U-5901 CP 2A Meeting-20251015_130322-Meeting Recording

October 15, 2025, 5:03PM

1h 30m 15s

Headrick, Hannah S started transcription

Jamison, John 0:03

One that I didn't get to eat 30 minutes ago.
And you're talking.
All right.
So.
Everybody can hear us.
Sounds like we can hear y'all.
Katie, can you double check me that we can hear y'all in the room? We had a couple computers on there.

Harville, Katie E 0:24

Yeah, we can hear you all pretty good.
Can you hear me?

Jamison, John 0:26

OK.
Yep. Thank you.
All right.
Well, I'm already talking.
We're here for you.
Pick 901 CB 2A.
We can run around the room here and introduce ourselves. Those that are online, Jon Jamison with dot environmental policy.
Seth will turn up Federal Highway Division nine, Eric Sallard dot Hydrox. Beg pardon.
DEQ 41, transportation permitting.
David Bakker, MP5 Hydraulics, Eric Midkiff MV5 and Hendrick DATEPE.
And run through those online so everybody knows who is here.

And I'll say your name then say where I think your problem y'all feel free to unmute and say something. I'll go ahead.

Blanton, William A 1:18

OK, Al Blanton, the project team lead in Division 9, Winston Salem.

Jamison, John 1:25

Thanks, al.

OT.

Cao, Luan T 1:29

Yep, lung out state historic preservation office.

Jamison, John 1:33

President score.

CI

Chris Inscore 1:35

Hey, Chris. Ens score Envy 5.

Jamison, John 1:39

What part of Indy 5 are you covering?

You push technical err.

CI

Chris Inscore 1:43

I I leave the ecology group and I sit and carry.

Jamison, John 1:46

Well, thanks Chris. Marissa.

Cox, Marissa R 1:51

Marissa Cox EPO.

Jamison, John 1:55

And mark entries.

Endries, Mark 1:58
Hey, Mark Andrews, US Fish and Wildlife service here in Asheville, NC.

Jamison, John 2:05
Hey, mark.
Let's see. Eric's in the room, Katie.

Harville, Katie E 2:12
Katie Harville EPU.

Jamison, John 2:16
Jared Mathis.

Jared Mathis 2:19
Yes, Jared Mathis, City of Salisbury.
Hope everybody's doing well.

Jamison, John 2:25
Good to see you injured.
Can 40.

John Conforti 2:30
John can 40 MV five. I'm with the planning unit with Eric Metcalf.

Jamison, John 2:36
Johnny banks.

Johnny Banks 2:40
Envy 5 roadway.

Jamison, John 2:44
Dave McHenry.

McHenry, David G 2:47
Dave McHenry, Western dot coordinator for wildlife resources.

Jamison, John 2:56
Ed, your backyard sharp knives.

Muire, Ed D. 3:01
That's it.
Ed Muir, Rowan County planning department.

Jamison, John 3:06
All right, Bryan nickel.

Newcomb, Ryan C 3:11
Ryan Newcomb, division nine.

Jamison, John 3:16
Find project spandrel. Brian is processing out the project manager for the sake of this meeting.

Newcomb, Ryan C 3:22
Yeah, processing out.

Jamison, John 3:25
All right.

Newcomb, Ryan C 3:25
I'm here for the sake of the meeting, but now the division traffic engineer for Division Nine.

Jamison, John 3:29
Oh, Congrats, Ryan.
Amanetta.

Somerville, Amanetta 3:36
I'm anetta Somerville with the EPA Region 4.

Jamison, John 3:40
And Steve?

Steve Brumagin 3:44
Good afternoon, everyone.
This is Steve Brommagen from the Corps of Engineers up down here in Charlotte.

Jamison, John 3:51
Wayne Miller.

Wendy Miller 3:52
Representing the Cabarrus.

Jamison, John 3:57
And Kaylee.

Yankura, Kaylie 3:59
Hey, it's Kaylee and Quora.
I'm with DWR with the transportation permitting branch covering divisions 9:00 and 11:00.

Jamison, John 4:11
Right. I think we covered everybody.
Anybody that didn't get introduced, you want the last second.
We got Jordan Sanchez here just walking in the room with DNT environment policy as well.
Alright, let's see.
Steve, do you have anything to start off with? Is the core there and say first words or anything?

Steve Brumagin 4:41

Well, good afternoon everyone.
Yeah, not a whole lot to say.
We're here this week.
Have some funding through Friday.
Not sure what's gonna happen after that, but I'm here today and we'll see how that goes.

Jamison, John 4:56

Thanks for being with us and hope for the best there, Steve.
Anything Seth on your end, Peter rabbit?
No, I think hopefully the the the early word in here today was just going to be a good meeting and nothing too controversial.
So hopefully that that stays true and it's not that wasn't the kiss of death.
So we'll find out in a second.
Alright, sounds good.
Do you run this?
Err Yep, I can run it.
Yep. Oh yes, perfect.
Yeah. Alright. You got anything to say?
Disappointed towards you, Ryan?
I don't know if you heard that anything from the division point of view.

Newcomb, Ryan C 5:39

I did not, but hopefully everyone was able to review the information.
I know we worked with Eric and his team to try to get the packet to you all in time.
Hopefully it is pretty straightforward.
And I will add that hopefully we get concurrence today and we have our public meeting scheduled for November 5th as we continue to work towards selecting the lead, but hopefully hopefully.
In early 2026 and so yes, I hopefully, Seth, you didn't do like when you say a field goal kicker hasn't missed one inside of 40 yards as he's about to attempt a 35 yarder.
But hopefully it goes smoothly today and we can reach concurrent.
So thank y'all.

Jamison, John 6:37

Yeah. Take it from here to heaven. You share your screen or anything.
All right.
Hey everybody.
Eric Metcalf, thanks again for attending the meeting today.
Again, I'm consulting project manager on this project with the NP5 engineers and consultants.
So I'm gonna be running through the project information today and keep it very casual. If anybody has any questions along the way, raise your hand or stop me.
I'm not gonna do a whole lot of presenting.
Here today, but what I will do right now is go over the packet.
Pretty briefly go over the materials that you have.
Make sure everybody understands everything, OK and.
Make it through, and when we're talking about the individual sites, have a A KMC, Google Earth KMC file, make a winto.
So we can kind of plug into the sites pretty pretty easily.
You see what's around there and talk about the the topics, the crossings and questions.
So starting out with the.
The meeting packet.
This is CP2 conference point 2A.
So we we will be discussing bridging or hydraulic structure recommendations at the major crossings and also reviewing the the alignment and just moving along with.
The.
Points in the packet really briefly talked about the meeting purpose. The project just for everybody here.
I think we're all pretty familiar with it. It's the.
New route from Jake Alexander Blvd. To to Pila Rd. in Salisbury.
The route is known as the Airport Parkway.
It's about a three and a half mile long project.
Depending on the alternatives, mainly a new location alignment, two lane facility with bicycle pedestrian accommodations, and.
Uses a little bit of existing roadway out there, but mainly on new location alignment and wanna come up to before we get too far. You see a couple changes there.
Seth is Federal Highway administration kind of new to the project.
Taking over from the FHWA and Steve, Steve and Kaylee still with us, Ryan, as you

just heard, is moving on to bigger and better things.
Believe Al Blatt and will be taking over his contact on that. Or is Amy?
I'm not sure in terms of merger team, but Julia Gotcha I still.
Amy, still her. And.
So, and I'm still real too.
Within 5 so update on the agency contacts and project is going through the full merger process and the packet we have the cost estimates.
I believe this is based on one of the alternatives, alternative one. If I remember right, the cost estimates will be updated for all the alternatives.
That are under investigation and we'll have that information available at the CP3 meeting when we're taking the lamp up a little bit about the project schedule. We've had CP1 and CP2.
Those occurred in 2024, if you remember.
We had a little bit of an update, a CP2 just a few months ago where we added the altern.
Atives 6 and 6A.
We did that through just three emails.
Verification. So I appreciate everybody's quick support on that and we're able to add that alternative in very quickly.
We didn't have to have a meeting, so thank you to the team on that.
And today we're at CP2A bridging decisions.
As Ryan noted, we do have a public meeting scheduled since this packet was completed.
We've actually changed the date.
About it's day earlier.
It's actually going to be on November 5th.
Be glad to send anyone the public hearing, public meeting information or calendar just brought me a line in the chat or let me know and I can forward that information to you if you'd like to attend that, we'd be glad to have you. Anybody who would like to.
The following that we'll be coming up with the concurrence .3 meeting. We'll choose the have the leadpa selection.
We're looking at that in early 2/20/26.
Hope hope, hopefully February and then.
The document is type 3C.

He and will be publishing that, completing that later in the year in September of 2026.
Right away, acquisition getting in 27, construction in 30.
That sort of tip dates.
Continuing on just a little bit of information on the previous concurrence points, if you like to see those packets.
There hear anything about that?
Just let me know.
Then we come to the.
The Water resources information.
So the jurisdictional streams of wetlands have been located, delineated in study area.
Those are all shown.
State what you got.

Steve Brumagin 12:39
Yeah, I I just.
I I feel like maybe I was a little too quick on the trigger there. Sorry, Eric, I.

Jamison, John 12:47
Eric and Marcus.

Steve Brumagin 12:51
I just at this point I just wanted to make sure everyone knew that kind of where we are with this right now and and if I'm stealing your Thunder, I apologize.
You know that that the waters have been delineated and a delineation, a jurisdiction, a jurisdictional.
Preliminary jurisdictional determination has been submitted to the to this office.
And we're still working on.
Getting out there to look at them and make a determination on on what waters are there.
One of the the things that we've developed a little bit over the past year or two with some of the lawsuits.
Is.
That read or wonder if there's.
Together, it hasn't happened yet, but we're well on the way and you know, I think the

the waters that are included in here have all been delineated at this point. And and I just want to make sure there wasn't any confusion with the word jurisdiction.

Jamison, John 14:04

Very well put, Steve. Thank you.

SB

Steve Brumagin 14:04

I'll.

Ah.

Jamison, John 14:13

Yeah, you tried to put this in here at the very least. I may put it in e-mail. Everybody but link on this meeting is it?

On there.

It is.

Not OK. It's not quite there yet, but yeah. But we do have it is set up.

It's just not been advertised yet, OK.

I'll drop a link to the public input general site, yeah.

So that they can at least go there, monitor that when it does get posted. OK, cool.

Thanks.

Yup. Thanks, Steve on that.

Yeah, you did steal my Thunder.

I was gonna say that.

I was gonna say all that. Nah.

Actually, what was it?

What was you gonna say? That much about it?

But I appreciate that input, so hopefully you guys can get that meeting set up soon and you're able to dissipate and that's the.

We do have that.

Ready to go?

Concerning verification.

There were what was defined earlier there by our staff.

There's 27 streams located.

In this whole study area.

Just repeat.

There's no no designated high quality waters.
Outstanding resource waters, or water supply watersheds project area. There is Grants Creek is on the.
33D list impaired water which is in project area.
3 jurisdictional 3 wetlands were identified as well.
The the resources the jurisdictional streams are all shown in your packet and figures 3A33 E and also the characteristics of those streams in the appendix as well in table spots and six in the wetlands.
That information is also presented in the same.
And you can mix as well.
So moving on to kind of the main topic of discussion is the hydraulic nature of hydraulic structures.
So just to define that a little bit, the major hydraulic crossings are those with a contributing drainage area requiring conveyance greater than 72 inch pipe. And I think an opening equivalent to.
OK.
I'm losing it. 3030 square feet, yeah.
So that defines kind of the measure site areas that we're gonna be looking at there.
A lot of actually screen crossings among the alternatives, but there were only 8 crossings that meet the definitions here. Of the major high throughout the crossings.
So we'll be looking at each of those eight sites and talking about the recommendations that we have.
Speaking of the recommendations for the hydraulics, they are in your packet.
It in Table 3 and.
So the table here is we'll have the site number, the alternatives that impact the site across the site are listed.
The stream location the ID.
This is our ID that's held or the tables or parameters and being the study type, drainage areas noted.
For each one, and if there is an existing structure there we we named that and then we have the recommendations recommended structure at each site noted as well as the structure cost that's proposed.
And this column we have it in the potential impact column.
We have a couple different calculations here.
First of all, is slope state plus 40 feet.

Feet having a 40 feet buffer that, as you know is just kind of an exaggerated buffer at this point of the project where usually our calculations are based off of slip stakes plus 40.
So in this column we give the impact of the stream considering.
What's within slopes takes plus 40, and if that amount of stream was impacted, how much the mitigation?
Cost would be and then over in the next areas is just the slope stakes column which.
Calculations are done just on where the slope stakes lie without the buffer.
This is the more realistic.
Likely impact area at each crossing, so we get the same information. The amount of stream impacted within the slope stakes at each crossing, as well as what the mitigation costs would be.
But and moving on to the packet at each site we show a recommendation. A little bit of the reasoning.
Why that particular recommendation is made and we can answer any questions you may have about that too. As we move on. And also we have in the packet the final environmental.
The the summary of potential environmental effects.
For each alternate.
These are kind of the major kind of environmental resource categories in how each is impacted.
Again, the table here is based on.
Impact or the slip stakes plus 40 feet.
Some of these impacts are based on fuel observation. Some are just GIS observations at this point. This is a table that will be updated also.
Also helped with more specific information. When we get to concurrence .3, you'll see that and then just continuing on, we give a little bit more voidance and minimization information and underst.
And form and just want to talk about the figures real quick.
Figure one is the study vicinity map that shows the overall study corridor. That's.
Within the.
That we agreed on CP1, and we also have the figure 2 shows the alternative study corridors and we also show the major site crossings. So those are the locations of the major hydraulic structures that we're going to talk about in just a moment.
And.

We also.
Only studied the delineations. The field delineations within the 100 foot or of each alternative is that is that 100 foot or 300 feet?
The corridors are 300 feet.
OK, so the the field delineations are only based on the 300 foot corridor. For each alternative we did not go out and do the entire study area.
The corrective point, Amy.
And continue on the. This is the figure 3 that I've mentioned.
Figure 3 has the environmental features. The major hydraulic stripe sites noted, and the glideated corridors showing the slope stakes plus 40 feet.
In there as well.
The the red.
Background is indicating.
The study corridor area that Amy was just mentioning.
Roughly 300 feet, unless it's widened out and then the black lines are representing the slope stakes. Plus we feet and the color lines are the basically the center lines of the alternatives for each.
For each alternative.
So.
That Yep.
Those are the main points of the.
Packet I just. Well, let me quickly other information. I'll just show you that these are the stream tables are showing characteristics of the streams are shown here. We can refer to that for anything you want to stream wise we have the same information.
For.
The wetlands we have.
Classification the wetlands that were determined.
And the impacts of each of those, the wetlands are mainly just within.
Three and three a but I will get in one in 1A and see that as well.
And then we just, we do have some specific site information on plan sheet style mapping your appendix for a detail of each crossing.
So I'm going to go into if I can. Each individual site and we'll and I'll talk about the individual recommendations that we have and we can discuss each one of them before I go on that. There any any questions at all about the information presented in the pack.

Or anything you'd like to discuss further before we get to the next step.
And I would.
Playing a little bit bring up.
Adding this KMZ file to work that would really think it's the best way.
I am going, but Mitch is trying down there to stop.
Yeah, yeah. And I've been struggling with that for a while.
I am gonna call on.
I'm gonna call a phone friend here if I can and call on Mr. Conforti.
John, you have the KMZ file available.
Can you bring that up and I can just lead you in. Where to thank you.
2.
Alright, very nice.
OK.
Zoom in a little bit here.
On on the figure, John.
Appreciate it.
So what we're showing here is basically all the alternatives, and if you could click on on the side you got the slope stakes. Very good and.
And.
That thinks it looks like.
You have a couple alignments checked on the side.
I can't quite see.
Is that correct?

John Conforti 25:53
Yeah, looks like the slip sticks and you see alternative Carters.
Do you want any specific alternatives turned on?

Jamison, John 26:00
Yeah, we could just turn.
Yeah. Turn off the alternative 4 doors.
At the right above your. Yeah. Turn that off, OK.
So looking at the alternatives, you know this may be more difficult than a thought without me driving.
So go up toward the top right where the alternative start.

All right. And all the alternatives, if you zoom in, we're sorting off at Jake Alexander Blvd. Here and.
If.
I can see it's showing there.
What are the alternatives?
Yeah. OK.
Well, the starting out with the alternative one, it's near the we're covering into Renner Blvd. If you can point that out at the very top there got to zoom in a little bit more on that.

John Conforti 27:02
Here's why. I just turn 1:00 on.

Jamison, John 27:04
Yeah, yeah.
And we're looking at the red alignment as alternative. One continues from that point kind of on new location.
And you draw along where you approach the the airport on the kind of on the east side of the airport. It continues on the red alignment.
Past the airport right at this point, that alignment pulls up into alternate pulls up and uses a piece of airport loop Rd. and kind of more of a widening of that road before it pulls off again on new location.
To tie into Siem Springs Rd. At this location right here.
So that is one.
There is a difference. If you go back to the very beginning again.
I want to show alternative 1A. Next you can click that on John. All right, so.

John Conforti 28:05
OK.

Jamison, John 28:08
Alternative 1A is exactly like one, except here at the beginning.
And you see the kind of the orange.
Piece.
I'm seeing the kind of orange or Peach alignment. If you can show that John going

down, it just takes a little bit of a different flow to remove the end of the project and a lot of it the the big, the big property that where all these al.

John Conforti 28:24
Right here.

Jamison, John 28:38
Tie in is owned by Johnstone University and so the kind of the A Alignment 1A just kind of does not impact as much of that property.
As the one that's really the the the main difference there so.
We continue on.
With with Alternative 1A is exactly like when the rest of the entire alignment through there.
So there's no difference.

Newcomb, Ryan C 29:06
Hey, Eric.
Just to interject real quick.
That's a Livingstone College that owns that property there.

Jamison, John 29:12
John not Johnstone.
Yeah. Livingstone, my fault.
Thanks Ryan.
Appreciate that and.
So going up next.
If.
We could.
Hey, John, is there a way to cut off the other alternatives?
Let's see.
The blue is on there.
I'm not sure what that is.
It looks like alternative.

John Conforti 29:43
OK, sorry there's this.

Jamison, John 29:44
Or is that a stream?

John Conforti 29:50
OK, Siri looks like a lot of the alignments are on.

Jamison, John 29:51
Alternative 30 OK.

John Conforti 29:52
I'm sorry, but they're two sections here and and it was showing that they were off.

Jamison, John 29:53
Great. Great.
This is much better.
Yeah. OK.

John Conforti 29:57
Now, now I've got them all off.

Jamison, John 29:58
Yeah, OK, put on the slope. Steaks plus 40 again right below that little bit lower.
Yeah, there you go.

John Conforti 30:03
OK.

Jamison, John 30:08
Bill before release all come on.

John Conforti 30:15
On a specific alignment on.

Jamison, John 30:18
Oh, they all OK? Yeah. OK.
You know, go for alternative 2.

John Conforti 30:23
Here we go.
It's all a bit tough to see. It's green.
It's like right here.

Jamison, John 30:28
Chris said turn on the heat buildings.
All right, so alternative two follows at this point exactly like alternative one going through here.
Exactly. The only difference if you keep on going following, keep on going John, on going through it's still kind of the same thing as alternative one.

John Conforti 30:56
Can you?

Jamison, John 31:00
And the difference is that it connects.
At.
At at a little bit further, as we continue, it still uses piece of the road and we continue on in and at this point on airport Rd. it takes a a job down.
Can you show yet John and and connects to South Main Street at that point and that's the end of that alternative.
So it's the shortest of all the alternatives that we have.
And if you go out to back to the top again, John.
The.
The alternative to a is exactly like alternative two, except it has the little variation there at the at the end for the aorta.

Next one is alternative 3.
You put that one on, John.
Thank you.
So alternative three, they all sort the same area.
Alternate 3 continues on new location.
Here a lot like alternative one and two except at this point where John is it takes a little jog down, ruin Mule Rd. utilizes an existing structure there.
A railroad mural Rd. cross Grants Creek and then takes a job to the South on new location.
Continuing on and this is the alternative solution, West side of the airport.
And it continues on.
One through.
Oh.
Until it connects up to Cedar Springs Rd. At the same location as alternative Wendy, and then the like.
The broken record here.
The variation Alternative 3A at the top just is the.
A different alignment there at the end of the project and then finally alternative 6 and knock that one and on and Jango all the way down to the other end of the project.
Because Alternative 6 is exactly like alternative one except for this one variation, could you turn alternative one on?
Right. So there's alternative one.
But their alternative 6 just connects into Cedar Springs Rd. A bit differently.
There it doesn't go through those that the businesses that are there, that alternative one does just come up a way to do that and.
And then other than that, alternative 6 is exactly like alternative.
And like all the other alternatives, alternative six has a alternative alternative 6A.
Which is exactly like the alignment of every project too. So that was just really quick.
It seems like there's a lot of alternatives, but I wanted to go through that again.
There's really not a lot.
They all finish here the same alignments, but there's little variations of them at each end, OK?
So at this point I want to talk.
Look at the structures and.

John, if you can go up to the very top when you see site #1.
If you can zero in in there.
To exit site #1 existing alignment all right.
All right.
Do you have the structures, your structures?

John Conforti 34:52
Brookshires.

Jamison, John 34:53
Yeah.
Hydraulic cylinders.

John Conforti 35:12
Yep, it's they're on.

Jamison, John 35:16
You got see Chris's comment.
That might help.
You turn the 3D buildings off if they make it easier to see.
Yeah. John, can you go down to your players list down bottom left of your?

John Conforti 35:31
I'm down here, OK?

Jamison, John 35:33
And cut off 3D buildings.
It's not, oh, also terrain.
Could you cut the terrain very last button?
This terrain, yeah.

John Conforti 35:46
OK. That makes a little lot more clear.

Jamison, John 35:49

Yeah. All right.
It can zoom on in a little bit to there into the side, so this is the first site.
And the all the alternatives affect this particular site.
And this is a new crossing, the.
Site #1 drainage area.
Pretty small, one square mile.
On the site, there's no existing structure. We're proposing a 13 foot by 9 foot reinforced concrete box cover.
The length at this location.
Is 190 feet totaling the cost of that new structure is $722,000.
Looking at the slope Stakes plus 40, the impact would be 321 feet.
The medication for that much would be 500,000.
Change from slope Stakes the beat, the impact there at this location would be 210 feet $332,000 mitigation cost now.
The that particular recommendation is made. It does meet the standards of requirements of the 50 year old.
It's in A50 year design year storm.
It also fits the.
Matches existing stream base with.
There's also a downstream structure near Jake Alexander Blvd. That's also very similar structure supporting by 7 foot reinforced concrete support.
So that is our recommendation.
At this site.
Does the team have any comments?
Questions concerning that.
Steve.

SB **Steve Brumagin** 38:03
Yeah, kind of a basic question and maybe you all have been over this before.
But when I when I look at like Table 3, Eric, when you're talking about your slope stakes plus zero.
Is that that 210 feet?
It's site #1.
Is that just for the box culvert itself and the fill and and then the slope stakes?

Of course, obviously is 40 feet beyond outlet inlet in that sort of thing.
And may include some fill slope or something along those lines.

Jamison, John 38:37
Yeah, it's close to that, Steve, but it's actually a measurement of the stream itself.
Within the slope steaks is that representative of in this case the 210 feet?

Steve Brumagin 38:49
OK.

Jamison, John 38:51
So it that's why there's a little bit different.
You have some meandering streams.
Kind of hard to see a little bit on this particular case, but it's not exactly what's located within the core.

Steve Brumagin 39:00
Right.

Jamison, John 39:05
No, it could be more than that.

Steve Brumagin 39:07
And that that helps me out with that. I I I it's kind of a second question.

Jamison, John 39:08
OK.

Steve Brumagin 39:13
I I wondered if if you know sometimes for box call for it's another call where it's there's there's some additional or may need be a need to do some additional stream work for alignment or inlet outlet sort of.
You know for placement of your structure and and for good transition in and out.
And I didn't know if that was kind of beyond the scope of what's in table #3 and would be something that would be analyzed at a later time or not.

Jamison, John 39:44
Yeah, that's that's why we show the plus 40 is to give you an idea of what the what those temporary impacts might be or you know a little bit of.
A extra permanent impact that we don't anticipate right now because we don't design on it, that's correct.
Yeah. I would expect you. You'd be somewhere between somewhere between that that 210 and that 3320 number with this particular stream. I don't think there's gonna be a lot of realignment of the stream just cause of this.

Steve Brumagin 40:01
OK so.

Jamison, John 40:12
It's a straight nature, but you know there likely will be some, you know, bank stabilization and things like that at the ends and and once we get into further design, some other treatments there.

Steve Brumagin 40:14
Sure.
All right.
Well, I appreciate that those were kind of the questions I had as I looked at the table and and thought I'd I'd wait for a good time to when you actually ask for questions as opposed to just jump in like I did before. So thanks, I appreciate it.

Jamison, John 40:39
Steve, you can jump anytime you want to, absolutely. Fine.
One other point of our case in the shape that you're seeing here is the the FEMA floodplain as well. On the aerial map.
So you kind of get an idea of where we've got the FEMA crossings.
So this is one of those.
And they can bring it breaks it down.

McHenry, David G 41:03
Hey, Hannah.

Jamison, John 41:05
OK.

McHenry, David G 41:05
Thanks.
Steve already.
Kind of had a question I had, which I guess is we'll look at design a little bit closer, I guess in 4C when we just get far that far along.
But I had a chance to go out there and look at.
A couple sites last week and.
You know the box covert under Jake Alexander downstream of here. And I know this stream is it's it's in rough shape.
It's in size.
It's a mess, and there's actually a.
A spur sewer line crossing downstream of this site.
Site one.
It's kind of a little dam.
But but I noticed one under Jake Alexander downstream.
It's it's, it's the inlet and outlet of that Channel is pretty wide.
It's probably been constructed that way, or maintained that way over time.
I don't know but.
The box culvert there doesn't have any.
It's not retaining any bed load.
And but it's in a big pool, so it's backwatered the whole way.
I'm. I'm not real interested in real concern about aquatic stuff passage, that kind of thing, but.
I wonder if you could.
I I noticed the channel too.
We're just walking it, it's.
I can jump across it in a few places and I'm not as nimble as I used to be, so it's.
I just wonder if you could all look at it.
I'm just saying now, getting out early. I know it's kind of early, but if you could look at like corner baffles or something in the boxes, see what that would do. Trying to retain some some bed loading in like this 200 footer you're looking at here at.

Site one as you move along and that's more for a terrestrial type.
Critters.
If that makes sense.

Jamison, John 43:06
Yes, that's something that we can look at as we get further down the line, Dave.

MG

McHenry, David G 43:13
OK.
Thank you. I didn't.
Sorry to belabor it.
I just want to mention early 'cause, that's kind of thing I think about and.
Appreciate it.

Jamison, John 43:24
Thanks David.
Mark.

EM

Endries, Mark 43:28
Yeah. I just wanted to reiterate with with what David said too, when I when I reviewed the site plans, I'd you know, I just made note that you know the culvert width matching the existing stream base width and not that not really providing with that kind of shape.
Or design not providing much in the way of potential terrestrial movement through those things.
So I would just reiterate kind of what, what what Dave mentioned and.
Yeah, potentially oversizing some of these if possible.
Just to allow a little bit more movement than just water through these culverts.

Jamison, John 44:08
Is this something that you would want to maybe consider a secondary culvert that's set up a little bit, you know, 2 feet higher or something like that, off to the side to provide something or that that's not something you have the division.
You know, if it's a hydraulic system.
Other stories?

It's the hydraulic.
Requirement for the culvert.
But Dave was asking for at least my understanding is to have within the Colbert someplace.
Playing with the design that's different than having a separate structure that our division would need to maintain.
Got you.

McHenry, David G 44:51
Hey, this is Dave again.
Yeah, that. That's right, Amy.
Thank you.
Not even fullwit sills. You know, just maybe some corner baffles like 4 foot, you know, to try and get some sediment deposition in in that thing.
And and I understand I did notice a bunch of trees down too. Is so incised that Channel you gonna have debris, so you might not wanna double box.

Jamison, John 45:16
Yeah, that's that's what we were trying to stay away from with the wider box, you know, having the whole full full 13 foot wide to match.

McHenry, David G 45:20
Yeah.
Yeah, but thank thank you for clarifications too and Mark, appreciate it.

Jamison, John 45:41
Certainly Mark's suggestion.
Any other comments here from our staff?
Recommendation there from Mark I think Mark which you were suggesting a washer.
Over this board.
Is that correct?

Endries, Mark 46:02
It just that was just one potential idea. Just to just to have the have the the opening be wider than just the stream stream width to make potentially allow. But like what

Dave mentioned would work as well.
Potentially, there's probably there's probably lots of maybe alternatives there, but just just something greater than existing stream base width.

Jamison, John 46:36
OK.
Thank you.
Any other?
Comments at this location.
Oh, yeah. Nice. Thanks, Marissa.
Marisa put in there to link to wildlife passage guidance.
Certainly worth reviewing that as well.
All right.
Job good.
Continue on to the next site.
We'll move down kind of down alternative one and you'll see site #2.
Give me.
Yeah, there we are.
All right, site #2 is another.
New location.
Site existing over there.
This is a very small drainage area, .34 square miles.
This location all the alternatives affect this site.
But they do it in a little bit different way.
Kind of a little bit difficult to see.
There's two different bridge sites here for sorry, covert proposed Clover sites.
So for alternatives 123 and six.
We're proposing A7 foot put by 7 foot RCBC.
A link of that.
Is at the at this location is 139 feet.
It's a new culvert call scope. 330,000 is a change.
Impacting 233 feet based on slope Stakes plus 40 and mitigation costs 369,000.
That goes considerably down to 148 feet and 234,000 for just slip states. Now at this same location, but with the different alternatives.
Alternative 1A.

2A3A and 6A.
Brit roses. We have the same size culvert recommended.
It's a 7 foot by 7 foot or C.
BC.
This would be a longer Colbert notice would be at 309 feet, costing that 735,000.
Impacting 388 feet.
So it takes us forty 614,000 mitigation cost or 309 feet for the.
No, no golf and swimsteaks 489,000.
This would be again.
Meet the 50 year design storm event and the culvert would match the existing stream base with.
Comments. Questions on these?

John Conforti 49:42
OK.

Jamison, John 49:58
All right. Well, just let us know if there's anything that comes to you on that one.
We'll move on to John to the next site we have.
Thanks, David. If you send, I think David sent that pictures for those I would say each side too, there is a there are pictures in the appendix at each site.
In the.
In the back as well.
Which side are you showing there, David? OK.

John Conforti 50:34
That's three.
I'll be going in numerical order.

Jamison, John 50:39
OK. And David, those pictures that you're presenting, what did I?

McHenry, David G 50:44
Oh, I'm sorry I didn't.
I missed that there was pictures before.

I didn't mean to distract you all.
Those pictures, the one the top one, is like a stream above or below site one about the channel.
You see a tire sitting in there in the Creek.

Jamison, John 51:00
Yeah, yeah.

McHenry, David G 51:02
You know they're good reference anyways, but the one down at the bottom is is Jake Alexander's existing the outlet looking up at it, you know?

Jamison, John 51:09
Oh, OK. Got you. Yeah.

McHenry, David G 51:11
Yes, just I mean it's just it's functioning OK.
It's just starting to grade because it's so wide and right below it, but.
Anyways, sorry about that. Thank you.

Jamison, John 51:22
OK.
No, very good. Thanks.

McHenry, David G 51:23
And actually, before I go my comments on this site, three are basically the same as site one.
It's about the.
Considering you know some corner baffles or something like that, sorry.
Thanks.

Jamison, John 51:40
OK.
Yep. Thanks Dave.
And if you'd like, if you turn off the, it's the flip.

It's 100 years.
Old Hundred year floodplain.

John Conforti 51:57
Turn off the honey earphone, please.

Jamison, John 51:59
Yeah.
I just want to see it.
About that moment. Very good.
Yeah, zoom on into the site there a little bit so we can see the covert.
Oh yeah, so site #3, this is another.
Alignment that is on new location.
All the alternatives hit this except for three and three eight.
The drainage area is pretty small, about one square mile.
We are recommending at this location a 12 foot by 7 foot.
Reinforced concrete box cover the at 164 feet.
In length.
Cost of that structure is 524,000.
800.
And slope steaks plus 40 impacting 287 feet, or a 454,000 mitigation costs. Looking at just slope stakes, it's 169 feet impact.
267.
$1000 mitigation costs and again, this meets our criteria for the 50 year design storm.
And the Colbert matches existing shrinkage with at this location as well.
David got got your comments recorded here.
Any other comments questions concerning the recommended structure here?

McHenry, David G 53:55
Not for me. Thanks.

Jamison, John 54:03
OK.
We'll move on site #4 John, if you push on down.

Yep, to the next location.
A little bit further down.
It's on existing Rd.
There we go.
Alright, site #4 is actually an existing Clover.
At this location it is a 96 foot cool gated metal pipe. Existing length of 64 feet and all the alternatives except for alternative three and three A impact this site the recommended.
When did hydraulic treatment here is to detain and extend that 96 inch pipe?
The cost of that or the total length would be 160 feet of of existing plus extension and the total cost of that's 384,000.
Slope tape stakes plus 40 would impact 270 feet 477.
And 1427 thousand and then the slope states would be 196 feet impact with the $310,000 mitigation.
Cost.
Much the same things the other this existing pipe size meets the 50 year design stand.
Obviously it is the downstream culvert that exists now.
We'll just be extending that and this recommendation there.

John Conforti 55:48
OK.

Jamison, John 55:51
Any thoughts, comments, questions on this recommendation?
This could probably be able to design A review, but is there a box to condition of this yet that we've won retained for sure on that or we'll discuss it?
That would be something we'll we'll discuss.
I'm not a proponent of CMP, but we can discuss that once we get survey and all that stuff.
Yeah, I didn't see the Inver busted out or anything like that, but.
Alright, I'll make a note of it.
That kind of goes for the rest of them too, but I'll retain extend.
Well, we'll use the weigh in.
You know, just as the condition good enough to retain an extend.

Or should we just go ahead and replace it considering some metal pipe? And how long we've been there?
But that could be handled later on, not not in all, right?
Any other thoughts on?
Recommendation here.
More.

Endries, Mark 57:00
Yeah, just if the if it turns out that that the pipe needs to come out is, is there any? Is there any recommendation of what would go in its place or is that we're not quite to that point to worry about that yet?

Jamison, John 57:13
Yeah, I think the main purpose of this is to verify that the hydraulic opening was the proper size for meeting the 50 year design.
And it is.
So the actual size could be determined later during design, but it wouldn't be.
It wouldn't need to be any greater than the 96 at this time.

Endries, Mark 57:36
OK.

Jamison, John 57:52
OK.
We'll move on to next item.
#7.
It is located up at the top where the top and it's along Alternative 3. Thank you. Yeah so.
This is.
You know, this is pretty easy.
This is the.
This is the point where.
Alternative 3.
Is actually using Rowan Mill Rd. a portion of Rowan Mill Rd.
Across Grants Creek.

And that's kind of why that alignment is located there.
So the bridge at this location is.
Adequate and meets our hydraulic needs, and so we're proposing just to retain.
The bridge in this location, it's 120 foot bridge.
This project had a bike path.
Yes, it's an athletic do that.
That is the there is a different.
Typical section for for half the project and.
The iPad recommendation may not be through here. I may.
That's a good question, Seth.
I need to look at that.
But we did.
We did not indicate that we felt there was a need for further.
Pedestrian accommodation across there.
And I'll see what I can do.

EM **Endries, Mark** 59:51
Can we?
Can we turn on the the three and three alternatives just to see the route since the next 4 structures are gonna follow that? Thanks.

 **Jamison, John** 59:53
Sure.
Yeah. Thanks.
Good, good point.
Alright.
John will go ahead and move to the next slide, #8.
All right.
Oh, God, what else?
Have it even close up. I was having a hard time seeing that.
The balloon.
Yeah. Thank you.
Yeah, there we go.

JC **John Conforti** 1:00:48

Yeah, the the flood wave is turned on.
So I just turn that off.

Jamison, John 1:00:49
Yeah. OK.
So yeah, I got you.

John Conforti 1:00:52
And here's the alternatives here.

Jamison, John 1:00:56
Thank you.
So this is a new location crossing of Grants Creek.
This is only pertaining to alternatives 3 and 3/8.
This is a pretty big drainage area at 35 square miles we are proposing.
A new 120 foot bridge.
Here the cost of this is.
1,944,000.
So the.
Just like before.
The drainage area at this location crossing is pretty big. At 36 square miles.
And ridges are actually utilized both.
As crossings both upstream and downstream.
Of this location said we were opposing bridge here.
Any questions, thoughts on the recommendation?

McHenry, David G 1:02:15
Hey, Eric, this Dave McHenry of up.
I'm off for a bridge here, obviously, but.
Marissa put that guidance in there.
We we always.
Alright, guidance. We just like you to look at the rip rap. You know, if you need scar depth protection, just try and bench it underneath the bridge for critters and stuff.
Avoid rip rap.
You know where you can or or top it with some aggregate or something like that.

During construction, but I know we're headed.
I'm head of the game again. I'm sorry.

Jamison, John 1:02:50
Have you seen that before?
Repeat that what he just said.
So when you have the full plan under the bridge, if it's gonna be a reprint like you need the Reprap and the floodplain to protect or scour that you actually cover it with native material or something, and then that way you get a path. Yeah, I haven't seen. That before, yeah.
Usually we're just using prep treatment on the abutment ends, so there is a a stretch in there. So I guess if you need it.
Rip rap under you, you embed it.
Create something.
Yeah. OK.
Yeah, that's how we've we've done it like that before.
The the Times where it becomes problematic is if the structure is low and you don't get grass under there, then you're just gonna have a erosion issue if you don't.
So OK.
I've got a few that we've done. If you need us yet. So basically saying that set back.
And the bridge length came out with minimum bridge length that put offsets from top bank.
And that's right, yeah.
Final bridge length will be determined during design.
Measures that.
David's just mentioning again.
Is that there being a design detail that we can?
And if y'all haven't had a chance to look at that aquatic passage stuff.
I'm acquired passage while I'm yeah, there's been some updates to it.
I'll definitely take a look familiar with the typical ones, some new, new innovative ways.
Yeah, this is more dealing with what's on top than OK and the Creek.
All right, if there's no other comments on that, we'll move down to the next site, John.
Site #12.

All right, very good.
So site #12's only involved with 338.
There is an existing.
Section 260. Inch corrugated metal pipes. This location existing length is 54 feet.
Our recommendation at this point is to retain and extend.
This pipe the overall length would be extended to.
It would be 96 feet total cost of that.
That would be 92,400 impacting 122 feet X + 4393 thousand mitigation or just 49 feet.
Here in slope states 78,000.
In mitigation cost.
Again, like all the others, it meets the design year storm event. Existing does and.
Is adequately size for that hydraulic measure.
Comments, questions on the retain extend recommendation.

McHenry, David G 1:06:27
Hi, this is Dave McHenry again.
This should be my last one, I promise.
The the two 60s.
They look pretty good right now.
They're kinda de facto, they're the same inverts it looks like, but they look like they're functioning pretty well for, I think, most of the water's going in the South barrel. I guess, I don't know, left looking downstream, but.
If you do this one, if you could try and keep.
Keep some inlet and outlet benching on the extensions to mimic what's there now. I mean it kind of like I said, it's kind of. I don't think they did it when they built it, but it's it's functioning that way to, you know, keep them base flowing 11.
Side and.
That's it.


Jamison, John 1:07:20
Thanks Dave.

McHenry, David G 1:07:21
Thanks.

Jamison, John 1:07:21

I would.
I would agree with you.
This is one of the better sites and it seemed to be just like a happy stream in their dysfunction.
Really. Well, so yeah, we'll we'll take it into account and make sure that we try to mimic what's going on out there with the extensions.
All right.
No other comments questions there.
We'll go on to the last site, #15.
Similar to this one, the last slide is an existing or as well.
This is on.
Remembrance Day.
Road, yes, an existing and the existing.
Puller is a 70 foot wide, 4 gate no pipe.
It's 49 feet in length, so we would recommend retaining and extending that culvert.
Overall would only be 69 feet, just a little bit of a extension quarter, $20,000 to do that.
Slope stacks plus 40 would be an 80 feet impact from $27,000.
Regular slope steaks would just be.
Pretty the impact you've this location $32,000 mitigation.
And this meets the existing structure does meet the hydraulic needs of 50 year storm event.
That is the recommendation at this location.
Comments. Questions concerning the retain extent.
What led to the kind of stacks down here is that.
Privately owned treatment or studies could be Sacre bags over time come out.
That's what I've seen a lot.
I thought was kind of stunned by pictures.
Yeah, it's very much out there into the pictures of this site in the in the package here.
It's better than a normal.
I don't know if you're gonna need to replace it that way or not.
Well, if you do replace it likely don't go up one size since it's not buried.
Now we need to bury it, alright?

Councilmember buriel.
This location is barely in the project.
Even the slope states did that.
Barely kind of touches it.
It's quite possible we can get there, yes.
20 can do but while.
OK, well.
It's a roll crossing. Recommendations.
Believe I have any more information to deliver here.
We will open it up to the team to see if there's any other questions, concerns, comments on any of the information we talked about.
Well, and it looks like.
The recommendations at the crossings that we have are all seem to be acceptable.
Obviously, we noted a number of comments of things to look at.
During detailed design of these crossings.
We'll document all the all the notes that we have that people comments people have on each crossing commit to go forward and reviewing that further and final design.
But other than that, looks like we're good with the alternatives we had, Steve.

Steve Brumagin 1:11:42
Yeah, I kind of feel bad. You know, I thought Seth had thrown down the gauntlet there to make it difficult.


Jamison, John 1:11:49
Bye bye.

Steve Brumagin 1:11:50
I did the best I could.
That's that's all I got for you.
No, I appreciate you incorporating those comments in there. I didn't know.
At this point.
With, with with two way if if somehow.
I don't know what you've done in the past and and like the avoidance.
To minimization section of the packet of information you sent to us.
I didn't know if it would be worthwhile including something in there along that line

to to utilize the document that we talked about there with the passage guidance for dot and the one that that.
Work case direction.

Jamison, John 1:12:43
Babe, you're breaking up.
Can you try that again?

Steve Brumagin 1:12:48
All right. Well, let me let me pull the tin candle.

Jamison, John 1:12:48
And we got the first half, but not the second-half.
Yep.

Steve Brumagin 1:12:57
Well, I'll give you the I don't know where the second-half started. So let me just say that that.

Jamison, John 1:13:01
That's when you started talking about the document that Marissa shared.

Steve Brumagin 1:13:04
You.
There you go.

Jamison, John 1:13:09
That's where we lost you.

Steve Brumagin 1:13:11
Well, and I met you may be able to hear it now and I still may lose you.
So no guarantee there, but.

Jamison, John 1:13:16
Now you're sounding good now.

Steve Brumagin 1:13:18
It's it's our Internet here at the office.
But I I just.
I wondered if if.
Included.
And then we just.
Iteration.

Jamison, John 1:13:32
You sound fine until you start talking. We lost you again.

Steve Brumagin 1:13:34
The.
I see somebody's.
All right, it it it must.

Jamison, John 1:13:41
Maybe put it in the chat.

Steve Brumagin 1:13:42
It must be.

Jamison, John 1:13:45
I think I think I know what Steve's trying to say.

Steve Brumagin 1:13:46
I.
Port.

Jamison, John 1:13:47
And Steve, if I if I'm totally off base, just tell me.
But I think Steve wants in the avoidance minimization for CP2A to reference the.
Terrestrial passage stuff.
That Marissa put in the package.

Or on the chat, just reference that as A to be used as a guidance for.
Animal passage, yeah.

Steve Brumagin 1:14:14
Yes. And anything that you may do.

Jamison, John 1:14:15
Now get a seat. Yeah.
Thumbs up.
Good job.
Yeah. Thanks, dia.
That's the best we heard that.

Steve Brumagin 1:14:29
Well, sorry about that.
It's our Internet.
But that's what I was trying to get at. Thank you, Amy.

Jamison, John 1:14:36
Yeah, yeah, absolutely, Steve.
Good recommendation and we will. We will note that.
So just for the record, while we were in this meeting, my predecessor in this project, ANI Peru, noticed my calendar and just wanted to say hello to everybody.
He misses you guys.
Donnie does not get the comment.
He is no longer.
He just wanted to say hello.
Sense of regards.
Back high back to Don Hill.
We listen.
Yes. Yeah, I have nothing else. If the team does not have any foot sounds like we're we're good to send around. Concurrence form to everybody for docusigning after this meeting.
Any comments on that Madison?

Steve Brumagin 1:15:40
Well, let me try it again.
This is Steve. Hello.
Can you hear me now?

Jamison, John 1:15:45
But when you get.

Steve Brumagin 1:15:48
Sorry, no, I I I think with with inclusion of of these things I I wouldn't have any problem with with going through and reviewing and signing a concurrence at this point.
Over.

Jamison, John 1:16:05
Got all that? And since since you may only have 48 hours till you things get shut down, then if you can knock that out before then we would greatly appreciate it. See, although we we hope that your a miracle happens and you're you're here on Monday, so.
Mark Andrews, you got your hand up, Jason.

Steve Brumagin 1:16:27
Thanks I I.

Jamison, John 1:16:29
Sorry, definitely not want you missing a paycheck.

Endries, Mark 1:16:35
Yeah. I just just one one bit of clarification if while while we're on for alternatives 2 and 2A and the figures it shows, it shows them going down Main Street a bit and then looping around, what is that long Meadow and South Mark and that's not what?

Jamison, John 1:16:50
Yeah.

Endries, Mark 1:16:53
We're seeing here today.

Jamison, John 1:16:54
Yeah, yeah.

Endries, Mark 1:16:54
Could someone just clarify that?

Jamison, John 1:16:56
Yeah, absolutely.
More, that's a really good point.
And I'm gonna.
This is Mike.
KMC file that is not working.
Responding.
Yeah.
Never works when you're sharing screen.
All right. Let me do, let me try this again.
Hey, John, can you put this off?

John Conforti 1:18:03
I'm sorry, what you want?

Jamison, John 1:18:05
The KMC file back up.
I took it away while ago, yeah.

John Conforti 1:18:07
Oh, just turn it off.

Jamison, John 1:18:15
Failing here.
Change.

John Conforti 1:18:21
He usually stop sharing, right?

Jamison, John 1:18:21
So yes, yeah. John, can you share your KMC file for everybody?

John Conforti 1:18:31
I mean it.
I didn't realize it turned off.

Jamison, John 1:18:35
Yeah. Eric took over the screen for a minute, but then he unshared.

John Conforti 1:18:37
Oh, sorry about that, I misunderstood, sorry.

Jamison, John 1:18:41
All right, turn on Alternative 2.
And and they're not building so.

John Conforti 1:18:50
Just two.

Jamison, John 1:18:51
Yeah, just leave 2/1.
OK.
Kind of 0 in toward the end of two mark was. Yeah, as it intersects Main Street there
Mark was noting that looks a little bit different on the package.
This is the actual.
End of the proposed.

Alternative right here as it shows in the packet we do represent alternative 2 going all the way up. If you can move to the intersection, the interchange at the end of the project.
We we do represent it. Note at the at the bottom, at the other way on Seeger, yeah.

John Conforti 1:19:41
On.

Jamison, John 1:19:44
Go all the way to where?
The other. Yeah, right here. We do show alternative 2 going up US 29 and ending at the interchange with all the other alternatives.
And we were showing that just representative to have the end of the alternative at the same as the others, it's still.
But as far as any.
Improvements or?
Widening or construction of anything it it does not go beyond.
Airport.
Roads there that were showing the end of it.
So that was in the packet that was more just representative of showing it going all the way to the end.

John Conforti 1:20:26
Are you?

Jamison, John 1:20:34
Of the project, but no improvements between Cedar Springs and airport.
Airport Rd.

Endries, Mark 1:20:46
No thanks.
Thank you.

Jamison, John 1:20:50
S.

There are words ending.
Like above, the Speedway looks like folks have just cleared something out, but they get ready to build something where potential alternatives are going through. Yeah, you know, I made.
Put that question to Jared if you're still on here.
He dropped off earlier, OK.
Or maybe Ed.
Are you on there with?
Is there?
Is there something getting built at that airport Main Street intersection there behind the Speedway?
Body aware.

Muire, Ed D. 1:21:32
I'm kind of confused what you're saying about Speedway.


Jamison, John 1:21:36
Oh oh, it's the old Speedway.

Muire, Ed D. 1:21:36
But.


Jamison, John 1:21:41
The gas station? Yeah. Just look for that grub.

Muire, Ed D. 1:21:43
OK.


Jamison, John 1:21:45
Red clay on the map.
There you'll see.

Muire, Ed D. 1:21:47
Yeah, it's in the city.

John Conforti 1:21:50
I hear you.

Muire, Ed D. 1:21:50
I'm not exactly sure what the.
What that project is so I do know, we our folks were looking at the the grading plan and and have it under review there or at least in their their site stops to to check.
But I'm not sure what the proposed use is.
Jared would be better equipped to answer that question.

Jamison, John 1:22:14
I'll just.

Muire, Ed D. 1:22:18
I do have one question about the term concurrence.
That you're sending out a document that folks would sign is that concurrence document.

John Conforti 1:22:30
Thank you.

Muire, Ed D. 1:22:31
Stating that.
The proposals for each of the hydraulic structures are suitable with everyone's criteria, and they're just agreeing that the way it's designed would work.
Subject to whatever alternative is selected.

Jamison, John 1:22:50
Yes, that's that's the essence of it.
That from a for for the regulatory side of things here. Yeah, it's it's asking each of the agencies to concur.
All that on what we presented and ensure that they don't question those findings in the future that makes sense.

Muire, Ed D. 1:23:10
That I guess it's also includes the alignments too, right?

Jamison, John 1:23:16
Yes, we, we kind of agreed on the alignments previously.

Newcomb, Ryan C 1:23:22
Sorry, John.
Oh yeah, this is.
Yeah, this is Ryan.
Yeah, it's the alignments were concurred upon previously as part of CP2P alignments that would be carried forward.

Muire, Ed D. 1:23:33
Right. I I thought so.
But I I just wanted to be sure that that's what concurrence actually meant. Thanks guys.

Jamison, John 1:23:41
And for for y'all it would be the FBO.
Yeah. Fuel con rare. They're representing on your representing the county and cities.
So that the county and the city individually would not be asked to incur it would be an MPO on this.
How crazy of that.

Newcomb, Ryan C 1:24:03
Sorry, John, there were a couple of conversations going on in the room, but I think what you were saying, yeah, so the the NPO is the is the official member of the.
Certainly their their role.
And and consider that.
So I think that's what John was trying to clarify there.

Jamison, John 1:24:27
Here's my.

Yeah, we may need to ask folks to use the chat 'cause we're having a hard time hearing.
Yeah, I don't think, Brian.
Brian's on the road, so I don't think.
No, we don't want you using the chat.

Newcomb, Ryan C 1:24:45
All of these guys, I'm not driving, but we were trying to pull the directions up.
We don't want to division in very often, so rightfully so.
But yeah, my apologies.
Am I clear now, Amy?

Jamison, John 1:24:59
Yeah, Ryan, you're cutting in and out.
You and Steve y'all just need to hang out together.
Talk to each other twinkle.
See if you'll have a whole Internet connection.
OK.
Any other questions before we finish this off and we'll CP3, you were saying early 2026, correct. Correct. The next time next time we go unless people want to join us at the public meeting. Be glad to see you there. And I think we have a.
A committee a little bit earlier to give everybody the invitation to that.
So we'll let you know when that's happening, where?
Sounds good.
All right.

Cox, Marissa R 1:25:50
Hey, Eric, it's Marissa. I don't wanna keep everyone any much longer, but I just wanted to make sure you saw the request in the chat from Mark for the KMZ file. If you could provide that out too.

Jamison, John 1:26:01
Oh, good. OK. Yeah, yeah, absolutely.

Cox, Marissa R 1:26:03

Thank you. I don't know if all of our regulatory partners would like it.

Jamison, John 1:26:04

Thanks, Marissa. Yeah, no problem.

Cox, Marissa R 1:26:08

Maybe it's worth just sending the link to everyone, but I do know that Mark asked for it.

WM

Wendy Miller 1:26:13

Hi this is what e-mail I just want to be sure you know I'm I'm here taking those and I'll be conferring with Phil Conrad as well as the county and the city of Salisbury.
So we're, we're the mpos on the call.
And yeah, we'd like to see the KMC file as well.

Jamison, John 1:26:29

Yep, there is no problem at all.
So Steve, you're gonna have to get that that log onto your machine after all, if you wanna see that.
She can't say anything.

SB

Steve Brumagin 1:26:45

OK.
Thank you very much.
I'm trying. I'm trying.
Bye.

Jamison, John 1:26:51

Yeah, OK. Alright, very good.
Alright, thanks everybody.

SA

Somerville, Amanetta 1:26:57

Thank you.

Yankura, Kaylie 1:26:58
Thank you.

John Conforti 1:26:59
Hey I can.
I can send the link out to the cams eat to everybody on the meeting invite.

Jamison, John 1:27:06
Yeah, alright.
Thank you, John. Thanks John.

Cox, Marissa R 1:27:07
That'd be great. Thanks.
Thanks y'all.
Have a good afternoon.

Endries, Mark 1:27:11
Thanks everyone.

John Conforti 1:27:11
2.

McHenry, David G 1:27:11
Sayings.

Wendy Miller 1:27:13
Bye.

Headrick, Hannah S stopped transcription