgrade existing because we are gonna be able to use much of the existing facility versus what. So if you if you I guess I was actually accountable other way if you widen out to say like a th.

Foot buffer on the new location and you're trying to take a look at.

The viability of that new location.

Should.

The should the alternative be constructed?

You're not gonna have. You're not gonna impact that full 1000 foot buffer, right?

And so if we're looking at again the viability of a bypass, which is what we're gonna look into detail for for CP2.

Is you?

You do wanna sort of narrow it down to almost like a realistic.

Potential of impacts should it be constructed?

And be able to compare that to the realistic impacts of an upgrade existing and that again is just gonna be the effort to bait if it is actually worth a detailed study.

And to do those field surveys.

And so I think that's why it's so narrow here is because we were thinking forward to that comparison.

But.

I very much see the side of, you know, it's almost like we've selected this alternative already based on desktop screen.

Don't wanna do that.

So how do we meet in the middle of getting?

A realistic idea of potential impacts.

Or a bypass alternative. Even even though they could shift, it could change a little bit, but relatively speaking.

Comparing it to the upgrade existing is what we're trying to get to in order to decide the details of the alternative.

And so you know, that's we can widen.

We can widen the the study area.

But ultimately, I think we would still want.

To show quantitative evaluation of a potential bypass in order to to have that discussion about the actual feasibility and viability when compared to.

The upgrade existing.

If the bypass desirable from a transportation perspective, Nope. And the and the locals don't want it either.

Alright, so I I guess I propose. I guess first of all, I notice there's not a no build alternative.

I'm not sure why we're looking at a bypass alternative.

Yeah, because we why not add a no build alternate and drop.

I mean, I know we're still at purpose in need and study area, but when we get to the alternative discussion.

A Nobel would be into this.

The purpose of showing these alternatives now was to inform the study area and send a no build will be a discussion or will be a an alternative when we get to that point. But for the purpose of meeting a purpose of need and developing a study area that.

Didn't bring it into this into this, but.

No, I mean the the bypass is not desirable, but as we were.

There were.

Questions about the impacts.

There's gonna be a number of relocations.

In specifically South of the Women's River, there's some some neighborhoods right along here.

Again, we've got the.

Frontage impact to a historic district.

So in order.

To feel like we truly have looked at.

Like permit reasonable or permit baseball alternatives to meet NEPA and we're not excluding something too early is why we're doing this.

And then CP2 would bring forward the more detailed comparison to see if it really is viable or if the impacts are just beyond.

Beyond compare in terms of.

If you've got alternatives with in.

Very existing and that would be purpose of meeting, are we?

Are we really considering bypass? And if that's will be, that discussion will be based on the quantitative information to come as part of CP2.

Well under the I guess the rules.

Merger and under Depot, if we're looking at improving existing, yeah, I mean.

We're we're not actually required to have to do location alternative.

Umm correct. Am I correct on that? Is it correct?

Yeah, there's no requirement to look at the location here.

There's simply history of having looked at new locations, so we and that specific to this project.

It was asked.

It was brought up.

Yes, it was.

I inherited the bypass umm and now we're trying to buy this room as inherited by passively robust conversations about this topic before this meeting.

So you're not someone there's a someone who wants to look at the bypass? I'll.

At some point, at some point there was and so, and there's documentation of that.

So that so in order to make sure all bases are covered.

We've thought that bringing both alternatives into the merger process and comparing them at CP2 was the best, the cleanest and like best way to.

Handle that within the process and have that done in the trail.

I have a question.

So I'm I'm mute, so I'm trying to understand this so.

The bypass the new bypass is just a decoy.

It's not really.

That's something that's just a throwaway.

It's a throwaway.

Well, it is what it is. It because we are actually going.

They actually modified the impacts to it, OK. And when you compare it to upgrade existing it.

Maybe it's going to be justified that it is not a viable alternative, given that we have an upgrade existing that is OK.

At this point it doesn't seem like a likely alternative, but we wanted to do diligence and figure out diligent because because there are impacts related to the upgrade existing that that are not an issue with the the bypass right now there are some positives. There are some POS.

Aspects to it. There's it had been really talked about a lot.

Lauren mentioned it earlier, but there there is the historic district on that northeast side of the river. LAN hasn't really spoken up much 'cause he's on the phone, but that historic district has protected over four ups. So from a Federal Highway standpoint, 4 up is one of our.

Most stringent regulations? Yep.

Caused us to look at all possible avoidance alternatives, so none of us expect this to make it out today.

The bypass.

But it will.

Will be helpful.

It could be helpful in saying when we get to that point with this historic property and there's a symbol fields on the other side, that would be a yeah, we we can show our work and we're not just gonna get the answer of the math problem. We're gonna.

Be able to show the work to say like. This is why we looked at other options and we didn't do it so that.

As part of our discussion that happened before today.

Rationale for including this today.

So it kind of ties question, right?

So how many alternatives can we have instead of kind of having this decoy?

You know, it's in our time on this deck or I've seen that to like 17 something on the

project, but it it's not necessarily a waste of time because there is a possibility that they could end up being better alternative, but it's unlikely.

Good luck.

Yeah. Or we could have property owners at a public meeting that are really upset. About being relocated and they could say, why don't you look at it and we'll say, OK. We actually did.

Here's why we didn't do it. And so it does help you sometimes explain the process better when you have something to compare.

Need but requires you to take a hard look at it.

So there, there are good reasons for and against talking about Spot Pass. If we we acknowledge that maybe that should have been my comment up front.

I don't want to spoil it, but.

Why you're asking all the right?

I was gonna ask.

I'm asking about this coming in.

I understand that's section 4F and it's historic properties, but kind of like we're discussing now sometimes look at alternatives.

To determine the comparison of impacts right.

So why not look at alternative that goes just South of the existing US 17?

In other words, from a transportation perspective, with the bypass be better South of existing US 17 instead of on, it would have to clear that so completely. So going South because we did kind of talk about this, you're saying basically off the map to the bottom.

I'm actually saying right through the other side the the current bypasses may not be permissible.

And you're looking just so flush out the impacts.

Why not show what the?

Actual historic property impacts would be if you were to, yeah, do an iPad that was better for the transportation perspective, tighter into the existing Rd.

Wider river crossing and bicycle enough against it that it it. I'm not really advocating for that.

I just wanted to raise the question.

They got the feasibility stage. It probably felt unreasonable to even go there.

Yeah, I mean, and and even if you think about kind of the geometry of 17 through here.

If you're gonna, you're not bypassing, so this takes you around.

So it would, from a transportation perspective.

Give you an alternative entry direction to to towns in the South.

You're not really bypassing anything.

You're and you're like, we've talked about the.

Historic. And then the wider river crossing. But I think when you're coming on 17 geometrically this bypass kind of pulls off and pulls back on a lot more smoothly than something to the South would I mean?

I just I think it was so far into the that's never gonna fly at that early stages that it didn't rise to the level of being my assumption that you just needed to show due diligence like this is the most reasonable bypass alternative.

Yeah. And so there's no point in showing three other less reasonable ones.

Where we got competing resources that reasonables from the perspective of the person who's advocating for the resource. Like there's upstream is, there's an administration area downstream. There's right.

**JK** **Jessica Kim** 57:32

I can jump in really quick and just note that the 300 foot buffer that's 300 feet on either side of of the.

Alignment corridor. So the total alignment ends up being a little a little over 600 feet. And that's sorry, the steady area ends up being a little bit over 600 feet along the Y lines and where the road ties back in the majority of the study area for the alignment. In the bulk or the middle of it is is about 900 feet and then it widens out for the interchanges because those have.

Like when you measure this study area just straight across because of the larger potential impacts of the interchange.

So. So it's not 300 feet total, that's 300 feet from the the edge of the alignment.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:19

Thank you.

Thank you, Jessica.

And is that that's a big difference.

Yeah, yeah, the.

That's for the the bypass is the upgrade.

The same looks similar to that.  
It's that accurate. Just looking at that.

**JK** **Jessica Kim** 58:39

That is correct, yeah.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:40

So we're more like 900 feet.

So as I think about that through like an affordance minimization perspective 600 plus foot width on the study area there.

Gives us some decent way of to work around any particular resources that we find as being move towards CP2 and beyond.

Obviously I can see from radios perspective how 1000 feet or 1500 feet might be a little bit better to have a little bit more wiggle room for minimization, but.

Have there have been other projects like this where the study areas kind of been?

Segmented like that.

I mean like that.

Like, not just one big study area, but like.

A spaghetti type area.

Yeah, yeah, we're we're same thing on, we're doing that.

It's a different.

Animal but wadesboro bypass.

I'll do a 70 four 8000 merger and we've got four different new alignment options as well as an existing alignment option. And those are done at holes in between.

We're not.

We're not studying the entire bigger buffered area, we're we're just focusing on those, whatever they are, 1000 foot corridors or whatever they are.

We on that one, we are doing a lot of GIS type screening up front rather than detailed field work.

Which is what our CP2 and permission would be based on, as well as the GIS.

Yeah. It's on the ground tomorrow on everything in the study area.

It's, but we don't have good GIS layers for all of our Tana AEC. So you may find that the desktop's not gonna be enough for the camera areas of environmental concern, but we can.

We've got a field Rep who's on the line and he can help you.

Discern.

Some of that one time comes.

It's not a GIS layer. It goes to wetlands or S ranch or on ABC. Those kind of things.

Yeah, I mean we, we, I would love y'all to sit down with us and go through some virgos layers.

We have just to compare stuff, so I don't exercise at some point.

Yeah, I can give it a try.

A lot of our determinations are made in the field, right?

Yeah, yeah, it's good.

There's lot of field indicators that are necessary to make the designation, yeah.

You do have some wetland models in the material.

But we have also taken a stab at what we think are AEC to just give us like a burst.

And not just for this area, but you know, it's a bigger question for, yeah, I would.

I would like to do that something Carol will.

And we don't for the bypass, we don't have them. But for the upgrade existing, I believe there were 2019 delineations done.

And when the project was in.

Project development before it got shut down.

And and suspended so I can double check that. But I do think we have better than GIS, at least on the upgrade existing.

But then it's like do we?

We may for that apples to apples comparison, should we really use that if we only have?

GIS based for the.

The bypass so and when you look at those delineations, check to see if they identified the CAMA wetlands separately from the other 4/4 wetlands.

OK.

I have maybe an ignorant question about the river crossing. So with the southern known bypass options the bridge already exists.

It's in good shape.

It's the idea that.

Like there will be any direct impact to the wed from the bridge.

It's like the work will be happening on the bridge itself, so we are proposing a because the bridge itself does not need Interstate standards, while it is does have sufficiency and some more life left in it, what is there now does not meet Interstate

standards and the agree.

Did quite a bit of work into looking at who we why they non existing.

Structure and that is not reasonable because you can't can't liberate enough.

So we've actually got a phase construction plan, again from a preliminary design level, but of how to replace both of those bridges.

And again, it's not necessarily because of their sufficiency.

It's so that they would meet the under state standards now, could, could they redesign exception?

Sure, but.

That's not for us to decide in this process, it's that would be when the C project is in development and and they're really working through. But you know this is sort of looking at that worst case alternative, but they do have to be replaced in order to meet.

The purpose and meet them.

So I I imagine.

So are you saying the new bridges would be on a new alignment?

Yeah, would be replaced in kind of in in its current location.

Yeah. How would you maintain existing traffic? So we have volume traffic in one bridge and build your build 1/2 at a time. OK, yeah.

And in regards at some .1 day, we're going to have to replace the bridges.

And so when I'm getting barely old, even those in these shapes getting gets made on. Yeah, the southbound bridge is 60 years old. Instantly have.

And and so for the purpose of bringing the entire corridor in a future build.

You're we are assuming that it would be replaced, but as of as of right now.

Yeah, that's just we have to assume that it's part of the project and then if it's going to be.

Design exception and rehab works until sufficiency doesn't kind of thing.

Then that would be part of the.

The preliminary and final design process.

So back to the study area discussion now that.

Kate Mckroe and it's 900 feet 300.

Are we?

Are you more you guys more comfortable with that in terms of being able to avoid and minimize within that corridor or are we still looking at?

The need for like a a different alignment of bypass.

That would be completely outside of it.

900 beats a lot more competitor. Thank you. Mm-hmm.

I apologize for that.

I should have done that.

I mean amanetta, can I put you on the spot and ask about, like, environmental justice type of impacts from an EPA perspective?

Is that a concern here?

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:06:24

Researched, but given our current.

Talking points from management were not as focused on EJ as we previously were and we defer to the dot and FHWA.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:06:41

One Federal Highway is elite federal agency.

We cannot even use that term anymore.

However, we we will look at community impacts without using any lenses of race or income.

And we'll document those demographics.

In terms of census data and statement of their at the state level, we still have slightly more stringent, right? Yeah nothing DEQ.

I don't know if faith would be for anything recently, but we had an environmental justice Advisory Board, so we have within DEQ, right.

We have some environmental justice, so we've advised NCDOT that obviously they're free to do whatever the state dictates through their own regulations, law, statutes, whatever. But that can be in a standalone report outside of our federal.

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:07:34

But if you happen to share that standalone report with us, it'd be greatly appreciated.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:07:40

Got it.

I couldn't if we happened to share that standalone report, that would be great.

While we're on the topic, I'll also add 'cause you use the term earlier.

We don't use cumulative anymore.

The the last term is reasonably foreseeable.

I didn't know that.

Yeah, yeah.

And in that regard, recently perceivable needs to be directly attributable to our project, something we have control over.

So from the coastal Area Management Act, we do have like 10 criteria that can lead to a permit denial and one of those is cumulative effects and another one is practicable alternative.

So at the state level for the CAMA permitting, we would be still looking at we still have that term cumulative effect and that would probably relate to the potentially the industrial park and.

Anything that may, I don't know if it would or not.

But anything that could result from the project.

Right now, just if don't don't do a control F for cumulative in the document 'cause, you won't.

At least for three more years.

OK, just let you know. Thank you.

Sound like we're sticking to the study area as is right now, so.

We need the three hours for this meeting.

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:09:11

This is amanetta.

So since we're sticking to, it sounds like we're sticking to the study area. The notes are just gonna reflect the the clarification that it's the six to 900 feet, right.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:22

Yes.

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:09:23

OK.

Thank you.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:26

And if we we can. Yeah, the notes will clarify that because the CP1 form includes the language as it is in the packet.

Unless we decide we want to change it there. But definitely the meeting notes from from, this will reflect that clarification.

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:09:45

Ideally, I think we should also update the form.  
Just so we're consistent.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:10:00

In the daily CPM form.

I'm sorry, was this the part of the packet?

No. OK.

No, but it has taken word for word from the packet. OK, the what's here?

This person need and the project study area are exactly what was in the packet and if we want to update that here in real time to so that everyone's comfortable with the signature, we can do that.

Yeah, so that it's easier to sit here and look at it for 5 minutes.

Because otherwise it goes out via dot.

You sign to everybody, and yeah, we're all sitting at our desks, you know, with different interests for the day. And it's hard to think back to what we talked about.

So clear it up as I think real quick if you need.

Get over chance of me.

I thought that DMF was on the invitation, but I know they're not in the meeting.

Did anyone reach out to them about whether they want to be on this larger team?

We we had. So we had talked about that.

Yeah, they're almost, but.

We'll reach out to them and ask, and I think that's one of the questions for the ask here.

In your opinion, that should be on.

In my opinion they should, OK, and that that puts me a little bit of a uncomfortable position because they're one of our commenting agencies.

So in hindsight, I saw they were invited.

I should have checked to make sure they were participating.

Yeah, you, you.

We invited Charlie up.

Yeah. I just want to make sure he was fine.

Yeah, invited. But they were not.

They're not currently.

Signature.

It's really their decision to whether or not to participate.

Yeah, we'll reach out to them for sure.

OK, well.

Are we comfortable with start a discussion in real time editing, everybody OK with that?

So, are there any proposed changes to the way the purpose in need is presented?

I know we had some discussion on it, but.

From Kathy's comments, we wanted to add anything from the Strategic corridor language or we're good as it is.

So yeah, currently the you know that we are supporting the NCB and TSTC plan.

We desire to put more in there about what that plan calls for.

I'm OK with that language, OK?

All right.

All right. So for the project study area then?

What if we say is generally?

900.

300 to 1000.

And.

Wilens.

Sure, that same language for alternative two. Yeah, down to the.

So we are now reading.

Up great existing.

Generally 900 feet in total width along US17 ranging from 300 to 1000 interchanges in wylands and then doing the the endpoints Starlight and Union Hall specifications.

And then for alternative 2, which is new location study area.

Again.

It's generally.

900 feet in total width along the location, ranging from 300 to 1200.

At interchange the pylones.

Well, there's there's no point where it's only 300, right?

I'm sure. Is anybody on line?

Have a question or comment?

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:16:44

This is amanetta.

I think it looks good.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:48

OK. And Jessica, just to confirm the 300?

There are some Y line that are only 150 on either side of the center line.

Is that correct?

**JK** **Jessica Kim** 1:17:00

No, it's 300 on either side, so it'd be 600 total.

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

600.

That's 300 feet on either side.

Thank you.

But the 1000.

Is is.

Should that does that then need to double to 2000 if we're keeping it's OK for 306 hundred.

**JK** **Jessica Kim** 1:17:29

Yeah.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:32

Thank you 300 a bit too small.

Yeah. OK.

Sorry, comfortable now with.

The rewarding there to clarify.

Generally 900 feet.

And then the extents everyone good.

OK.

And so if we are all.

In agreement with the language here, we'll send it out for DocuSign.

But first, we will reach out to DMF to see if they want input on it.

Yeah, we could just go through.

That rooting regulation.

Which is a part of that discussion, yeah.

So great hurricane relief. It's all part of that point.

The STC plan.

If we could just rundown.

And just get verbal, OK? What?

You're canvassing. Got it.

Just to make sure.

So I don't have a concurs.

Amanetta, do you concur with what we have so far?

**SA** **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:18:50

Yes, I concur with the revised language.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:18:53

Thank you.

Paul, OK.

Travis, you concur?

**WW** **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:19:04

Wildlife Commission can concur.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:19:09

Captain, this DCF, DCM can concur.

I would just ask that the meeting minutes show that we expressed the need to contact DMF and determine if they need to participate on the merger team.

Kim.

Yes, NCDNT.

That'd be something.

And then, uh, can you concur for?

**CT** **Cao, Luan T** 1:19:44

Yep, shipper's.

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

Well you will.

I still send to Renee for signature.

Or do you want me to do your name for Renee or your name Toby?

**CT** **Cao, Luan T** 1:19:56

You can send send it to me.

Yeah, you could change it to my name.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:03

Changing.

OK. And then?

Albemarle RPO is David here.

Was it heath? Yeah, it was.

**ES** **Ethan Sommers** 1:20:12

OK, who concurs?

But yes, what's my name as well?

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:15

Just.

We'll send out meeting minutes and send out form shortly.

OK.

Thank you all.

That we are good.

Thank you.

Great stuff and prepaid that.

You.

Cleared out by then.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription