

R-5889 CP2 & 2A - US 29 Upgrade to Interstate - Guilford County (Division 7)-20260722_100504-Meeting Recording

July 22, 2026, 2:05PM

47m 43s

● **Harville, Katie E** started transcription

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 0:03

Your your time today before we get into.

Projects in detail, I want to go through introduction.

So why don't we start with folks?

Hey Harville, NCDOT environmental policy unit.

Rob Wrightings division water resources.

Josh Loman, division seven, the engineer.

Division Seven project team lead.

So then I'm at the division seven project meeting.

Does Charter de Berry runway design?

Both Smyr Dewberry, project manager and Dewberry environmental planner.

Brett Faulner, DeBary engineer survival scientist Eric Goldsmire, Corps of Engineers.

Policy unit.

All right.

And then for the folks on the front, I'm just going to go through an order that I'm seeing you on the screen. So Marissa?

CR **Cox, Marissa R** 1:02

Good morning. Marissa Cox, Environmental policy unit.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 1:07

James Gates.

YB **Yates, James B** 1:11

James Yates, Division seven senior PM.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 1:17
And Ed.

LF Lewis (Volkert), Edward F 1:19
Ed Lewis, Division seven, project delivery.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 1:23
Gary.

JG Jordan, Gary 1:26
Gary Jordan, US Fish and Wildlife Service Raleigh field office.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 1:32
Amanetta.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 1:34
Good morning, everyone.
This is Amanetta Somerville with EPA Region 4.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 1:39
Travis.

WW Wilson, Travis W. 1:42
Travis Wilson, NC Wildlife Resources Commission.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 1:47
Brian Kettner.

KK Ketner, Brian K 1:50
Brian Kettner.
Provision 7. Project development engineer.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 1:54
Christine.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 1:57
Christine Farrell, Environmental policy unit.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 2:01
Next.

LC **Lineberger, Nicholas C** 2:04
Nick Lineberger congestion management.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 2:08
Mark.

SK **Staley, Mark K** 2:11
This is Mark Staley.
NCDUT right side of our middle unit.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 2:16
Michael.

AR **Abuya, Michael R** 2:24
Yeah, Michael Avuia transportation Planning division NC dot.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 2:30
Dan.

DC **Duffield, Dan C** 2:32
Dan Duffield, NCDAT hydraulics unit.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 2:36
Andrew.

HA **Hayden, Andrea** 2:39
Dewberry hydraulics. Andrea Hayden.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 2:43
In our team representative Federal Highway clearance.

CC Coleman, Clarence (FHWA) 2:49
Hi, Beth, this is Clarence Coleman, Federal Highway administration.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 2:54
And apologize if I mispronounce it ronick.

MR Mishra, Raunak 2:59
Yeah. Ronak Mishra. Greensboro, MPONDOT.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 3:05
Nashawn.

SM Shah, Nishant M 3:07
Hey everyone.
Nishant Sharp, project delivery, division seven.

CT Cao, Luan T 3:17
Morning lungao with the state Historic Preservation Office.

PP Padilla, Peter 3:25
Padilla de Berry traffic.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 3:29
Hey Cortana.
In Montgomery share my screen here.
OK.
So again, we were talking about AUS 29 improvements.
This is project R5889 in Gilford and Rockingham counties.
We last spoke last September about concurrence .1 so, and I know we've got a couple new folks on the team and working on the project, so we'll do a little bit of background before we get into concurrence. 22. We also wanted to do a two and.

Two a meeting today due to the scope of the project.

And we'll talk about that in more detail.

Just real quick that sorry, go for it. Does any of our murder team have anything to they want to address up front? Yes.

Or the project.

Sorry. Nice to meet you.

No, Clarence, you got anything you need to bring up right off the bat?

CC Coleman, Clarence (FHWA) 4:54

No, just of course Seth is will be the representative from federal highways and he's on. He's on leave for the next couple this week and next week.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 5:06

Wonderful. Thank you. All right, Ben.

Yeah, and rules.

CC Coleman, Clarence (FHWA) 5:08

Mm-hmm.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 5:10

I check just after introductions, I think the only one we're missing is someone from the MPO, Tyler Meyer.

I think we got a representative.

OK.

So officially on the virtual do we not have someone from the NPO?

It's on Knoxville. Oh, OK.

MR Mishra, Raunak 5:33

Yeah, I am here.

I'm here from the Greensboro MPO. Yeah.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 5:36

Perfect. Thank you.

Got you.

Alright, so as a reminder, R 5889, these are proposed upgrades to the US 29 corridor

in Guilford and Rockingham counties.

This is starting just north of I-75I-40 in Guilford County and ending just over the US 158 MC 14 interchange in Rocky Hill County.

This is divided into two sections.

The dividing line is just on the north side of the NC 150 interchange.

The project is included in the step section. A is funded, but B is funded for preliminary engineering only.

We will do one document for the entire project, so it will cover both sections.

As we talked about back in September, this is essentially it's an Interstate upgrade.

Project so the the needs for this work to accommodate access provisions for what is expected to be a high growth in traffic.

This is also intended to ensure that the project complies with local and state plans.

Forties 29 corridor. This is a strategic transportation corridor for the region. So the purpose that was agreed upon back in September was to.

The project is to enhance regional mobility.

Along US 29 between Greensboro and Reedville by implementing improvements that are consistent with current Interstate standards.

We also presented the project study area at that time and no changes have been made to it since then.

So as and we got into this a bit at the end of the purpose and need discussion. Again, this is an Interstate upgrade project and it's with this type of project you have to do everything that's required to meet Interstate standards.

You can just do part of it. You got to do one else.

Everything that's required for nothing.

So we're really proposing only one build alternative at this point and we'll walk through what's involved in it in a moment.

But essentially this is going to involve the removal of.

Any unsignalized intersections and removing any driveway access and U turns that are currently on the corridor to accommodate those property owners. We have a series of 13 service roads that are proposed.

This is also going to involve the installation of guardrail and widening shoulders along main line US 29 and there is a partial reconfiguration of the NC 150 interchange that will affect access at that location.

We are not adding lanes to this.

We're not adding capacity as part of this project.

We did do a mainline analysis traffic analysis of the corridor and it was determined there was no auxiliary lanes were going to be needed.

Everything was functioning at a satisfactory level of service along the whole corridor, so the additional lanes were not required.

So this is primarily addition of service roads to provide access to properties that are going to lose direct access to US 29.

As well as guardrail and.

Shoulder windings to meet Interstate standards.

So I'm going to switch and Zack.

All right. So within the merger packet, Figure 3, we created detailed alternative map for the showcasing some of the needed changes.

For for the project. So within this figure we have the proposed service roads.

And the service roads previously and CP1 go from High Cone Rd.

In the South all the way to US 29 business.

We highlighted where the pave shoulder needs to be extended between Icon Road and Reed Park.

Way summit Ave.

The shoulder needs to be extended 6 feet in the median and 12 feet outside from there to.

He was 29 business.

It needs to be extended 6 feet in the median and 10 feet outside.

We also tried in this map to highlight where guardrail is needed.

There's a section of guardrail needed here between road and Reedy Creek Parkway slash Summit Ave.

And then there's some guardrail needed between.

Creek Parkway, Summit Ave. and the North Carolina.

UH-150 interchange we highlighted where the NC 150 ramp reconfiguration is in general what what it will look like.

And then besides this, there are 39 accrate interceptions that that will be removed, as Beth said.

Quickly just sort of scroll through the detailed alternative map to sort of showcase where where everything is.

And the service Rd. improvements and really the the actual improvements really end at the US 29 business interchange in Rockingham County.

North of that, the order is already the Interstate standards, so we've not proposed

any additional service roads along that stretch.

It's really just going to that US 29 business.

So that's why this map just goes up to there, since there wouldn't be anything north of that.

And we have, as Zach said, there are 13 service roads that we put in that we numbered 2 through 14 and I like the first one. So if you hear us call that you're wondering where #1 is.

We dropped that, but we've kept the rest of the number and just to project history. You wanna share it?

I'll go back to that.

The private teams calculated the build alternative impacts to.

Due to the build alternative, so for stream impacts there was 1988 feet across 14 stream crossings. Wetlands there was 0.2671 acres across 6 wetland crossings.

There's one direct impact on 100 year flood plain floodway crossing and at Sandy Creek, which will discuss more in a CPQA section.

Was 9.3 acres.

There was no known occurrences of detected species.

The build alternative did not impact any managed areas within the project study area.

There's no water supply watershed.

No water supply, critical area or EMS facilities.

The build alternative impacted 50.45 acres of prime farmland farmland, so statewide importance and then.

Yeah, and this with the alternative impacts could be found within the mercury packet as table.

Three to build alternative did not impact any voluntary agricultural districts. The build alternative impacted had two access impacts to places of worship and then one parcel, but not the structure was impacted and that was a greater stepping stone church and that was for service Road Three 100.

And 50 parcels required access reevaluation.

107 parcels were impacted by the service roads with around 14 residential structures impacted.

And seven business structures impacted.

We're still waiting to get the impacts for them due to noise, the traffic noise analysis is scheduled to have a draft completed in December.

And then the final in February on our latest schedule.

There were five new environmental sites with access impacted.

These were the Southern plastic engineering, the CGR products, the sheets, Lacie Allred farm subdivision, the QMG and QMG Enterprises.

And that can be seen in the environmental features map, which was Figure 4 within the merger packet.

No recreational areas or parks were impacted.

No concert.

Patient easements were impacted by the build alternative and then?

The current stage 1 historic property is impacted, which is the Tinsley handmade furniture and antiques that's directly impacted by Service Road 11, but we're in the process of designing.

Of updating the design to alleviate that impact.

Do you have?

Tell me maps in the appendix we have 96 streams and seven wetlands within the project study area.

6 main streams.

No high quality waters.

We do have one stream that's on the 2022 three and 3D list and the majority of you go within the Cape Here River basin.

Next week, I think you guys are going out to clarify.

To verify the delineation.

I don't know if you're gonna need a separate one with DWR.

I think we would need to because you guys are gonna wanna make terminations on stream call. Since we're a buffer base. And yes, So what? After you go through the streams and wetlands, the delineation, what I would suggest is you could.

With buffers, anything that's on the top of a soil bed that's covered anything that's not not you go through those, and if you see specific ones that.

Need to be kicked out because yes, we go and thank them so we could definitely narrow it down to get the ones that were say are not there.

Yeah, who knows? You might only have a few. Got all of that. There's at least a few.

Yeah. Yeah, so.

Saying I think for the three and three BI think it was too realistic.

Oh, there were two.

Yeah, I think it's troublesome Creek for.

Copper, yeah.

So wanted to pause it there and answer any questions you have about the alternative that we have as of today.

So again it's it's one build alternative that we're proposing.

We realized we have yet to go to the public with these with this option, with the service roads we anticipate getting comments on the location of the service areas.

We still need to go through the section 106 effects process.

We do have one property that we know we're impacting as of right now.

That we're going to look at options to avoid that impact.

And then we'll continue to try to look for ways to minimize impacts to streams and wetlands on report.

So no, we still have some things to do.

We anticipated this being more of a for a conversation, but it seems like 22A but want to know at this point.

What feedback do you have?

What concerns do you have?

I do have a few questions.

Would you be able to pull up the environmental features maps?

Yeah, let me. Let's get to it and I'll share.

Next, it's right there.

Do you know what page page three? I'm sorry.

Just asking about the proposed mountains to sea trail that's on there.

I guess that that doesn't have anything to do with the project, right?

That's just correct.

They're proposing to to put it a different place.

Mm-hmm. Is it?

Does it connect back to?

The existing trail on the eastern end? Or is it just where they got it proposed?

I think so.

In this section it does. I think West of the project in connects, there's another proposed.

Section of the mountain to Sea Trail that's on the Haw River and that will then connect on the east side.

So I think there on their plans, they're still figuring out which which way they wanna go.

So is I guess that right now there's no accommodation for crossing US 29.

For that, there's no culvert or anything.

OK, that's not being considered at all for this, but it's crossing at the existing Summit Ave. interchanges, right?

Yeah, that's exactly crossing right.

Mm-hmm. OK.

And then also on Page 3.

The service Rd.

At Eckerson Rd.

But I think you you move that a little bit because that wysong and miles planned and I'm just wondering about that that streams on the east side of Eckerson Rd. looks like.

You'd have potential for parallel impact where you're connecting that service Rd. in.

And I know it's early in design and all that, but.

I guess if it could be that could be avoided.

Making sure that we're not.

Heading towards something with this, with the alternative we're looking at for that service Rd.

I think that, yeah, we can definitely take a look at that. The challenges on the other side, we're trying to pull it off the historic property, right, so and it's so we pulled it into actually some homes along that side of the road too, so but we'll take.

A look at it OK.

And next on page 4.

And this is just the first example of of several places where you've got tributaries of the parallel existing 29.

And got the service road is right there next to it.

Do you anticipate you're gonna be able to avoid it? Was parallel impacts on that one?

Connection. Yeah, in the bottom right of the of the. Yeah, on the.

We got it pulled as close as we can to the existing portal, or we'll look at see if we can pull it.

As much as we can off of that.

OK.

There's other examples on.

Let's see.

OK. East Side on page 10, the West side.

And both sides actually on page 13.

But I'm not sure if that's service Rd.

That may just be the main line.

Yeah.

Got pitched down.

Yeah, that's not not a service room there.

So yeah, I wasn't sure.

When I was first looking at this, I I wasn't sure about if the there was gonna be any changes to the existing US 29, but you find that there's really not gonna be accepted that.

Yeah, interchange business interchange now.

Yeah. OK.

Yeah, I would.

I would second the concern on any time you got one of those running parallel. Yeah, to give them as much space as possible.

Exactly. Great.

It's a stability issue. Even if you don't actually affect the stream, you'll have parallel buffers, which is a large amount of mitigation required so.

And then the last thing I have is.

Page 9.

On friendship Church Rd.

Near the middle of everything.

Middle I guess.

The bottom left of where the.

Study area is.

You got the service road coming in there right next to that tributary.

And just want to make sure that we can.

Avoid parallel impacts to that as well.

Yeah.

Page number is this.

Friendship church.

It's like 4 screens and a wet with all cluster, yeah.

And that's that's it for me.

Other than that, I don't have any issues with the.

Alternatives.

Anyone on the phone? Any questions?

If not y'all want to go ahead and do a preliminary concurrence on.

The CP2.

That OK with everybody.

Meeting preliminary as far as, yeah, just verbal. Verbal, right? Yeah.

All righty, looking at the concurrence point #2 sheet, I don't see any ages that need to be made.

Does anybody else have any revisions to the concurrent sheet?

Are we good to get some burger?

Four engineers.

EPA.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 24:09
PPA concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 24:11
You said to wildlife.

JG **Jordan, Gary** 24:15
The US Fish and Wildlife Service concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 24:19
DWR.

MT **Meyer, Tyler** 24:24
Yes, the NPO concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 24:26
Chippo.

CT **Cao, Luan T** 24:28
Ship open cursed.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 24:30
Fhwa.

CC Coleman, Clarence (FHWA) 24:32
Yes, incurs.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 24:34
Answer dot.
And Wildlife Resources committee.

KK Ketner, Brian K 24:41
Get a cursed.

WW Wilson, Travis W. 24:44
WRC concurs.

AR Abuya, Michael R 24:49
TPD concurs.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 24:56
Is there a minister at the end?
Location planning. Oh, OK.
Thank you.
Beth, do you want to move forward with 2A now? Yes.
And a quick question, I know you said at the beginning of the presentation that the intention is to do one you need the document for the whole project.
What type of document?
Good.
So we have 4 concurrence .2 a.
We have one.
What is considered major hydraulic crossing?
This is the area we were just talking about.
This crosses can be Creek at the US 29 business interchange.
This is a nine page nine of Figure 3, Figure 4 concerned.

And the details of this are in the packet, the recommendation.

And this was our job recommendation to dot. I know we've gotten some pretty bad since then.

But this was for it's basically we're recommending a solar not recommending a bridge at this point due to the size and location of the crossing.

Andrea, anything to add to that based on the feedback that we've received from dot?

HA Hayden, Andrea 26:30

I think the only feedback we have really received was just the concern about widening out the stream. So as we went into design, we would definitely be looking at creating high flow and low flow barrels so that you know we are not then Whiting it out across all.

3 barrels.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 26:59

Any questions or concerns with that proposal?

Everybody in line is good with that.

I hear it.

JG Jordan, Gary 27:23

Yes.

WW Wilson, Travis W. 27:25

Yes.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 27:25

Yes.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 27:27

Very good.

Thanks guys. OK.

Well, then we'll just do a quick verbal rundown again for concurrence. .2 A and just making sure folks.

Table 6.

Is right.

All right. Corbin here. Kirk, US EPA.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 27:50
EPA concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 27:51
U.S. special wildlife.

JG **Jordan, Gary** 27:56
US Fish and Wildlife Service concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 28:00
NCDWR, yes.
NPO.

MT **Meyer, Tyler** 28:06
Yes, the appeal concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 28:08
Ripal.
All right. We'll come back to Len FHWA.

CC **Coleman, Clarence (FHWA)** 28:23
Yes, concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 28:25
COT, yes.
WRC.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 28:30
WRC concurs.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 28:33
And we had TPD.

AR **Abuya, Michael R** 28:38

DPD contrast.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 28:40

Alright. And then back around Shippo Llan, can you hear us?

Yes. Did we hear Gary?

Yes, Gary, we heard you.

People are asking.

But in fact.

Let's see. I wonder if we lost.

CR **Cox, Marissa R** 29:09

I think he's it might be his audio 'cause. He looks unmuted, but we can't hear him.

B **Boiling Springs Conference Room** 29:15

Yeah. OK.

Oh yeah, this question.

Oh, he's he's just misleading now. He maybe having some issue.

He'll probably.

He'll probably pop back on.

I just got him message it said Internet bad and all caps.

We'll just give him this a second on that.

And since that was easy peasy.

We should expect the concurrence forms to go out by a DocuSign.

Yeah, within about a week.

Sounds good with everybody.

And we have had we have noted that we've had some some troubles. Our federal agency partners.

So the firewalls and things have been not allowing the notifications from to get to them.

And so we we'll send an e-mail out first.

Yeah, saying that that's coming into y'all. Great. Thanks.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 30:25

This this is amanetta with epai know, sometimes you guys add your documents to connect. EPA can't we don't have access to connect. So if you could just include the PDF that'd be fantastic.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 30:39

Are you accessing them via the exercise as well?

SA Somerville, Amanetta 30:45

Yes, I can access it on the extra site.

It's just our firewall is so secure we can't get to your connect.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 30:49

Yeah.

Sometimes I prefer expert too.

We will do that amaneta. Thank you.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 31:00

Thank you.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 31:04

Gary's back.

Got one back yet? Looks like it.

CT Cao, Luan T 31:10

Yep, I'm here.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 31:11

All right, Lauren, we just need to know if you concur with two.

CT Cao, Luan T 31:16

Shippuku's.

B Boiling Springs Conference Room 31:17

Cute.

Already, Beth, do you want to?

Just give us a brief mention on the next.

Potential.

CP schedule.

Next step for steps for us is we're gonna start rolling this out to the public.

We're gonna try to meet with some stakeholders first later this summer, just to mainly at the county and city levels, just to introduce and roll out the proposed service roads because we know these are gonna drive a lot of public comments for the residents on corridor. So we're.

Gonna meet with them first and then schedule a public meeting.

Likely one in each county just to get and make sure we reach the maximum number of people.

This is already driven several comments in the brief time that we've had the website up, so we know we're going to get interest within that and that could drive some changes to the service rates when before we meet again.

So we know that's potentially coming.

We anticipate then, after the public meetings have been held, coming back for and we're recommending combining CP3 and 4A because again 4 is going to be the real discussion here and we'd like to do that by the end of this year.

Beth, regarding the public involvement, you will need to make sure you get the core language in those in your public notices and handouts for that.

And if you got any questions about that, let me know.

But it's in the merger documents. Yeah, I think in the specifically in the public involvement.

Appendix. Whatever it is I tried, I tried to look it up, but that's when.

The.

SharePoint list down so.

Convenient timing there, yeah.

Thank you, Beth.

I think I think just last real quick, our overall schedule, like I said right away for Section 8, that's the only section that is funded is right on 2027.

I think that maybe shifting a.

Yeah, and the B section still funded for P.

Thank you, Beth.

Does anybody have any final questions, thoughts, concerns?

I guess LAN.

It's good what they do in Stratford in no, he already concurrent multilateral.
We got it.
All right.
Well, that's it.
I have one question for Eric.
And like our visit next week, does it change anything here?
No, no. OK.
No, it's pretty clear about the that crossing.
So OK.
Yeah, this I don't.
I'm not gonna have any questions about that.
I need to feel OK on the two way.
Yeah, yeah. I mean, the pictures give a pretty good view of.
The size.
Good question. Thanks.
I was just.
I know that our order probably wasn't the best as far as getting that out so.
On our on our end. Sorry, it's fine.
All right.
Well, thank you fellas.
And we will let you all have the rest of your morning back. Thank you. Thanks everybody.

 **Somerville, Amanetta** 34:51
Thank you.

 **Cox, Marissa R** 34:51
Thanks Sean.

 **Coleman, Clarence (FHWA)** 34:52
Thank you.

 **Coleman, Clarence (FHWA)** 34:52
Appreciate it.

CR **Cox, Marissa R** 34:53
Thanks Katie. Thanks, Hannah.

AR **Abuya, Michael R** 34:57
Thank you.

● **Harville, Katie E** stopped transcription