

R-5876 - CP2, Revisited.-20260812_130028-Meeting Recording

August 12, 2026, 5:00PM

1h 35m 16s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:11

Hey, no, we're just giving everybody just one more minute, and then we'll get started. Thank you.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 0:25

Thanks, Morgan. I'm gonna let him know I'm down here. I already did.
Is Seth the one there? I mean, you clearance going to that one? No, they just pulled out of the parking lot here. Oh, OK.
OK, so I just, I always forget.

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

Good afternoon, everybody. Thanks everybody for joining us. The R5876 CP2 revisit with some more information. Before we get started, it's going to probably take us a few minutes to get through introductions, but we're going to go
Make sure everybody's here. We'll start in the room here. I am Morgan Weatherford from NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit. Hannah Henry NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit.
Katie Harville, NCDOT, Environmental Policy. Matthew Martin, U.S. Army Corps, Wilmington District.
Eric Mitkiff, MV5 Engineers, Project Manager, Consultant Project Manager. John Kafordi, MV5 Engineers. OK, so we are all in Raleigh. There is an office full of people in Wilmington, I believe. Brian, is everybody in your room?
Birthday break.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 2:21

Yeah, we can run through introductions here, who's who we've got here in person. So, Brian Harding here, Project Manager here, Division Three. Alex Stewart, NCOT,

Project Development, Division Three. Holly Snyder, Division of Water Resources.
Mason Harding, Division Three, Project Development, Environmental.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:25
Yeah.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 2:41
Seth Welcher with Federal Highway.
David Leonard, Division 3, Project Development. Bretton Cutchin, SCDOT, Program
Manager.
That's everyone we got in our conference room right now.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:56
Okay, we'll just run through everybody all fine.
But I'll call your name if you would just introduce yourself.
Um, Abby?

AV **Abby Vogt** 3:13
Hey, every vote every five, where do we design?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:18
And, and...

AE **Ann Eaddy** 3:20
Hey, Ann Edie, Project Manager with the Charleston District Corps of Engineers.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:26
Thank you, Anne. Kathy.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 3:30
Hello, it's Kathy Brittingham with the North Carolina Division of Coastal
Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:37

Like faster?

Search out.

CB **Carter, Alexander B** 3:41
Alexander, summer intern.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:45
Sun.
Charles.

CH **Charles W. Hightower** 3:54
Hey, yeah, this is Chuck Hightower with South Carolina Department of Environmental Services, 401 Water Quality Certification.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:03
Thanks, Joe.
****.
Chris Clark.

CG **Chris Clark, GSATS** 4:14
Hi, this is Chris Clark. I'm from the GSATS MPO, and I'm the interim MPO director.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:24
Christopher or Chris Stout.

CS **Christopher M. Stout** 4:28
Afternoon, everybody. Chris Stout with the South Carolina Department of Environmental Services, Bureau of Coastal Management. So your Coastal Zone Consistency Review.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:37
Thank you, Chris.
And then we have a Christopher Cooper.

CB **Cooper, Christopher, B.** 4:45

Hey, good afternoon. Chris Cooper, SCDOT Environmental Department NEPA Coordinator for RPG2 PD region.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:53

Alright, thanks, yes.
Take it back, bye.
Oh.

DB **David Bocker** 4:59

David Balker, NV5 Hydraulics.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:07

We have Eric in the room, Christine.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 5:11

Hey, Christine Farrell, NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:19

Ali.
Hey, Rita, sorry I cannot see the screen.

HS **Haley A. Smarr** 5:32

Sorry, did you say Haley or Katie?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:35

Excuse me, Hayley.

HS **Haley A. Smarr** 5:37

Hi, this is Haley Smarr with South Carolina's Department of Environmental Services. I am the SCDOT 401 project manager.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:49

Thank you, and sorry about that, Haley.

HS **Haley A. Smarr** 5:52
No, no problem.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:54
Faith.

HF **Hardin, Faith** 5:56
Faith Hardin, Division of Water Resources, 401, Permitting Branch Supervisor.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:03
All right, I got Brian, Kate is here, Jessica.

HR **Hinson, Jessica R** 6:11
Hi, Jessica Henson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service out of the South Carolina Ecological Services Field Office. I am the South Carolina Department of Transportation Liaison.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:24
Ignite.

HE **Hite, Katie E** 6:30
ADI dot Division 3.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:36
John.
Install them.

JJ **Jamison, John** 6:40
John Jamison with NCDOT Environmental Policy.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:46
Aaron.

JN **Jenkins, Erin, N.** 6:48
Aaron Jenkins, SCDOT Environmental Permits Coordinator, RPG2.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:53
Thank you. John here. Johnny Banks.

JB **Johnny Banks** 7:00
Hey, Johnny Banks with the NV5 Roadway Design.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:06
Eric.

JG **Jordan, Gary** 7:10
Did you say Gary?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:11
Yeah, sorry, Gary Jordan, go ahead.

JG **Jordan, Gary** 7:12
Okay, yes, Gary Jordan with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service out of the Raleigh, North Carolina field office.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:22
All right, and I apologize for this next name. Is that Natali?
Like.

KN **Kajumba, Ntale** 7:28
Yes, Entala Kajumba EPA Region 4.
I need the section manager.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:38
Awesome. Thank you.
Uh.
Colby.

KA **Kolby Altabet** 7:50

Colby Altabet with the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources out of the Office of Environmental Programs.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:58
Kristen.

KA **Kristin Andrade (USACE)** 8:01
Hi, I'm Kristen Andrade. I'm the acting Deputy Regulatory Chief in the Charleston District for the Corps of Engineers.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 8:10
Stephen Lane, North Carolina Division of Coach Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:10
Goodbye.
David letter.

LD **Leonard, David** 8:18
Hey, David Leonard.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:29
Very good.
At 4 A.m.

LR **Lorianne Riggin** 8:35
Afternoon, everybody. Lori and Regan, the director of the Office and Programs for South Carolina DNR.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:42
Sam Boswell.

SB **Sam Boswell** 8:46
Sam Boswell, Cape Fear RPO Director at the Cape Fear Council of Governments.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:51

A reason.

SP **Sarzaeim, Parisa** 8:53

Parisas are the indivision of water resources.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:58

Barry.

SM **Sherrer, Mary** 9:02

Sorry, did you say Mary?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:04

Yes, excuse me, sorry.

SM **Sherrer, Mary** 9:04

Okay. Yeah, that's all right. Mary Sharer, I'm with the South Carolina SHPO. I'm the review coordinator for transportation projects.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:12

I work on turning into the mic. I found myself squinting at the screen. I think it's big enough to where I don't have to squint, but...

I am getting older.

Aaliyah.

SA **Singh-White, Alya** 9:27

Good afternoon, all yes saying White. I'm with EPA Region 4 and the NEPA program.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:33

Alia, thank you.

Yeah, it's alright.

Trying to get into that one.

How about that?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 9:45
I'm Aneta Somerville with EPA Region 4 NEPA Section.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 9:50
Steve.

SD **Steve Drum** 9:54
Hello, Steve Drum with NV5 Engineers, Railway Design Group.

TD **Tom Dobrydney (GSATS)** 10:04
Senior planner with few sets.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 10:08
Uh, track schools.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 10:11
Travis Wilson, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 10:16
And then, Richard.

XA **Xu, Richard A** 10:19
Afternoon, Richard Sue with NCDOT Division 3 in project development.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 10:28
Thank you. Lon, I think you joined us after we started.

CT **Cao, Luan T** 10:33
Yep, Lung Gao, Environmental Review Review Specialist, State Historic Preservation Office.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 10:42
Did not, and anybody else, Trevor, maybe?

CK Carroll, Trevor K 10:49
Hey, Trevor Carroll, NCDOT, Division 3, Division Engineer. Thank you.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 10:57
Thank you. Anybody else that we're missing or skipped over?
All right, I will kick it over to the project team for the presentation.

HJ Harding, Brian J 11:15
Let's see how we got here. I was muted. Sorry. Hey, Morgan.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 11:21
Yes, sir.

HJ Harding, Brian J 11:22
Seth's sitting here and he would like to kick us off and kind of gives everybody up the date of how we got here and what the purpose of the need is.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 11:29
Gotcha.

HJ Harding, Brian J 11:33
Yeah, 99 times out of 100 more gonna ask me if I have anything to say before we start, and I say, no, let's just dive in, but you know, this, I guess...

HS Headrick, Hannah S 11:41
I knew the one time I missed it.

HJ Harding, Brian J 11:45
Murphy's Law, right? You know, Eric was probably going to say a lot of the same stuff, so hopefully I don't steal his thunder too much. This is South of Federal Highway, and for a lot of the folks on this call, you haven't really, you know, been involved in this project in a while, and having...

HS Headrick, Hannah S 11:47

Yeah.

HJ Harding, Brian J 12:03

When was our last merger team meeting? It was a good while ago. A couple years ago. But then for a handful of us on this meeting, we've been deep in the weeds in this for a long time and working in the background. So just to catch everybody up since we were all last together, been plenty of things happening.

The EEIS came out, the draft EIS last summer, and we had public meetings in the fall. And they were, if you didn't see in the news, very heavily attended and very, especially on the North Carolina side. There was one in South Carolina, one in North Carolina.

North Carolina meeting was not only, it was like standing room only, and I would say passionate to say the least. And the preferred alternative 4 that's preferred by both state DOTs did not get much support. And the

public comments were everything from wanting a bypass that runs all the way to 140 near Wilmington, which would be, gosh, at least like 50 more miles to not wanting anything at all because of environmental impact. So it really ran the gamut of concerns. So the Environmental Law Center was there and

Also, I sent a letter. One of the things they have says was environmental impacts along with looking more at improving existing.

as an option. They noted funding not being identified yet in North Carolina, which continues to be an issue with just not having enough money to build on our side here in North Carolina, while South Carolina, Horry County, has the local tax because they've collected a large amount of money and kind of been rearing it a bit to go. for a long time while the cost of building a road goes up and that money is not buying as much Rd. So they're very anxious. North Carolina is, you know, in a different boat. So it's a lot going on in the background here. So that led to the transportation agencies kind of looking to see what other alternatives could get this project built in some form or fashion that would reflect not a strong public consensus and also not funding in North Carolina. So that's, I could probably write a book about this project at this point, but that's kind of a, in a couple minute nutshell. So with that, you know, I'll let Eric and Evita take over, but

appreciate everybody reconvening today to hear what's been going on in the background and what the new plan is going forward.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 14:50

Alright, yeah, thanks. I appreciate you saying that.

HJ Harding, Brian J 14:54

And one thing, one more thing, Eric. So just sort of already get this out there. So what you're hearing today is going to be incorporated into a supplemental EIS that we hope we can get out, probably, I guess, in the wintertime, Eric. So that that's where we're going with this and where next steps are going to be.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 14:55

Yes.

HJ Harding, Brian J 15:16

Go ahead, Eric.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 15:17

Okay, yeah, very, yeah, all true. Thanks, Seth. Yeah, I appreciate everybody's attendance today. A big, big merger meeting, always one of the biggest meetings I've ever attended for merger meetings since I've been doing this for quite a while. So, yeah, this is a supplemental CP2 meeting and or a CP2 revisit, I guess you could say. If for those of you who are maybe not as familiar with the merger process and the various concurrence points, CP2 is the point where we or the merger team decides on the alternatives that's going to be carried forward for.

detailed study. So we actually had this meeting in May of 2020, I believe. And at that meeting, we did come up with seven alternatives the merge team concurred with to carry on for detailed studies.

And since that time, I think just Seth alluded to this, these various alternatives have been under review for design, environmental and traffic studies, and we completed the graph DIS and

Ah.

July of 2025 and present to the public hearings and also in 25. So yeah, with the

information that said provided it due to public feedback and the NCDOT, NCDOT and FHWA have conferred to identify some other alternatives that would, of course, meet the purpose and need of the project and would be more cost effective dealing with the cost constraints that are in North Carolina. and would also lessen impacts and use some of the... concerns that a lot of the public have about the project when you first did it. So we have a few alternatives that we would like to display for the or present to the merger team and have a discussion on if any of these we agree would like to go forward. And I will I will talk about each one of these. We also have the impacts as well. located in your table, in your packet, and talk about each one, and then we'll just see if we want to move forward with any of these. And in addition, concerning the other detailed study alternatives, the seven that you're seeing here on the screen, They, NCDOT and SCDOT would like to review those as well to determine if there are any of these existing DSAs that may could be dropped from further consideration. Given that they have been evaluated in the draft EIS and also presented to the public, we have public feedback on them as well. So I'd like to have that discussion as well after I present on the new alternatives. Going to be mainly in your packet here. I'll briefly go through this. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on much of the stuff. I want to get to the alternatives that we'd like to review. Introduction, I think we stated this well already. There is one thing I'd like to mention. You'll see in the introduction and also through the handout that there's a lot of emphasis on alternative 10. And just for disclosure, that was when we first started going into this Um... merger meeting and putting the information together, we were really just going to, NCDOT was really just going to introduce alternative tenants, the only alternative. But as we always do, we coordinate with the merger team leaders before going into any merger meeting. And through that coordination, there were some other potential alternatives identified that the team leaders thought it would be beneficial for the merger team to review as well to determine if they may be also good alternatives, good candidates going forward. The same way as with alternative 10. But so we have moved to include those, some additional alternatives to review, but some of the write-up

that you have here kind of emphasized the original intent at alternative 10. So just to explain that a little bit. Project description, and I think we all know this, projects in two states and beginning in SC9 in South Carolina under the old Carolina base. project ends right now, goes up through Horry County and then continuing on into North Carolina to the shallow bypass.

project, as stated before, is funded in South Carolina, not in North Carolina.

Um...

Moving forward in the packet, we have the STIP estimates. Now, the individual DSAs have their own cost estimates. These are just what's involved in it. Various TIPs, but that information is provided for the individual alternatives as well in the packet.

Looking at the project schedule, I think we've touched on this already.

Recently, the EIS was approved in 2025. Public hearings were held in the fall. We're now at supplemental to meeting to see if we will add some more additional alternatives. And we'll be working on a supplemental draft EIS.

Um...

right now anticipated in December.

This year.

Moving forward, just we have the regular information that we always include in past concurrent points meeting. We can read all about those if you haven't already. And draft and environmental impact statement link is included as well if you want to do some light reading here.

The public involvement occurred is all documented here on the dot website links that were provided. And also we have a link to the public involvement or public hearing summary for that meeting as well. And then additional information hear about some of the alternatives that we have evaluated. We have the typical sections that are being reviewed. And

And then we come to really important, the impacts table for all the alternatives. The impacts table includes all the detailed study alternatives here.

Is that what happens? It's the first time I've looked up at the big screen. It's really delayed.

All the detailed study alternatives are included. Those are all the values that were in the draft EIS. And then we have here the additional alternatives that we would like for the Mercer team to review to determine if they may need to go through for an additional study.

This is alternatives 10 through 15. And just a word about the impacts that we did

here. The impacts for the new alternatives, they're actually very good. All the regulatory strain, wetland displacements. It's because all of these new alternatives are predominantly still located within

in the study corridors of what were studied in the draft EIS. There's a little bit of difference in alternative 10 that comes out of one of the corridors a little bit, but we have all this information, so it was very easy to put together impact. So it's very accurate.

A couple of things we don't have here are noise receptors. We haven't had the opportunity to do that study yet for the new alternatives, and we have not done cost estimates for the new alternatives as well.

With that, I am going to move over to talk about the alternatives that

We would like to determine if they need to go through for more detailed study alternatives or more detailed study. These figures are all in your packet as well, so that'll be good one neighbor if you want to follow along with that.

First of all, is the first alternative that we wanted to bring to light is alternative 10.

And this alternative would very closely go along with alternative 4, original detailed study alternative 4 in South Carolina. So it goes completely within that corridor. You can ask the same typical section. It's alternative 4. The only the difference is it breaks away from 4 and makes a little bit of a turn to the north here.

and then would tie into Wampi Road, which is S-57 in South Carolina. This portion of the alternative 10 would be the same typical section that was proposed before and the other alternatives.

which is a four lane median divided controlled access freeway type facility. It would transition down then with that turn to the north and connect to Wampy Road. At that point, the alternative involves upgrading a very short section of Wampy Road And Hickman Road, which changes its name in North Carolina as you go across the state line, it would upgrade Hickman and Walpie Road to a four-lane facility divided by a 23-foot raised island. So kind of a more of a boulevard type

This would not be the high speed freeway that we have on the other section. And there would be no control of access or limited control of access here. So driveways would be allowed along this section of the project. That widening occurs up to US 17.

And so the construction component of this alternative would end with an interchange, a trumpet-style interchange at US 17 at this location. Now, for the rest of the project, continuing or the alternative continuing down

US 17 throughout the project limits, so through the rest of the project limits, the

alternative will involve a monitoring effort along US 17 by NCDOT, and this would just be an ongoing monitoring effort through the project limits. So there would be, for this alternative, no initial construction along this section of US 17. It's just reviewing that to determine if there are other improvements that may need to be accomplished in order to address any traffic capacity or safety issues that are occurring along that section of US 17. So again, the construction component of this alternative would end at US 17 and the rest of the project would just be a monitoring effort. Now, this is going to be a pretty consistent thing, a pretty consistent type of improvement that I'm going to go over for the other for the other alternatives as well. So I wanted to just pause for a minute because I know this is a little odd and see if there's any questions concerning this concept that I've laid out before I continue on for the For the rest of the alternatives.

Okay, any questions at all, just let me know, and I can stop at any time here. I'm going to go ahead and review the next alternative here, and then we'll go over to the impacts table after that, try to talk about it in more detail. This alternative is Noli's alternative 11.

And it is almost exactly the same as the original DSA alternative one. The dark gray area that you see would be exactly alternative one. New location freeway facility. ties into US 17. However, as with alternative 10 that I explained before, this alternative along US 17 going up through the remainder of the project area, would have the same monitoring effort that I discussed before. So alternative is basically alternative one with a monitoring effort for the section of US 17.

Next one is alternative 12. This is the same alternative as the original DSA alternative 2. And exactly the same as before with the other alternatives. The darker alternatives are the darker area would be the construction component.

And the dashed.

part along US 17 would be the monitoring effort done by NCDOT, so no construction on that particular part of it.

And alternative 13 is the same as original DSA alternative 4. Again, broken record here, it will be the same as alternative 4 until that alternative touches US 17, and then the monitoring effort will continue.

Along that section of U.S. 17.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 31:30
Mm.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 31:32

And alternative 14 is the same as alternative 7. And again, that alternative will tie into US 17, just like it did before. It would alternative 7, and then the monitoring effort would continue.

Along 17th.

And finally, the last one we'd like to talk about is alternative 15. This coincides with alternative 8 of the original detailed study corridors. Alternative 8 always had the longer section of US 17 on it. So again, this alternative will tie into

US 17, as it always has with at Calabash Road, just inside North Carolina state line, and then would continue along US 17 with the monitoring effort. So those are those are the alternatives that we would like for the emergency team to review to see if we would like to add.

any of these ongoing. What I would like to do now is go to the table in your packet and talk about these alternatives in terms of their potential impacts. And then as I go through, I'll also

mention what the recommendation is for NCPOT and SCPOT for these alternatives going forward. And we'll put that each one for discussion with the merger team to see if this is if these are any that we would like to move forward. So I'm going to start with alternative 10.

And just if you've seen the impacts here, this is, this alternative has the potential to have to be the least impactful of any alternative we've ever developed and any of the newer alternatives too that we're looking at as well with very the wetland impacts that you're seeing here.

Please make this bigger with 57 acres of impact. You see that compared to many of the other DSA's numbers are twice that and even as well as compared to the compared to the.

the new alternatives that were generating much less than many of those. Also very low. These are the stream impacts at 3000. You see much lower than any of the other alternatives. Tributary impacts here at 2200 feet, again, much lower than any of the older or newer alternatives that we have.

Even looking down at the potential number of relocations, we have 11 for this

alternative, and so much lower than anything. We feel that we'll be able to have traffic benefit for this.

noted in purpose and need, but we do need to review that as well. It will be part of our project study, but NCDOT and SCDOT feel that this alternatively should be added as a detailed study alternative and going forward for additional study.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 34:45

Yeah.

Eric would like to note that also this would be the our preferred alternative in the supplement on DIS.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:11

So I'll put it out there, Matt, if you think this is a good way to go, just individually talk about it and ask or I should finish. Okay. So I'll go ahead and just put it to the question to the merger team. Would there be, merger team members, would there be any objection?

to adding this alternative to the list of detailed study alternatives.

I was in the morning.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 35:58

Do you hear me? I was about to say, Eric, are you able to hear us? Just checking.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:03

We sure can, yeah, loud and clear.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 36:04

Okay.

I just make sure you heard what Mason stated.

But this is going to be our preferred. This would be our preferred alternative moving forward.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:15

Yep, yes, sir.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 36:18
Gay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:25

Well, the, I guess, silence I may take is okay. There's no objection. We can go through.

Okay. Yeah. You want to do it maybe after all the discussion. Okay. Very good. All right. I'm going to go ahead to the next alternative that we had, next new alternative, which is alternative 11.

As a reminder, this is old alternative one with the monitoring effort added. And I want to look here. It does have some pretty, still some pretty significant wetland impacts at 118 acres.

It would be not as many as some of the DSAs, definitely not, but it would be one of the higher number of the impacts that we have.

with the newer alternatives that were evaluated at 118. I'll say it's pretty heavy stream impacts at 12,000, 11,000 feet of tributaries. So that'll be among the higher efforts of a new alternative as well and kind of up there with some of the original DSAs.

The looking at the number of residential displacements for alternative 11, we have 52, which is kind of medium in terms of the new alternatives that we have.

that we're looking at, but certainly lower than a lot of the DSAs, original DSAs that we have. So I want to talk about this one, though, in terms of the impacts. There are 28 in South Carolina.

By the way, if you had noticed, we have all the impacts divided up between one of those in South Carolina on the left-hand side and one of those in North Carolina on the right-hand side of each column. This alternative

at the public meeting, received quite a bit of opposition. It's probably not as much as alternative 4 did that Seth was mentioning, but it did take quite a bit, mainly in South Carolina.

The alternative goes through a community called Brooksville.

And.

Let me show you real quick on the map.

for this. Yeah, this is it. Brooksville community is right here in South Carolina.

Brooksville is a

predominantly low income, kind of farming, agricultural crossroads type community. Most of the homes there have like small farming operations with their home. This alternative would be pretty disruptive in the Brooksville area and Princeville community likely relocating or displacing a church, and some of the businesses that serve the community, specifically the, let's say Dollar General, is that right? Yeah. And we'd have a few relocations to this as well.

The Brooksville community did come out in a lot of numbers at the public hearing, and they also subsequently sent a petition basically stating they were opposed to any alternative one A and two.

which uses the alignment here that we're showing for alternative 11. So that was part of the feedback that we got at the public meeting. Additionally, this is an extremely long alternative still in North Carolina, as you see coming through. And

It is not likely that this would be a financially feasible alternative skill, even though it does not have the 17 component. Not likely, I'm saying that because we, that's just based on the length. We haven't got the cost estimate for this yet. So

For those reasons, NCDOT is recommending that we do not carry that this alternative forward, alternative 11 forward for detailed study alternative.

like to turn that over to the merger team to see if there's any discussion about that. I guess, would the DOTs still be proposing 1 and 1A stay as preferred all as detailed studies? No, we dot would like to recommend that one and 1A be dropped from further consideration.

That may be, I know I kind of nodded yes to go on one by one, but I guess it wouldn't be bad to hear kind of the back. Yeah, I wouldn't mind hearing what DOT's proposal is for DSAs, and then we can kind of talk about each one if that makes sense.

Yeah, yeah, I don't want us to go one by one and just end up with 10, yeah.

So are you guys open to doing that? Just kind of let us be behind the car really quick? Oh yeah, absolutely. Mason, assuming you're fine with that process. Actually, yeah, that probably Mason would have done that. It was more of my idea.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 42:53

Yes, sir, I am.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:59

individually, but yes, and the yeah, I'll just go across even from the DSA's, the original

DSA's and state DOT's reference. So

And I can also go into the background of all this, but I'll just tell you what the numbers are right now. NCDOT and

Let me say, NCDOT would prefer to drop for further consideration alternative 11A.

Four.

Or a.

And, and pick up.

As new alternatives.

alternative 10.

Twelve.

14 and 15.

Obviously, those are all part of all of the review by the merger team. That's NCDOT's fault right now. Some of those alternatives are not great, and I think NCDOT and SCDOT would be

fine, not carrying some of this board that I've just mentioned, and I could certainly go into that as well, some of those alternatives.

HJ

Harding, Brian J 44:42

And Matt, one of the reasons we wanted to drop some of these alternatives, after we had the public input and looking at our financial situation, we put out a press release saying that we would no longer pursue alternative 4 as our preferred alternative.

And so basically the ones that he mentioned, 1, 1A, 4, 4A, 11, and 13, follow that same alignment in North Carolina as alternative 4. So we do not want to take those back out to the public since we've already committed not to pursue that.

alignment any further. We're somewhat on the fence about alternatives 14 and 15, especially 14 because of some high relocations, but we were going to leave that open to discussion from the merger team to see if

you know, they wanted to keep any of those alternatives, but we're pretty sad on not wanting the ones I've named off before.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 45:51

Okay.

That helps me. I was also tracking that 14 as close to the most relocations and sevens not that much ahead.

Yeah.

Yeah, 14 is for the displacements point of view is very, very disruptive. Yeah, and I guess.

Ohh, it looks like, is that trust?

Travis, do you?

Had your hand up.



Wilson, Travis W. 46:36

I was just going to talk once y'all finished. I just go, I mean, we had that kind of asked for concurrence on some of these and I was going to give WRC position and I have a question. So I'll just go ahead and I don't have the Wildlife Commission does not have an issue with dropping the alternatives that you mentioned. They're the ones that have the.

the most new location miles to be constructed. So, you know, we support dropping those alternatives.

My question is, it's hard for me to see how we can keep, say...

seven and eight, two and then try and relate it to the 12, 14 and 15. Those alternatives are, you basically just shorten the project. I don't see how you can look at those and compare them.

everything one through 8 is automatically going to have significantly higher impacts.

And so can we legitimately keep anything one through 8?

Or do you just adopt 10 through 15?



Harding, Brian J 48:00

Hey, Cortana, can you answer that one, because I understand you want to get rid of all the original one?

NCDOT is in agreement with you, Travis. There was just some discussions early on with Federal Highways to potentially trying to keep some of those original detailed study areas, but you're right. It's not an apple for apples comparisons because the amount of improvements is

Totally different.

Although so.

I can speak for NCDOT, we would be fine with dropping all the original ones. Yeah, and plus we don't have the money to build those, so they're really not reasonable and practical alternatives.

WW Wilson, Travis W. 48:55

Yeah, I mean, the way I'm looking at 10 through 15, you pretty much just literally shortened project limits.

HJ Harding, Brian J 49:02

Right, well...

Yeah.

Travis, this is Seth with Federal Highway Ed. I was out a couple weeks when this was discussed and Mason said Clarence Coleman with Federal Highway may have had a reason to keep 7 and 8 that I'm not aware of. So if that's true, we'll get back to you. But in general, I agree with what you're saying. I don't know, Eric, do you remember Since you were there, what motivation Clarence may have had for seven and eight?

HS Headrick, Hannah S 49:50

No, I don't know if there was a specific comment for Clarence concerning 7 or 8. I think she was fine with NCDOT's proposal to To try to not go forward with 1184 and 48. But, uh, yeah, quite quite honestly, I don't know if we really had a of. Dropping 7 day.

HJ Harding, Brian J 50:23

Yeah, I mean, I agree with what Travis said. Sorry, in addition, we don't have, sorry, North Carolina doesn't have the money for 7 and 8, too, so.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 50:25

Yes.

HJ Harding, Brian J 50:36

As far as I'm aware, so. No, we don't. I mean, and basically, you know, that's why we've gone to just look at monitoring existing 17 like we always done. I mean, in the past, we've had some spot improvements, like we put RCIs at Hickman in 17 and then Thomasboro in 17.

And that's kind of what we're committing to for the rest of 17, if...

A need comes about, and you know we would address it accordingly, but you know...

they're not needed right now and cannot be funded right now. So we're all in favor of dropping all the original ones and just keeping.

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

A.

Seth, what does that do to you for the supplemental EIS? Just out of curiosity.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 51:19

Ohh.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 51:25

If you drop all the alternatives in the initial EIS.

I don't want to tail wag the dog too much.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 51:33

Yeah, I mean, that's what I'm wondering if Clarence, you know, if that was his motivation, is there's a need to retain something to piggyback off of. So I apologize, I was out for that meeting and can't speak on his behalf. But so let's say like we're tentatively dropping 7 and eight, but let me confirm that with Clarence.

Well, that would only leave two. I mean, are we talking about dropping two to two, 7, and 8?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 52:05

B.

In reality, if you look at comparing 2 and 12, the only difference is if one doesn't have a 17 component, how does it compete with each other? The 2 can't compete with 12. If they both accomplish a purpose in need and you don't have a wide set, you don't have to do construction on 17, then two can't compete. That's where I see that for Travis is coming from it.

HE **Hite, Katie E** 52:10

He Mason.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 52:28

They just can't. Yeah, I'm definitely open to dropping one through 8. Yeah, they really

can't compete with the new ones. It makes, I think it makes a lot more sense that we're just comparing similar projects. And if DOT's stance now is that 17 doesn't need to be wide, like originally, when the project was conceived, we thought.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 52:34

No.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 52:50

Yeah, it's kind of maybe disingenuous to bring that out as alternatives of widening 17 when on other hands you're telling me we don't need what 17.

Yeah, ohh.

So it's kind of apples and oranges, which we talked about in the pre.

Or not.

Wellington District's not opposed to to drop us one through 8. I think my only hesitation is Clarence did seem opposed. Yeah, so I don't.

I don't remember why. Yeah, yeah. And just Clarence was okay dropping some. Yeah, I know that. And he stated so, but I don't know. We just never really talked about the possibility of dropping every alternative.

that we have. And I don't know what that would do to our NEPA study that is underway. Yeah.

Yeah, that's my biggest false, yeah.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 53:56

Yeah, if I had to guess, I think that's it, because there need to be some kind of tie to the original DIS with this supplement, and maybe that's why he didn't.

Ohh.

He wanted to keep a couple, a few of those originals, but...

From a public standpoint, I mean...

North County in 2002, why would you want to go back and take those back out to the public when they're not, you know, they kind of fall in the same category as one through 8, so.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 54:31

Yeah.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 54:31

Hmm.

I'm sending Clarence a message right now, so maybe I'll have something for you guys soon.

HE **Hite, Katie E** 54:41

Hey, Mason.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 54:42

Hey, Katie.

HE **Hite, Katie E** 54:45

Hey, was it in relation to the question we had about the potential for a do-nothing in North Carolina when we were trying to see what would still meet the purpose and need? Is that where that conversation came in about 7 and 8?

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 55:04

I don't think so. I mean, because no build's always on the table. I'm thinking that it was really tied to the original DEIS, but

You know, I'm just really...

Don't remember what his point was for that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:28

Does it take you out of supplemental territory? Yeah, I think that would be the... I don't know that for a fact, but I think that's what we're feeling here, that if you remove all the alternatives that the NEPA study was based on,

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 55:48

Then a second, yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:48

I don't think we have the supplemental vehicle to be able to go forward with.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 55:55

Yeah, I think that's it.

And I think that's the tie. I mean, if you got rid of everything, basically you're talking, it's not a supplement, it's a whole new DIS. Yeah. So I think, you know, to make it a supplement, that's why you wanted to keep the original.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:06

And what?

What brought this to EIS before?

What made this an EIS initially? The level of impact? Yeah, the level of certain communities. It was a major major investment project by FHWA.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 56:24

When we're doing new four lane divided on new alignment, that's almost always an EIS for highway.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:33

Okay.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 56:36

Clarence is typing right now, so um, well, but it does make sense that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:40

Well, anxiously wait, a couple of controversy in this.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 56:45

If it's hard to say you're supplementing something when you've gotten rid of everything, so is that very...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:49

Yeah, I think that one, yeah, definitely, you know, supplement it with the projects.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 56:54

So, I mean, it may just be a paperwork formality to allow us to tie this on without starting all over.

I will let you guys know soon. Hopefully we can talk about something else while we wait on Claire.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:09

Yeah.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 57:12

I guess we can move on and talk about maybe potentially which one of the...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:12

Ohh.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 57:19

I'm more interested in talking about maybe possibly 14 and 15, because those are the ones we're kind of on the fence for. I think 14, because of the substantially higher number of relocations, I'm

Don't know why we'd want to carry that forward either.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:40

Mason, 14 was one I was going to suggest be dropped. So I'm open to that. And just so you know, looking at the impacts there, that was 14 is extremely high. Just

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 57:44

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:58

a much higher number of relocations, displacements, than any of the other alternatives by a long shot, except for seven, which is a sister alternative, which has more. There is a little bit lower wetland impact.

than some of the other alternatives with alternative 14 and 86, but you know, if the as well as it would have the lowest stream impact of any of the alternatives that we have. 14? Yes.

Yeah, but yeah, that's going through like a neighborhood. Yes, it is, yeah.

So, those are the main things it would be, it would be the.

If you wanted to take it for words for...

The potential for having an alternative that had a little bit lower impact. Oh, it's not lower than 15. Yeah, I think we would want to keep 15 and 12. Eleven was one I had on my list to try to keep. But it sounds like that was one you also received. It's sister one. Right. Also was not popular. That sounds like. That is correct.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 59:29

Yeah. And it also follows the same alignment in North Carolina as alternative forward, which we said we would no longer pursue as an alternative. And that's why the NCDOT wants to remove it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:42

Yeah, and that's the one you're saying he did the press release.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 59:47

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:47

Or 34 OK.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 59:49

alternative 4, but this follows the same alignment as alternative 4 in North Carolina. That's why we're saying we would like to take it off the table and not present it back.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:52

Is blame.

Okay.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:00:03

Plus, it also has issues in North and South Carolina in that Brooksville. Community.

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

Yeah.

And.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:00:12

The.

So Clarence said he's not opposed to dropping any of the original alternatives as long as we have documentation for why and that the supplemental gives us the leeway to add or eliminate alternatives as we see fit as long as they speak to the purpose and need.

On the project, so I think we're in the clear.

Great.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:40

Just feels weird.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:00:41

I love it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:43

Ohh.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:00:45

We'll take one through 8 are gone, and the burger team concurs.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:51

I...

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:00:53

So as it stands right now, dot is looking at carrying 4, 10, 12, and 15. Is that where we're at?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:59

That's what I'm tracking.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:00:59

Yes, sir.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:02

Which, that's.
skinnier than I hoped, but...

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:01:07

What?

But you just got to consider, Matt, you know, one through 8 has already been evaluated and taken to the public. And then based on that public input, you know, that's kind of why we're saying eliminating 11 and 13. And then, you know, you recommended 14 being eliminated. So
It's kind of where we're at.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:35

Yeah.

No, I yeah, I don't think you're wrong. It's I think.

What may help Clarence's effort, and maybe mine's used for documenting why we're dropping so many at 2, maybe a brief memo of sorts that just outlines the reasoning you guys have explained about, you know, we're dropping several based on public interest factors.

These sister and shorter alternatives have the same public interest concerns that even if you were to bring it forward to the public, you just don't believe you would get to a building point with those. I think something like that for those ones. And then there's obviously, you know, 14.

That's what I assume are all unreasonable residential takes.

I think some kind of brief memo to the file like that to just help explain why we're abandoning the whole previous study and why we're moving forward with just the three. And then 1A and 4A would have the heaviest environmental impacts from a wetland standpoint, things like that. So that's why 1A and 4A dropped these. Not only were they not popular,

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:02:46

Cool.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:02:51

But from a like a regulatory standpoint, they had they were both with the highest wetlands and whatnot. So that's right. Yeah. So we do have that in our favor for dropping 1A and 4A because that helps from a purely environmental standpoint. Others are falling out because of public opposition and very heavy residential and business impacts. So you have.

Yeah, I think you've kind of got a shotgun approach to where you're hitting a couple points. And I think it's good to get as many points as you can and into that kind of memo is, you know, and comparing it to your preferred where you're saying, you know, 1A has four times what it impacts. And that's kind of the spirit of 2A where we're looking at things that just aren't.

reasonable. And we're saying, well, that one, obviously we wouldn't do that when this is what we're proposing. So we do have the benefit of normally a two-way, you don't have this level of detailed information. It's actually good. I mean, usually you're going in there with, you know, wetland.

28, not delineation, but wetlands based on the map. We actually have field verified data in here, which works to our favor. So it gives us a much more comfortable reason for drawing things or any. It does. It does.

One thing I do want to mention concerning

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:04:11
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:14
Oh, John.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:04:15
Hey, Eric.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:16
Oh yeah, yeah.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:04:18
My recommendation would be, you know, what Matt's requesting, we can definitely do that in the minutes for this meeting and for each alternative we drop, we can do a bulleted list of why we dropped them.

Um...

And I, I would hope that would satisfy Matt's needs.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:38

That sounds great. We have that in the job. Oh, yeah. I would need to do that in the supplement as well. Yeah, it might not be. Hopefully not just an effort for the course sync. Yeah.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:04:40

Gone.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:54

Yeah, I think the minutes is fine.

Yeah, the only thing I was going to mention here, and I'm not suggesting this would change over.

what we're talking about here going forward with, but alternative 12, which is the same as alternative 2, would still have the Brookston impact. Yeah. But you know, like in North Carolina,

No, that alternative is a lot better. Okay. And that might be a better discussion at CP3, where we would think about LEDPA, including the public interest factors behind it.

I think that's kind of the dance that I need to play is which ones are better to discuss at that next point. Do you mind just showing us what we're left with, assuming we all agree with just on the maps with 10, 12, and 10 really quick? Just to kind of give people that visual.

All right, alternative 10 is the one with the, you know, really kind of low impacts. And not this one.

Alternative 12.

Alternative 12 is kind of a little bit close to 10, actually, in North Carolina. It uses a component of Hickman Road, but it would just have more relocation freeway type facility.

It's very similar in North Carolina.

15 and alternative 15 is this kind of the eastern most alternative.

It would have the most US 17 monitoring components.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:07:05

Is.

South Carolina, okay with what we're proposing moving forward, alternatives 10, 12, and 15.

I'm getting a nod, Jess, here, so we're good.

Does anybody, any merger team member, have any concerns with what we're proposing?

which is moving forward alternatives 10, 12, and 15.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:07:53

Hi, this is Kathy Brittingham. I just wanted to ask about alternative 14, because that one does have reduced natural resource impacts. But then, of course, it's got the much higher residential displacements.

Is there anything that could be done to avoid and minimize those residential displacements to make that a more amenable alternative?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:08:15

You.

We it certainly can, Kathy, but not to.

Assuming we're just going to be minimizing within the 1000 foot corridor.

We can minimize, and I'm sure we can cut down on some of the impacts, but... nowhere near to the level that would get those impacts down to the other to the other alternatives or more closer to it. Trying to.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:08:58

Isn't that also one that has a lot of planned development too?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:01

Yeah, um, and I think, let me see if I, because that would be, that's like a four-lane design.

facility throughout.

Yeah, off course community. Yeah, so here is, here's the alternative.

Right now, going through on an aerial view.

Follow my course of through there.

That's where everything, that's where all your relocations are coming from. And you say, and you see those are spread out to all through. all through the corridor. So even moving the alignment around. And also what you're seeing here, the purple, those are planned communities that are obviously under construction right now. So those numbers, unless the houses were there when we counted them, which they probably were not, they're not even, they're not even in the count of that 233.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:10:21
Okay, thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:10:22
Yeah, while you have that kind of G.S. up, what's where?
Alternative 12 intersects with 17.
I don't know, with your slip stakes plus 40, there's a little more dark gray on that one than 10 at that interchange. Is that 12?
Do you? Yeah.
Yes, it kind of right at the.
Oh, are you talking about going down 17? Yeah, headed towards South Carolina.
Yeah, I think it's kind of the orange to your left area. It looked like you had a little more impact. I don't know if it's impact or not, but at least a larger footprint at that interchange for.
Twelve, which was two.
Leave.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:11:26
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:27
And then was 10 was 10 for a of the past.
Ten was 4. Just regular 4. Yeah, only in South Carolina. I am going to, I'm seeing this right here. It's kind of hard to tell because there's a lot of alternatives. Yeah, and maybe that's not the best way. Maybe I can wait.
Yeah.
No.

Okay.

Here it is.

Um...

It said, this is alternative to can I see?

where the interchange is.

It's one of the way the interchange is done through here. It's in order to get all these turning movements that we have because we have Pickman Road coming into it. This is a lot different than

Alternative 10, which is coming through along Hickman right here, this alternative is coming up a little bit from the south. And so that the interchange is completely different than alternative 10. 12 segmentation.

Well, it has a component of Hickman here, but we also have, we're also trying to tie in differently. It doesn't come in exactly. That's what I was noticing. It's just, okay, so it would be a little, it's a little, you know, it's not exactly like 10.

Ten deviates from all the alternative quite a bit, as it comes in North Carolina. OK.

Yeah.

Well, you know, I take that back. It does come in on Hippie Road, alternative 10.

Yeah, it just looked like there was an extra interchange. I may have to ask my roadway design folks here a little bit, Johnny Abbey, concerning alternative Two.

Um, coming in, which is...

the alignment here.

We are, we are introducing an interchange here.

That is a lot different than alternative 10, which also comes in at Hickman as well.

AV

Abby Vogt 1:14:54

Yeah, it's pretty different. I can display it real quick. It flops the other way, but it's still a trumpet.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 1:14:59

Yeah.

Yep.

Yeah, please do that.

AV

Abby Vogt 1:15:05

Let me pull it out real quick. I had the...

I had the third sheet pulled up in case you wanted to talk about the one connection, but not that one. So just give me a second. These are really big PDFs.

Okay.

Can you all see my screen?

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:15:47

Yes, ma'am.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:47

Sure can.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:15:49

Awesome.

Just wanted to add that there. So this is where Heckman comes in, which is that four lane raised median divided where it comes into US 17. And we tried to do the smallest. Yeah, this alternate 10. This is what we kind of have on any of the reduction alternates that use Heckman as a four lane divided. So.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:03

Yeah, alternative team, right?

Yep.

And so I guess what we were looking at, what Matt was pointing out, is that the alternative.

Two original DSA.

which comes in kind of on hidden as well. It has a lot different way of conveying the traffic, a lot different interchange. And it goes through.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:16:38

I was in.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:49

Bob.

Yeah, it doesn't necessarily need to be addressed during this. It was just kind of a...

Yeah, that port was the same for 12 and two. Yeah, that was just something I noticed

when you would think, I guess, you know, I would think that 12 might connect to 17 the same, but I don't know. I mean, I'm happy to be proved wrong.

If there's, you know, a reason that that would have a large connector there, feel free to, you know, just explain that to us and kind of catch us up on why that might be, yeah.

And I guess.

Abby, if we do have alternative to available to you there. Well, you can look at just two, right? No, you can look at 12, right? Yes, 12. 12 would be a little different.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:17:36

Excellent.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:17:47

Well, yeah, but we didn't, they don't, we don't have a design completely for 12. And maybe that's get cut off. We just cut it. Right. We just cut two off. Well, and that makes sense for this effort. And maybe, yeah, and maybe that's all it's, you know, a relic of something that was part of two.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:17:47

Mhm.

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:18:10

Yeah, and maybe it doesn't make as much sense in the monitoring world. You know, it may be one of the things that we have talked about is...

that for this exercise, we did just cut off the various alternatives where they had a reasonable spot, where they connected the 17. And that's how we calculated the impacts. We did not do

a functional design yet, where, how that tie in would actually happen, because when we still need to do that with 17 for each of them, because the tie in that we had for the other alternatives,

assumes it goes on, you know, 17. And so the tie-in needs to be designed, assuming it does not carry on 17, which will be a little bit different. Yeah, and that probably explains it right there. So with that, I guess when we go to CP3, we may have a little refinement there. Oh, yeah. We'll have to have functional.

Level besides that there. OK. Yep. It would change. Yeah, we're we're really a little what we're talking about. Yeah. So that one's 10, 12, and 15th. It's the Wilmington districts. We're able to that and just like Mason was talking about.

including the meeting minutes about the rationale for removing the ones we've discussed for moving.

All right, we can do that.

Oh, it looks like we see.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:20:07

Did you want to look at this cell? I found it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:09

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah, at least.

Yeah, this is a completely different way of handling, yeah, a number of traffic movements.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:20:34

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:38

Okay, so our impact numbers may go down a little. Yes. True. Yes, it will.

AV **Abby Vogt** 1:20:46

Yes.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:59

All right, well, I think, I'm not sure if there's any other official order of business. I think I've finished completing everything that I was going to present. Yes, Anne, are you comfy with everything we talked about from Charleston?

AE **Ann Eaddy** 1:21:14

Yeah, I am. I'm comfortable with dropping one through 8 and I agree with 10, 12, and 15. So that works for us.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:21:32

We can, just to make sure we've got all night.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 1:21:33

But this is...

This is Zamanetta with EPA. Are we going to be able to see the language before you guys or when you guys have a chance for, I guess, our next meeting?

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:21:45

You should, yeah.

HJ Harding, Brian J 1:21:46

Yeah, what we plan on doing is sending you the minutes, and then those minutes will describe why we dropped them and give you an opportunity to review and comment on those minutes. And then once we have that nailed down, then we'll send a concurrence form out for signatures.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 1:22:02

That sounds fantastic. Thank you.

HJ Harding, Brian J 1:22:04

Yes, ma'am.

Those minutes will be out in two weeks.

BC Brittingham, Cathy 1:22:14

Hey, this is Kathy Bradingham. Just a minor thing. Before we get to the CP2A, would you confer with Stephen Lane to see if there needs to be an update to any of the CAMA AEC calls and also add a row to your table for CAMA AECs?

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:22:33

Yeah. Oh, yes, absolutely. I think there may, there's a possibility for an additional AEC call given with alternative 10.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:22:42

Mhm.

Okay.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:22:45

I don't think so. Those are all inline ponds and so forth. They're box cover. They go to Gulfport ponds. I don't.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:52

It, it's there's a...

There's one.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:22:57

And then that people call.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:22:57

I think Stephen was thinking that maybe Shingle Tree Swamp might come pretty close to the right away of US 17.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:01

Yeah, that's it.

I think it does. I think it does. That was what I was thinking about.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:23:06

Okay.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:23:08

Yeah, that that's something we need to we need to check out, Mason, so I'll get on to that and let you know where we end up with that.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:23:12

Okay.

Yes, sir. Thank you, Steven.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:23:18

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:18

So shingle tree, that was the, that's the string where we had the concern, right?

The.

Yeah.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:23:26

Yes.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:23:27

Yeah, previously we identified Shingle Tree Swamp and Kaka Swamp as AECs, but not throughout the whole area. So we just need to determine where the AEC jurisdiction ends for Shingle Tree Swamp.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:32

Yes.

Yeah, correct. Yeah.

Yeah, yeah, and we do have a crossing shingle tree with.

Alternative stand.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:23:47

Yeah, I think it's an existing double-barrel box culvert.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:23:47

And.

Thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:56

But yeah, heard you, Kathy, we can, we'll add that, take that line to the table as well.

Ohh...

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:24:11

No.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:24:13

All right, I'm going to just run through the concurrent form just to make sure that these names, that we have the correct names for everybody, that they're still valid.

This is based off the CP2A, always five years ago. So we've got Matt.

Jerry Jordan.

So.

Holly.

which was Hannah.

Kathy Brittingham, Travis Wilson.

We gotta have one instead of Renee now.

We had Elizabeth Johnson for South Carolina HBO. Is that, Mary, will you be signing that now or?

SM **Sherrer, Mary** 1:25:03

Yeah, I need to check with Elizabeth on that. I think she may still sign it, but I don't think she was on this call, but I'll go over what we talked about. I'm sure she'll get the minutes. If that needs to change, I'll let you know, but I think it will still be Elizabeth.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:25:18

OK, great. Thank you. And then we had Krista for NCDIT. I'm assuming that Brian. Brian. OK.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:25:23

Now they Brian Hardy now.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:25:28

It is for South Carolina.

Does it stay?

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:25:31

Leah, happy Stacey Johnson.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:34

Stacey Johnson now. Okay. And then we have Ann Siv Travis in South Carolina.

HJ

Harding, Brian J 1:25:36

I hope.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:42

Um...

Oh yeah?

Do we still go with you for EPA in South Carolina?

SA

Somerville, Amanetta 1:25:51

Yes.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:52

Ah.

And then...

SA

Singh-White, Alya 1:25:54

Yes, I'm still a contact for South on South Carolina side, yeah.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:56

Okay.

For the US Fish and Wildlife in South Carolina, we had Thomas McCoy. I wasn't sure if there was anybody on here.

For South Carolina, that one, Jessica.

HR

Hinson, Jessica R 1:26:12

Yeah, it'd be Jessica Henson now. Thomas McCoy is no longer with the South Carolina field office.

HS

Headrick, Hannah S 1:26:20

Thanks, Jessica.

Lisa, would you be the NOAA Fisheries signatory?

No.

We did have Twila, but I don't believe she's...

LW **Lisa Wickliffe (NMFS HCD)** 1:26:33

Am I the only one here from Noah? I'm wondering.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:26:36

I think so.

LW **Lisa Wickliffe (NMFS HCD)** 1:26:40

I was just seeing if Noah Silverman was here. He would be probably the person that you would want to get at this point. But yes, I'm just here from the Habitat Conservation Division and from that standpoint, yes.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:26:42

Gotcha.

Thank you.

And then we had Myra Reese from DHEC.

Do we have another? Will that be Myra or is there another signature?

Yeah.

CS **Christopher M. Stout** 1:27:17

That would stay, Myra, and we can shoot you. Since the last one, our agency split, so DHEC doesn't exist anymore, but it would be Department of Environmental Services. So, she's our director.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:27:32

Eric.

And then, Chris, you're also...

Not signatories.

CS **Christopher M. Stout** 1:27:39

I would, yeah, I would get switched out for Benjamin Tapo. I can put his name in the chat if that's helpful. I think at the time we did all of this in 2019, I was over our

coastal zone consistency section. I've since been promoted, but I'm filling in for Benjamin.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:27:50
I...

CS **Christopher M. Stout** 1:28:00
on this meeting today, but that would be his signature there.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28:11
Then we have Chuck Tower.
Bureau of Water, is that still Bureau of Water, Chuck, and...

CH **Charles W. Hightower** 1:28:19
Yeah, yes it is.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28:21
And within DES now.

CH **Charles W. Hightower** 1:28:26
Yes.
Yes, pure water with DES.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28:33
Gotcha. Maggie Jamison with DNR.

LR **Lorianne Riggin** 1:28:38
So Maggie is now with TNC Virginia. So put down myself for the signatory on that one.
Lorian Brigglin.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28:55
Uh, and then...
GSAT, MBO.

Correct.

From the uh, Chris Clark, potentially.

CG **Chris Clark, GSATS** 1:29:07

Yes.

Yes, I would be the signatory for G-sense.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:29:13

At the county.

Ford County.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:29:18

David Gilruth.

County.

And would they deal with? It'd be Dave Gilruth.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:29:25

Sorry.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:29:30

Can you get on the chat and give them that name? They'll put their name and e-mail address in the chat for you, Morgan.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:29:40

Thank you.

And finally, the Cape Fear RPO, and that is, is that everybody? That's everybody you gave for me last one. Yeah.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:29:54

This is Kathy Brittingham. I didn't hear you mention Division of Marine Fisheries, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. And I just wanted to say I have a note in my file from 2019 that they were going to coordinate through DCM up until about CP3. But I just wondering if you invited them to this meeting and if there's been in the update to their comments since 2019.

I don't need an answer now on that. It's just kind of a reminder and I'm sorry I didn't look into it myself before today.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:30:32

Look, we're looking at that right now, Kathy and the list.
I don't remember off the top of my head. I don't recall.
But we can definitely follow up with them.
Canceled it. Do you have the rules of the? Oh, it's on.
I don't have access to it.
Our list, I know.
Included.
I don't believe they work.
Not North Carolina.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:31:31

No, I don't see them on the invitee list.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:31:41

Well, maybe that Morgan and I can communicate with them after today. I think we've done that on another project that worked out pretty well.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:31:48

Hey, Kathy, who would that be? Who was?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:31:51

The Charlie Deaton is the now the Habitat Section Manager, and Derek Detweiler is the DMF representative in the southern area.
I can, I can send you their contact information if you like.

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

It's on our agency contact map as well. Yeah, it's very early there. Yeah, he is.
After 20.
I'm almost wanting to think they may have pulled out.
Because they didn't have an issue, something.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:32:31

Yeah, there's not any coastal waters or joint waters in the project limits, so I don't see why we've had this going back and forth about even if no one needed to be involved because there's no P&As, not even on alternative 8. So I think that's what happened is they just didn't have jurisdiction or any resources in this project.
Bowed out.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:32:52

Okay.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:32:55

Mason, I think you're correct. I think I run across an e-mail when I was just going back through this project from Kurt Weickert that basically said that.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:32:59

So.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:33:06

I think I'm on the right project. I don't think I'm getting that confused.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:33:10

Good.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:33:11

Yeah.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:33:12

If someone finds that e-mail, if they can, if they can forward it to me, I'll just add it to our file so we'll know that moving forward.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:33:22

Alright, I'll look at mine and see if I got anything.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:33:24

I don't think I have it in mine.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:33:29

Yeah, and I'll, yeah, I'll do the same. I might have some records.

All right. Well, thank you all. We will send out the meeting minutes and then congratulations.

HJ **Harding, Brian J** 1:33:46

All right, thank you everybody. Appreciate y'all's time and effort on this.

Good job, Eric.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:33:52

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:33:53

Thanks. All right. Thanks, everybody. Appreciate everybody's participation.

HS **Haley A. Smarr** 1:33:59

Thank you. Have a good day.

AE **Ann Eaddy** 1:33:59

Thank you.

SJ **Scott Jones** 1:34:01

Thank you.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:34:02

Thanks guys, bye bye.

SA **Singh-White, Alya** 1:34:02

Thank you.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription