

U-5949 CP 1 and 2 Merger Informational Meeting-20260819_100756-Meeting Recording

August 19, 2026, 2:07PM

1h 33m 14s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:04

This is to update the team on some.

Some slight changes that have occurred, and just to update the team on some new information.

The purpose and need are essentially the same, staying the same on the project. The study area is slightly expanding to accommodate some slight changes due to some updated traffic forecast.

And we'll be addressing some of the secondary needs for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in the city area and typicals. We'll also be switching from state to a federal document. So with that being said, we'll go ahead and start with the Introductions here in the room, and then we'll go online.

But.

Katie Farbill of NCDOT Environmental Policy. Morgan Weatherford from NCDOT Environmental Policy. Liz Hortman, Three Oaks Planning. Faith Jonkey with Summit. Josh Shargan with Summit. Matthew Martin with the Army Corps. Zach Cowan, NCDOT.

Project Manager overseeing the project. Nice, Division Three, Project Development and Environmental. Seth Filcher of Federal Highways. Anna Hendrick, NCDOT, Environmental Policy. Jim Mason, Three Ops Engineer. David Cooper, Three Ops Engineering. Brittany Kelly, Three Ops Engineering.

If I call your name online, if you could tell us your name and who you can work with. We'll start with Brandon Johnson.

BP **Brandon Johnson, PE** 1:46

Hey, Brandon Johnson Summit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:46

Yeah.

TM **Tim McCurry** 1:48
The.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:50
Rihanna.

BA **Briana Allmon** 1:52
Brianna Allman with Accelerate Engineering.

TM **Tim McCurry** 1:53
So.

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

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:57
Good morning, this is Kathy Briddingham, Division of Coastal Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:02
One.

CT **Cao, Luan T** 2:04
Lankow State Historic Preservation Office.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:07
Here.

DJ **Detweiler, Derek J** 2:09
Good morning, Derek Ditwiler, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

TM **Tim McCurry** 2:11
It.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:13
Christine.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 2:16
Hi, Christine Farrell, Environmental Policy Unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:20
And Gavin.

GT **Gavin Teng** 2:21
Gavin 10, accelerate as you knew.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:26
Uh, thanks.

TM **Tim McCurry** 2:26
Play the song.

HF **Hardin, Faith** 2:28
Faith Harden at DWR 401 transportation port permitting.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:35
Jennifer.

JP **Jennifer McRoy, PE** 2:37
Good morning, Jennifer McCroy with Summit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:41
State of light.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 2:43
Eveline Division of Coastal Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:47
Even we had a very hard time hearing you on that.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 2:53
Let me adjust my computer a little bit. Can you hear me now?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:56
Yes, sir, that's much better. Thank you.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 2:59
Okay, thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:00
Patrick.

PP **Patrick Hartnett, PE** 3:02
Patrick Gardner with Summit.

TM **Tim McCurry** 3:04
Mother.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:06
Uh...
Marisa.

SP **Sarzaeim, Parisa** 3:10
Paris also has the Division of Water Resources.

TM **Tim McCurry** 3:11
I love you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:14
A banana.

TM **Tim McCurry** 3:15
Hello.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 3:17
Amanetta Somerville with EPA Region 4.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:20
Steve Giordano.

S **Steve Giordano NOAA Fisheries** 3:23
Steve Giordano, NOAA Fisheries, Habitat Conservation Division. Good morning.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:30
Good morning, Alex.

SD **Stewart, Alex D** 3:33
Good morning, everyone. Alex Stewart, NCOT Division 3 Project Development. And in the room with me, I also have Katie Height and David Leonard from Division 3.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:42
Right, Tim.

TM **Tim McCurry** 3:45
Tim McCurry, Camp Lejeune, New River.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:50
And Bravis.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 3:54
Travis Wilson, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:59
And then we just had a couple of folks walk into the room just in time. Stephanie Kurtz, City of Jacksonville Jumbo. Steven Adams, City of Jacksonville Jumbo. Thank

you for coming up. Before we begin, I did want to offer the Corps engineers because they were the

Previous federal lead agency, do you have any comments? No, no opening comments. All right. And that's the news. The federal agency with FXWA have been found. Now I'm just getting up to speed on this. I read the packet and talk to Mason about it a little bit.

Clancy on board.

I'd have you before.

With that being said, I'm going to kick it over to the private team for a presentation. Thanks, everyone. We appreciate you being here. This project has been around for a little while, and so we do have some new folks on the project, and we'll try to get you up to speed as easily as possible and refresh everyone's memory on what we've done in the past. So we've done concurrence points one and two in 2018, 2019 and received concurrence on those. And so this meeting is basically an informational meeting to update everyone on where we've been and where we are going.

So, let's get started.

For the agenda today, we just did introductions. We'll talk about the purpose of the meeting. We'll go over the project and some of the history. We'll talk about what we agreed to at the concurrence points one and two meetings, provide you with the updates, and talk about next steps.

So the main purpose of the meeting today is to update the team. The last meeting we had was in August of 2019. And because we're doing a type 3 CE for this project, we'll have Federal Highways, the lead agency, to approve the document. And Finally, we want to get your concurrence on, or to have confirmation on the concurrence of the purpose of the project study area and detailed study alternatives. Project history and overview, just to go over where we are. There are quite a few new people on the call. This is in just south of Jacksonville in Onslow County. US 17 runs north and south through the project. As you can see here on the left side.

NC 210 runs north and south down to North Topsail Beach. And then we have a couple of Y lines NC 172 and we have Old Bugstone Road that cross the project.

This project is roughly about .8 miles. It's adjacent to Sneads Ferry. We have a couple of...



Yeah.

On a teams meeting with on the highway 210.

They can actually hear them.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:28

I'm sorry, we're getting some feedback. I don't know if that's a question.

Somebody have a question or comment?

Okay, we're going to continue on. If you have a question, just let us know. Raise your hand or we'll have questions at the end of this presentation. So there are several really important resources that we are working with along this project. Mostly those are the

Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, which is north and east of our project. Stones Creek Game Lands is south and west of our project. We have Everett Creek Preserve. There's tons of recent development in the area. And then we have North Topsail Beach, which I see two times leads to.

The description of the project in the step is to widen NC 210 to multi-lanes from US 17 to south of Old Folkstone Road.

These are the project costs. They're old. They're likely to go up quite a bit. We're talking about \$164 million.

So we had a concurrence point one and two meeting in August of 2018. At that meeting, it was decided to break it out to CP1 and a separate CP2. So we have an addendum to CP1 to go over the purpose in need and look at traffic a little bit. little bit more. The agreed upon CP1 in May of 2019.

for the purpose and need was about traffic congestion. The need is traffic congestion exists along the existing facility and is expected to worsen in the future. And then the purpose is to achieve an overall level of service of D or better within the study area during peak hour operation.

Grations.

See.

Our project study area at that time is basically the same as what we have now. It starts at US 17 and it extends along to 10, about 300 to 500 feet on either side, crosses over MC 172 with some Y line improvements and crosses Old Boatstone Road with some Y line improvements and ends just south of that.

It's about 5.8 miles.

So, here's a review of Concurrence Point Two. The meeting was held August of 2019,

and Concurrence Point Two was signed October of 2019, and we talked about the detailed study alternatives.

The project was broken into four parts, so there's four segments. Segment one goes from US 17 and ends at Rifle Range Road, which is where the base entrance is.

Segment 2 goes from Rifle Range Road down to

Betty Dixon Road, which is just south of the Everett Creek Preserve. Segment 3 goes from Betty Dixon Road down to NC 172, just after that. And then segment 4 goes to the end. So of those four segments, we looked at three different alternatives. There's A symmetrical widening.

an east side widening and a west side widening. For segment one, we preferred the symmetrical widening or the east side widening, which would move towards the marine core base. Our objectives here are to minimize impacts to the historic resource, which is the Dixon School at US 17 and 210.

There's plenty of wetlands out here, lots of wetlands. We definitely want to avoid those. And of course, we want to impact the Marine Corps base as little as possible. Segment 2 goes from Rifle Range Road, which is the entrance down to Betty Dixon Road, and we prefer symmetrical widening in this area. There's some U-turn bolts that we like to move around to minimize impacts. There's a communications tower we'd like to avoid, and then, of course, Everett Creek Preserve is a...

hugely important resource for red cockaded woodpeckers and their habitat. So there's been a huge push to avoid any issues there, as well as the game landstones Creek. So this kind of gives you an idea, like there's tons of resources around on segment 2 that we need to avoid or minimize the impacts to. It's like threading a needle in this area.

Segment 3 is much more simple. You like special lighting here. There's a lot more. development and segments three and four. In setting up four, we want to move the U-turn bulb to avoid impacts to stream F and work with the community on new planned developments. And then the no build alternative is still on the table for all the segments. So we're going to go through each of the segments and you'll see some of these areas that we're most concerned about. This is segment one. We prefer symmetrical and east side widening here. I am going to enlarge some of these areas so you can see them a little bit better. This is Dixon School. It's eligible for the National Register. You can see here the orange boundary that goes around it is the part that we

want to avoid and minimize as much as possible. Across from it is a gas station. You

can see the little circle. That would be a UST underground storage tanker or something like that that has some hazardous materials involved. We have wetlands and streams labeled on the

these maps. There are three alternatives that are hard to see. It's the dashed lines that go along NC210. There's A symmetrical alignment, an east side and a west side alignment. So those are our three alternatives. The green, which I know it's hard to see, but that's our symmetrical line.

The east side is red, the yellow is the west side.

That's a good question. Sure. Is that the printed out package? Do they have the... This is actually the handout, but you're welcome to look at that too if it'll have to be matched.

That's the old maps, isn't it, but O.K.? Yeah, we can get some more information.

Oops.

So just kind of going through some of the features on this. I just wanted to point out here is the dashed magenta color.

looks like on your screen. This is the Mountains to Sea Trail that goes along US 17, a busy Rd. And you'll see it come back into the picture on segment 2.

The Marine Corps Base is labeled.

north of this section of NC 210. We have lots of wetlands, a stream crossing here.

This is Stones Creek, very important to note. It's a primary nursery area and a Kama AEC.

It is bridged.

And then this is the end of segment one.

Segment 2, we prefer symmetrical widening. We would like to minimize the communications tower, impacts to the communications tower, Everett Creek Preserve, and Stones Creek Game Lands. A no build alternative is an option for all of these. I'm going to zoom in so you can get a better picture of what we have out here. Section 2 begins.

At this point, this is, well, Rifle Range Road is up here. This is another access into the base.

So you can see the three alternatives and dashed lines.

Right here where the blue arrow is pointing to is the communications tower.

There's an electrical substation just south of that.

The other side of the road has a water tower and an EMS building.

This is the Coastal Land Trust, Everett Creek Preserve.

And then on the other side is the Stones Creek Game Land. The RCW is Red Hockey and Woodpecker. RASP RASP is Recovery and Sustainment Program.

The end of segment 2 is here, just south of Betty Dixon Road. The Dixon Elementary School is located at this break point.

We're going to go on to segment 3.

So segment three starts here, just south of the Dixon Elementary School. You can see the three alignments here. We have a bulb out location.

Segment 3 is symmetrical widening.

Not too much to say about this segment. Besides, there's lots of development here.

We do have some USTs located near 172.

Segment 4, our goals here to minimize impacts to stream F and new developments. Symmetrical winding as well. We'll start here at the top. Segment 4 starts just south of NC 172.

We have the SE or Mill Creek crossing here. This is also a CAMA AEC and a primary nursery area. Currently it's piped. There's 72 inch CMP in this location right now.

Here's stream SF. It's one of the streams that we want to minimize impacts to as well.

And then we have some hazmat sites down here, a UST and something else. I'm not sure what the grain is. A few stream crossings and wetlands towards the end of the project, which ends just south of the

Folkestone Road, close to Mill Run Road.

So those are the four segments. I'm going to turn it over to Faith with Summit now, and she's going to go over the typical sections with you, and then I'll jump back in in just a minute. Yeah, so these are the typical sections that were used for the previous alternate designs. As you can see, it

takes the roadway to a four lane divided, median divided roadway with 12 foot lanes. And it had four foot shoulders with an 8 foot total shoulder and a 15 foot ditch along MC210.

The NC 172 typical section was one lane in each direction with a two-way shared left turn lane, with each lane being 12 feet, and again, a four-foot cape shoulder and 8 foot total shoulder width. And then the

Old Folk Stone Road, typical section. It's just two lane, two way with a two shoulder.

We have 8 foot total shoulder.

Okay.

So, this shows what the bridge options were for each alternative with this metric east and west side widening. With the symmetric widening, it would be replacing the

existing bridge with two new bridges.

As shown here, one bridge being wider than the other due to the need for maintenance of traffic. And then with each of the east and west side widening, It.

So it would be proposing, we're proposing to keep the existing bridge and build one new bridge on either side.

That just had the two 12 of lanes and a thirty-six foot minimum clear width.

Thank you, Faith. So we have quite a few updates for you today. Mainly we have new traffic numbers, so we definitely wanted to talk about those with you and let you know what the traffic forecasts are for 2050 for no build and build conditions as well as

I'm sorry, and capacity analysis for levels of service in the area, as well as recommendations on lane improvements along with some of those Y lines. Our design criteria has changed over the years. The roadway design manual has been updated, and that's reflected in new typical sections for us to look at about those in just a minute.

The bridge over Stones Creek, bridge number 19, we'll have a little information on that for you. Bicycle and pedestrian needs are strong in this community, and you'll see that in just a minute. And there's tons of new developments. We have extended the project study area just a little bit, and some of the areas will point out those sections to you. And then we have a typical section with a multi-use path to show you as well. and schedule updates.

So traffic forecasts, we did a new traffic forecast in 2024, and you can see here the 2024 no build versus the 2050 no build numbers. The 2050 no build numbers increased quite a bit on the southern end of the study area, like on the north tops of each side.

has the least percentage of increase. It's about 65% increase. As you travel up the project, up to 10, towards 172 and US 17, the numbers increase to 85% and 95%. So you're almost doubling traffic in 2050. So it's quite It leaves us with a lot of uncertainty on how this road is going to function if it's not improved.

A.

So 2025 traffic capacity analysis gives a lot of information. I'm going to read this to you. I apologize. I'm just not really good with my nomenclature with traffic. For the

2024 no-build condition, all signal S intersections operate at low D or better during the peak hours, though several individual lane groups may operate at a low C or F.

At 3 signalized intersections in the study area, the cue results indicate that the movement that through movement cues may block entry into adjacent turn lanes. The figure on the left shows where the signalized intersections are along the project. So we have, well, one at US 17, that's actually not large, but the next one is Rifle Range Road into the military base. We have a signal at Betty Dixon Road, which is like the south end of Everett Creek Preserve and where the elementary school is located.

We have a signal at NC 172, a signal at Ridgefield Drive, and a signal at Old Folkstone Road.

So the 2025 traffic capacity analysis really gave us some clues on how to move forward with all the projected traffic in the area. Extensive queuing and delays throughout the network are expected for the 2050 no build condition. Those signalized intersections are projected to operate at a low speed or F during at least one peak hour

and all signalized, I'm sorry, all unsignalized intersections are projected to have at least one lane group that operates at a low F during at least one peak hour. The analysis suggests that queuing from signalized intersections block traffic at nearby unsignalized intersections from entering the NC 210 traffic flow, which may result in high levels of delay for unsignalized movements.

Yes.

We do have Gavin from Accelerate on the call if there are any questions about traffic capacity. So we can address those at the end of this presentation.

I'm going to turn it over to Faith again for the design criteria slide. Yeah, so with the updated traffic numbers, we use that to update all of the design criteria, as well as the just updated design standards.

since this project was previously looked at. As Liz said, you can clearly see the increase in traffic, which drove, between the increase in traffic and the design center base drove all of these provisions. The main changes are due.

to the shoulder width, both the paved and total shoulder width, as well as the horizontal alignment. And then just the addition of the multi-use path and a small increase in clears up width.

So this is the previous typical section that we went through. You can see the 4 foot

tape shoulder with the 8 foot total shoulder width. And so that is the main change on the new typical section. Due to the increase in traffic, we are now showing a 10 foot Uh, shoulder, which increases the total shoulder width to 12.

The rest of the goal section is all the same, the 15 footage and same language and media width.

Thanks, Tate. This is a slide picture of the bridge, the bridge over Stones Creek. This bridge was built about almost 20 years ago. It's in good condition. It's neither functionally obsolete or structurally deficient. It's about 130 feet long and 385 currently. So just wanted to let you know that that's the condition of the bridge. And this is the latest structured safety report as of February.

So there are numerous needs in the area. Bicycle and pedestrian needs are high on that list. All kinds of plans talk about bike and ped accommodations in the area. I'll talk a little bit about the amounts to the sea trail. You did get to see some of that on segments one and two.

The Mountains to the Sea Trail, as you know, goes across North Carolina from the Mountains to the Sea. It comes down US 17, goes through Stones Creek Game Lands as a trail, and then joins back to NC 210, which is our project, all the way down to Tops Beach.

Set the maps to see trail segment 15.

Similar to that alignment is the East Coast Greenway. The East Coast Greenway is pretty significant. It goes from the Canadian border in Maine all the way down to Key West in Florida. There's A spur that breaks off in Richmond, Virginia. Part of that spur, or one side of that spur goes through Raleigh. The other side of that spur goes Haysburg.

through Greenville, New Bern, Jacksonville, and on to Topsail Beach. And it joins back to that Raleigh spur in Wilmington and heads further south down to Florida. So this is the coastal spur of the East Coast Greenway. It goes right through our project. It travels down US 17. You can see that this is a high stress Rd. extreme caution.

It also goes down in C210 down to Topsail Beach.

So that being said, it's also on all these other plans, needs for community plan, Jumbo's MTP and Long Range Transportation Plan, Cape Fear Regional Bicycle Plan. We've had conversations with IMD about how to incorporate bike and head into this project.

And then there's connections from Camp Lejeune has trails through the base, as well as lots of access at the coast. So there's a lot of need for bicycle and pedestrian

needs in the area. Lots of development that carries folks to the shopping areas that are

going in along these intersections on the project as well.

We have another typical section. Faith, can I try to say where you should? So this just shows the addition of multi-use path and what we've kind of been looking at as an option for incorporating that into the project. So the multi-use path needs to be outside of the peer zone in the shoulder section.

And so, what that results in is a, I don't know.

Eighteen foot ditch when we multi-use path behind the ditch.

16 or 18. Okay. And then we would also be proposing for the lower speed portion of the project, which is essentially from Betty Dixon Road down to Old Folkestone Road. It's posted 40 miles, 45 mph.

We could utilize curtain gutter in that section to place a multi-use path on one side of the road in the berm and sidewalk on the other side of the road.

Thank you. Okay, the next slide is about new developments, and I will not read all these out to you, but you can clearly see there is a lot of development in the area. We're talking about 240 single family homes, 178 apartments, 90 townhomes, 264 apartments, retail centers, blah, blah, blah. So

You get it. There's tons of new development. If you look on Zillow, you can see there's tons of...

houses and apartments sold right in this area in the past two or three years. So, so much development, all that traffic is jumping on to 210.

This slide talks about changes, other changes in the study area. I just wanted to go over a couple of these. The ports of call bike route in C3 has been rerouted. It no longer goes through the study area. I think our old maps from 2018 show ports of call through the study area. So that's no longer

and stuff here, yeah. To the right of that, we have the communications tower in segment 2 that we wanted to avoid. That is no longer there. This picture is from 2024. The aerial is from 2026, and you can see it's been cleared. It's a little hard to see from this, but anyway, that's the gist.

These middle pictures here are Dixon School. The historic area is in this reddish brown shading. There is a building structure located on this property.

As of today, the latest aerials, that building has been removed. And so we'll be working with Shippo on how, if any, are there effects to this parcel boundary and how to move forward with our design in this area.

The far left pictures, you can see the upper picture shows these points. These are wetland points from 2018 when we did delineations out there. NC 172 is the road that's at the very top. A power line easement is running along the right side. This is forested.

The picture below, it shows what it looks like now. So we have re-delineated this area. It does not look like what it used to look like. This past year was an extreme drought. The wetlands have changed in boundary. They have not been verified yet. So we don't have that information to share with you. yet, but it's a talking point for the future.

So those are some main changes that we've had in the study area. We wanted to let you know what those looked like.

The extension of the project study area, there haven't been many new areas, just small slivers here and there. This is NC 17, so the south end near the high school. We've been coordinating with the school on what their needs are with traffic and, you know, new drivers and things like that.

what the improvements need to be to help them get into school. This is MC 210 here. We have Village Drive, so there's some improvements at Village Drive intersection. That's why that's new area. And then a little bit west on 172, we need this lane improvements in here to accommodate traffic.

Um...

This is Ridgefield Avenue here. There's a signal and this is the location of Dixon Middle School. So we need to do some improvements at this location. And then on the very south end of the project, close to Mill Run Drive, we have an extension here to accommodate some

Turn lanes and such, there's some a lot of new development in this area as well, so. Schedule and next steps. We have a type 3 CE anticipated in November of 2028. Right of way plans will be ready in January of 2029, and the project goes to construction in June of 2034.

So our next steps for the merger team would be to get back together for a CP2A meeting and talk about bridge decisions at Stones Creek Bridge and possibly at Mill Creek or the SE trip to Mill Creek and LEDPA.

We also need to have archaeological surveys done in the area and working more with Shippo on the Dixon School property. So those are our next steps. I think I've covered a lot of history and our updates.

And I think at this time we will open it up for questions.

You could raise your hand on Teams or just speak out and we'll capture questions that way.

Fun question.

CT Cao, Luan T 36:40

Hello. Ultimately, EA will make a decision on whether or not a full reevaluation is needed, but from the perspective of the SHPO, Dixon School is very unlikely to be eligible anymore. We reviewed the project separately under GS18-2092 for... anticipated demolition through state funds. And one of the buildings that they did demolish was the principal contributing resource. So, you know, the buildings that we see left on the satellite are contributing, but quite frankly, they weren't the most important buildings. You know, ultimately, we don't think a full reevaluation is needed. If anything, we would just like some like updated photos that we could add to the our survey site file.

to kind of update that, hey, it's been completely demolished. But realistically, I don't think you're dealing with historic property anymore.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 37:33

That's good to hear. Thank you so much.

TM Tim McCurry 37:45

Yeah, Tim McCurry here from Campbell June. Can you hear me?

HS Headrick, Hannah S 37:48

Yes, sir.

TM Tim McCurry 37:49

Yeah, the questions I want to see if we have we addressed the utilities locate since we've expanded the...

The area on and including the bike and pedestrian path, have we looked at that in conjunction with any type of utilities located, especially since that's additional impacts on the military installation?

Over.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 38:15

So we have completed the final surveys for the project and we have done the evaluation of the dry utilities for utility revification by others. We have not completed the subsurface utility investigation for the water and sewer lines. Yet, we've done by records investigation of where the water and sewer lines are located, but we have not done actual testing like test holes to know exactly where the water and sewer lines are. We have a plan for when we get past CP3 to be collecting additional information on the water and sewer lines.

But.

But, but that that'll be that'll be upcoming.

TM **Tim McCurry** 39:14

Thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:23

I guess my question is on that with the Army Corps. My question is, is managed to catch me up on this. So it looks like...

Your proposal for CP2 was just to have the best fit with the various segments and a no-build. And I know you kind of went over that you did an east and a west sort of analysis. Did you guys present that? I didn't.

I saw like a mention of it in the handout.

So we did go back with the new typical section and go through and develop designs for all the alternatives again. Oh, that's awesome. So we actually have the roll plugs over there and they were included with the meeting information too. So yeah, if we want to look at anything in particular in any specific areas,

All of the alternatives are showing off at all talks with the new typical section, and then we also show the multi-use tab and ask the version without the on the new are all the various alternatives. OK. We also have in the back of your handout, the very back.

a lot of calculations in the very back. Yeah. But it talks about the 2019 alternative, symmetrical, west side and east side. We had the calculations that were done back then for streams, wetlands, start properties, buildings, all that other things.

And then we have a comparison number for the 2026 design with the MEP and without the MEP. So you can get an idea of, you know, how the wetlands.

Rate compared to back. Yeah, that's a lot of numbers, but it helps. Yeah, that's kind

of what I was looking for. So that would, so that's like 2019 all three E is it shifted to the east and I could see it with the MPU there. Yeah, OK.

Yeah, OK.

Oh.

But.

That's per second.

Looks like we have a question from Travis.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 42:01

Yeah, I just wanted to make it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:02

Acha.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 42:04

I just want to make a couple of comments. I had provided written comments on this project as far as impacts to Stones Creek Game Lands and how, so we could understand a little bit how it may impact the RASP agreement. And I understand it's going to be, you know, concurrence.³ before we can really get those numbers.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:16

That's true.

Yep.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 42:23

The other comment I wanted to make was...

because this area is Stones Creek Game Land on one side and we got Everett Creek Preserve on the other and as well as Camp Lejeune. When it comes to the hydraulic structures moving into this next

section item of 2A. I will have some emphasis on wildlife connectivity and passage through those structures, not looking to adjust the grade of the road or anything, but just how those structures are designed, specifically Stones Creek Bridge. And also there is, there's a hydraulic conveyance

Yes.

Around Everett Creek, I don't think it's a large structure. I don't know the size of it. I

don't have it on any of the shapefiles that I have, but it does look like there is a structure that crosses.

TM **Tim McCurry** 43:04

I think.

Okay.

Play the song.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 43:13

from Everett Creek Preserve to the game land somewhere in the headwaters of Everett Creek. But that's a smaller structure that we normally wouldn't look at necessarily at 2A that I will probably like to have some conversation about.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:32

Thank you, Travis.

TM **Tim McCurry** 43:33

This is Tim occur again, specifically with Travis, because I do believe that they've got something when we start talking about the Stones Creek Game Lands or Everett Creek, Stones Creek Game Lands with the grass program, that's definitely a partnership with the state on the management of the Red Cockaded Woodpecker. We would have to have the conversation sooner by later on impacts along that way because we have equity in both. You know, we either give up training land or we give up red cockade and woodpecker habitat on the other side.

of the road for encroachment issues. So we're kind of like stuck in the middle. So I think we need to work that out, which way we need to expand because the whole reason for the RASP program and the Stones Creek Game Land was to protect the range training area. So we would definitely want to have those conversations sooner by later on impacts. And then of course, we'd also have an easement with the Everett Creek game lands also, or not game lands, but the preserves there. So I just want to put that out there. And then I also would like to ask if,

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:36

So.

TM Tim McCurry 44:51

When is the real estate ask going to be from NC dot? When do we need to, when do we need to prepare for that? Because that's going to take an exorbitant amount of time to run up to Naval Facilities Engineering Command for approval.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 45:08

I believe our right away acquisition date is January 2029. That's right. That will be 2034 for our letting date, so we would have four to five years to do the acquisition.

TM Tim McCurry 45:22

OK, it'll take us about that long.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 45:27

But.

OK, we hear you, Tim. Thank you.

TM Tim McCurry 45:32

Okay.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 45:33

I've done that.

Stored and asked that that pass.

****.

Yeah.

Sorry, where does the multi-use trail end to the cell?

Um...

We're proposing it to the end of the project. Are you talking about like where, like before the bridge or? Like, yeah, for like the southern terminus of the project, is it, does your multi-use trail of logical terminal? Yeah, so we were looking at ending it basically at Old Folkestone Road. Okay, so it'd be just before the end of the project. Okay.

I felt the project went to the bridge.

It is a footage.

Yeah, well, it was right before the bridge. There's no run Rd.

Yeah, it might not sound right on the other.

It's before the bridge, but it, but it ends at a driveway to a cost of development. It's hard. OK.

Have we made a decision on the multi-use path?

I believe it's going to be included. No, not yet. We've just been looking at the impacts of non multi-use path options and including the multi-use path. I did want to note on page 8, from Steven and I's knowledge, the commissioners for Anzo County have not.

said that they will take over maintenance as for the multi-use path yet. So here it says that they, that Carter confirmed that they would provide future maintenance, but from our understanding, that has not been brought back to the commissioners yet for actual approval.

Just as a heads up. Thank you. I'll make that.

And just to add to that, that was just a...

unofficial verbal amendment from Pam from the Also County Planning that the when Also County Planning asked the county commissioners about the future maintenance of the multi-use pad, they

They did a job.

So, unofficially said that they would be willing to take a maintenance of the of the multi-use path, but we don't have anything in writing, I get.

Yeah, Matt, I guess just to piggyback that Sneets Ferry is unincorporated, so there's no current entity to take over maintenance. It would fall on county. County doesn't quite have the infrastructure equipment to commit to maintenance for that to use path. So there's still some things we need to figure out on that end.

Yeah.

One of the things that we discussed yesterday about the trail, the MUP, is if...

And I don't know how this works, but if the East Coast Greenway can utilize the same route as the mountains to sea trail in segment one, that would alleviate, in my opinion, that would alleviate having to install something along segment one. And then you could pick up at Betty Dixon and install.

where the actual commercial development is happening.

I don't know how that works with those two entities, you know, talking and making that possible, like rerouting the East Coast Greenway. But that was just something that we talked about yesterday. Just because segment one, it appears has the most impacts with the

you know, the inclusion of the multi-use path.

So, just a thought, I think you know it, it would be more beneficial.

to have pedestrian and bicycle accommodations from Betty Dixon South to the end of the project.

The code would be interested at some point if boardwalks were any less invasive methods of multi-use paths been investigated.

Ohh.

plus regulated paths.

Would that be good?

Would that be like a pedestrian bridge over Stonewidge Creek? Yeah, a lot of times we'll see.

Multi-use paths installed as elevated structures that think like, you know, a wooden boardwalk is often understand, but...

Tell to project budget now.

Those are very expensive and very difficult to maintain. I mean, the county doesn't maintain asphalt or sidewalk right now. I can't imagine that they would be willing to take maintenance of a boardwalk. Just FYI. The city does want to have to maintain boardwalks and we have

The ability to do that, yeah. So, just no, and that's a that's a legitimate reason to to cost is a consideration and and so is logistics. Yeah, logistics is a legitimate item too, but those are our new conversations to have when we get to CP3.

I guess one not saying that too, but it like I added up all your your alternatives to the inclusion of the MP or the multi-use path and.

Alternative one, your preferred Samsung, or the symmetrical widening, which I'm assuming includes all your different segments. Is that right? Okay. So that one did come out the highest on the impact front, at least for resources by agency management.

You do have lots of bits and pieces on this one, and I'm sure your symmetrical widening is probably avoiding us historic resource here, avoiding 4F here, avoiding military property here. So we're basically threading the needles through all of it. You are. I mean, and then the symmetrical, it's not being completely symmetrical. It might be 8 feet on one side, 10 feet, you know what I'm saying? Yeah.

That's kind of why that best fit came through is 'cause we knew we were trying to thread the needle since these valuable resources, so...

And so I guess like when I look at it through the 441 lens, I'll have to, you know, think

about practicability concerns rather than the least environmentally damaging, because you're not, your comfort is yet again, not the least environmentally damaging.

On.

But any help dot has to add things to like what practicability concerns, which I guess reminds cost, logistics, technology, and availability, which this might be a unique project where dot does have availability arguments. I'm sure.

The military is only willing to give you so much or things like that.

Um, you may have more than availability arguments in some spots.

The cost logistics technology available.

It's not.

Y'all confirmed that the.

So, properties are for this, yeah.

I think Kathy has read that.

I can't get him something to say.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 53:47

Hi there, just a couple of comments.

Let's see. So because of the designation of PNA for Stones Creek and that tributary to Mill Creek, I'm guessing is PNA also. I just wanted to kind of wonder if you've put some thought into your stormwater management over those water bodies.

And I guess put a plug in for minimizing any discharge into those water bodies during your design.

That was one.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 54:23

Yeah, we haven't yet, but that will definitely be as we move forward in developing the best fit widening option. We will definitely incorporate that into it.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 54:34

Okay, awesome. And then I had spent a comment ahead of time about control of access. I believe that there's no control of access proposed, and I was wondering if there's areas along the alignment where either limited or full control of access could be utilized to help avoid impacts to the environment as well as maintain that purpose in need of reducing congestion.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:02

Hi Kathy, this is Zach Howard with Project Development. Could you maybe send us an e-mail identifying which of the parcels that you're considering the control of access, just so that we can review that further and perhaps have a decision made on that at that simply three. We'd like to see if that's feasible. And we just, we'd like to investigate that further before responding.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 55:41

Okay, I don't know if I can, but it was more like a general comment. I guess I was thinking along the lines of any of the more highly prized environmental resources like the game land or the Everett Creek Preserve. If there's areas where there's not the need for the access, if there could be some kind of full control of access instituted.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:47

S.
Yeah.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 56:08

But yes, I will. I'll try to put a little bit more thought into that question.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:11

Yeah, I mean, I think our initial thought is a lot of those areas are already protected, you know, from development and preservation. So I don't know what we would gain for control access to those resources.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 56:27

Okay, yeah, I make that make sense.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:28

I mean the base and the game lands and every, you know, Creek, I mean, they're not going to be approached upon. So that whole segment one and part of segment 2 is already protected.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 56:42

Okay.

I think I have one other question I had just seen, I think on page 4 of the packet where there's that proposed outside paved shoulder to maintain traffic during construction of about 21 and a half feet.

And I don't remember saying that on coastal projects before. Maybe there have been, I don't remember. I guess I'm wondering what would happen to that paved area after the project construction was complete?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:19

Chick.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 57:19

Would it be utilized in some way?

What would that look like?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:33

What did you say that was, Kathy?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 57:35

So I think it's page 4. Build 2 bridges, Stones Creek Bridge alternatives, number one. The other bridge will have a 21 and a half outside paved shoulder which will be used to maintain traffic during construction.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 57:52

I got you.

Thank you.

I think ultimately, I mean, we're not.

Looking to likely go with that alternate.

Being that there is a bridge there that is still in good shape.

But just, you know, in our...

In our design development for all the alternatives, we were considering all of the options and that is just what would make symmetric widening in that alternative feasible.

But, you know, I think from our perspective, that's the least desirable alternative design for that area. I will say there's also other constraints. The creek itself turns right after the crossing. And so even just design-wise to do symmetric widening in that and that bridge location is not necessarily a practical alternative. So, I think we're kind of saying this might be worst case scenario, but I mean, we would avoid that if it's not warranted because that's an expense on a bridge structure. We would not.

Want to encounter, so I think it's as we dive into traffic and more of the...

Construction sequencing, we will know more on that, but we would avoid it at all, if all possible.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 59:25

All right, so I guess from a DCM perspective, seeing as that's a crossing of public trust area as well as PNA.

that is likely an alternative at that location that we would probably not support.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:40

I understood. Agreed.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 59:42

Okay, so you still you want to keep it in for study purposes?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:48

I'm gonna have to ask the design team on that.

I think, you know, moving forward, we're going to be primarily more focusing on the best on a best fit type of alignment. So, as we start developing that, we will be kind of narrowing it down to what's going to actually work going forward.

So it may be eliminated. Yeah, it may be eliminated like in the very near future.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:00:20

Will we be doing a revised CP2 or?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:20

Yeah.

No, our agenda is just to have Federal Highway sign off on the CP1 and CP2 and we're just planning on moving forward with two CP2A.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:00:26

I guess I...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:41

No.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:00:42

at 2A.

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

Correct. Kathy, that's kind of a question I had to use, like reading the old CP2 document, it seemed...

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:00:44

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:52

What was agreed upon was just moving the best fit, alternative forward and the no build, right? Well, in segment one, you still have two alternatives. You've got east widening or symmetrical. And then in segment 3, 4, we've got best fit and no build. Are you all turbans?

OK, I'm not. I'm not totally sure. So, in certain segments, I'd have to. When we went to CB2, all three options were looked at: symmetrical, digging, East widening, West widening, and all four segments.

So the merger team concurred that for segment one, they wanted to look at E widening and symmetrical. And then the segments 2, three, and four, all symmetrical. OK. And no, really. Always gotta have no. Yeah, I just turned out. Yes. Brandon. So we need to forget that. Yeah. OK, so yeah, it sounds like we would go to CB3 with not just one altar. Correct. Love that. Yeah. We would show you east widening on segment one or.

OK, and then we could do our 404 be one thing and beautiful. Yep, and then of course, as we move through the once we choose that laptop.

You know, we would look at avoid minimization, we could still potentially reduce the shift in the new resources. OK.

Play Travis has a question.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:02:31

Yeah, I don't want to cut off this conversation if more needs to be had, but I did want to confirm now that there's federal highways and federal money being involved that the Stones Creek Game Lands is going to go through 4F coordination or evaluation.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:02:48

Yes.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:02:49

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:02:49

It will.

And currently this project is still state funded, but the way things have been going, we feel comfortable going, more comfortable going federal documents.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:03:01

OK, that's good to know.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:03:08

And I just had one question about CP1 with the person need.

Is it? Do you guys feel that it's encompassing enough to cover a multi-use path as well?

Are you all updating that?

Isn't it just out?

So, we we have discussed this over the last few months, and I know that we have discussed modifying the books to include a statement about the bike and pedestrian accommodations, but we we thought that

It wasn't the specific purpose in need of the project. It's really just the traffic congestion, but we were.

close driving, yeah, yeah, that's enough described in there. It's like a secondary

purpose, and last I can say, yeah.

Oh, I see that.

Okay, all right.

It does say it.

What is the official? What does it say in the last paragraph on paper? Where is my signature paper? On paper.

We do not talk about it. No, we do not, but it's not.

It's not uncommon for us to stay in as a secondary.

See you back.

****.

Is it listed as a secondary?

Not in the purpose of the statement is to decide by the other thing, yeah.

No, that's the actual state, I think.

That's in the meeting purpose.

Yeah, because of originally.

Down 18, we did not have complete streets where we were looking at multimodal requirement and we have that policy in there, so that's how it's we're saying that's a change in dot policy. We're having to implement into this project now. Even without that, this project was still purpose needed for the traffic congestion, so I just.

And.

I mean, I'm open to suggestions, but I mean, I just feel like the purpose of need that was agreed upon is still the same that we're trying to address the congestion.

Second, right way.

Yeah, I hear you. I think I worry they could put you in a spot where there's alternatives without a multi-use path and still meet your purpose and need.

I don't know. Are you are you comfy, Seth? I agree with what you're saying. I think it may be wise that we have the latitude to revise the purpose statement as part of this signing on or that is required. Everyone has to go back and resign.

Is that considered a significant enough change? It dies to or forgot something that happened.

I mean, well, like Matt said, I don't want it to be like if it's important, especially with the Mountain Sea Trail and the East Coast Green Bay, like I built more than most problems like this could really demonstrate.

I don't want to be a scenario where we have to cut it out because it impacts and getting to let the, I don't know, so until we have concurrence on actual maintenance

of it, I'd hate to change the hate to revise it, and then that puts us in a predicament where we have to install it, but then there's no.

Maintenance of it.

So, I think I, I mean...

I don't, I don't know if revising the purpose in need.

without fully knowing that they're going to commit to that.

And I do want to say that we are looking at two different options for the symmetrical widening and for the use of less widening. That's why the in the tables at the end of the merger handout, we calculated MX for the option.

just for the roadway widening, the non-MUP option, that we have an option in the table with the calculations of the impacts, including the most of these maps. So just want to, I just want to make sure everybody's aware that we are looking at both options. So you're presenting it with MPU. Yeah, sure.

In.

So I guess I mean maybe you can make an argument that because there are users of the East Coast Greenway and the Mount Sissy Trail that otherwise would be in a lane of traffic, that that's going to contribute to congestion, which is part of the purpose and need. Yeah. And that's a way to kind of thread it in there without calling it out.

Yes, if you got a really busy Rd. and got a biker or a hiker, that's gonna get more conservative like that's backed up. Yeah, so we do have some allowance.

tweak the language in the document. We do have that.

In the within the yes, the merger documents. Well, within, so yes, we all agree on knowing that there could be some final tweets at the document.

So, as long as everybody...

Yeah, without officially going back to see.

Yeah, so you're...

You're saying we, yeah, we have latitude for the NEPA document to have a different type of state? It's kind of where you're going, yeah.

Um...

But we did not.

Hold on.

Sh.

You got the same.

It's A catch-22 because I hate it. So all of a sudden, you know, multi-use path is the maintenance of it is funded.

I can see Matt's point is that it's mostly used as far as that significantly changes the potential impacts to.

Or, for resources, so...

And I will say that the multi-use map will also increase the cost of the project for a right-of-way acquisition, utility location, and the construction costs. So there will be additional costs, quite significant increase in cost for including the multi-use map. So that's something else that we're considering.

decision making. Okay.

I'm kind of leaving. I think it's kind of a risk decision on y'all's part. So I think, you know,

It sounds like, at least what I'm hearing is it sounds like the multi-use path thing isn't, not everybody's sold on it about how are we doing this maintenance and all that. I'm going to take this question. The transportation agencies have to figure out how long is it going to take to decide that's feasible.

Is it realistic that we can have that before before we can sign something?

So I think it would take months or years. And Seth, I don't think the proposal you were kind of saying was, I don't think that was crazy to be like, well, thanks for not taking it. But to, you know, try to like, it might just involve like a little wordsmith and. Of.

You know.

the bike and pedestrian traffic on the road, given the, you know, all these major pedestrian thoroughfares are all. I mean, to almost address it by just saying the congestion and safety along is due to cause the bike traffic in the travel lane currently.

Yeah, by safety. I don't see it. We've all seen people making really bum-head decisions when they get stuck behind the bike here and pass and take the test that they probably shouldn't take. Does it say unsafe? No, but I'm just saying that could be the small tweet we can make.

Without resigning. Yeah, I don't hate from my side. I don't. I don't dislike that. It's I mean, it's like that boxes you into it for an option. Federal Highway doesn't like safety and perfect in these because a lot of times.

Despite the best effort, say she doesn't, we don't like to put something in there that we can't really.

Yeah, it's possible way of cheating. That's not a hard and fast.

To get a final decision on the maintenance of the Bonzo down or the multi-use path,

they would have to, we'd have to have a signed municipal agreement signed by Bonzo County and by NCUT that Bonzo County would be doing the maintenance of the multi-use path. So we'd have to have that.

Agreements will be signed and executed, and that contain.

If, if everyone is in agreeance, so that also counting and hits a DFT, it could take two or three months to come out.

TM Tim McCurry 1:14:40

Yeah, I just want to add in from the military's perspective. I agree with what Stephanie put out there for the maintenance of that, but there's still going to be a real estate ask from the military. And we're going to weigh both options, you know, multi-use path or not on the real estate ask from our standpoint.

And that's going to go up for approval for both scenarios. So I just want to make sure that.

As we start looking at stuff, then we look at and balance the purpose and need off of that. So you're going to have to do a pretty good job of clarifying what the purpose and need is on any type of proposal going forward from our standpoint.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:15:21

And one other thing that I'll add, the option that we're looking at for the different widening scenarios for the multi-use path, we are only looking at including the multi-use path on the west side of NC 210 across the road from the Marine Corps Base. So we're not looking at having the multi-use path on the east side, Marine Corps Base side of the roadway. It would be on the opposite side. Is that the left side? 73? That is the Nixon School side. Okay.

TM Tim McCurry 1:16:00

Yeah, and we saw that, but you know, from a symmetrical side, from our standpoint, when I think of symmetrical, are we shifting or are we just doing lane widening? But if I'm adding an extra 10 plus the buffer in there, feet onto the asymmetrical, am I shifting?

You know, the symmetrical.

The roadway encroachment on the bay side increases for symmetrical alignment, not just an additional right of way encroachment on the west side of 210. How am I

reading that? Do I interpret that right or how do you see the multi-use path coming down?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:27

Right.

Yeah, I see your point because you're talking about a wider corridor with the multi-use path and then shifting, even symmetrical, it could still shift more and create more of a take or potentially impact in the marine base.

TM **Tim McCurry** 1:16:55

Exactly, both sides.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:57

Yeah.

So it seems really important that we know whether we can do sending Pete.

For both angles, whether it's yes or not, and I'm in the kitchen, so.

Once I got to do the schedule.

To sign.

Totally sad.

Possible, or is that great? Yeah, I can. Do we need to revise the purpose and need to specifically call out the MP? We need to know then.

That's really truly an option.

But I don't know, your overall schedule, that's good.

It seems like it could. We don't want to potentially paint ourselves in a corner, you know, being honest, we can prematurely move forward without this, right? We're looking at May or the CB2A.

If the East Coast Greenway uses the alignment for the mountains to sea trail, then it avoids the it avoids the base.

If you just eliminate the multi-use path from Betty Dixon to 17, then it's not impacting base. Or the big lakes.

it would just use that same alignment. I don't know if you have that whole, like if you can go to Google or whatever, you can bring the mountains to see and you can see their alignment, their full alignment, how it runs.

So, a multi-use path would start segment 3, segment 2, segment 2.

I think maybe not, maybe second.

I, yeah.

I would just go to like just punch in Google mountains to sea trail and they have a website and you can just pull show their map.

Tim, can you see the site or see the screen?

I took, I did not share.

TM **Tim McCurry** 1:19:12

I know what the Mountains of Sea Trail actually, I've seen it many times before. So I know it goes through, you know, Stones Creek and I've been on it. So I understand that piece of it. I don't understand if we're talking about a multi-use

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

You.

TM **Tim McCurry** 1:19:30

path. I'm thinking of pedestrian traffic from the local community applies the mountains to sea trail, because I think somebody with carrying some groceries back and forth are not going to use the mountains to sea trail. So we're going to get the six or seven people that actually want to do that hike. And most of them are just parking in the parking lot and running through Stone Street and coming back. But

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:19:45

See.

TM **Tim McCurry** 1:19:52

actually coming from the western part of North Carolina and using the mountains of sea trail, I think that's minimal impact. It's more of a...

That's more of a commercial or whatever a billboard than it is that actual usage. But I do want to say that we do have multi-use trail that comes out of the Stones Creek or the Marshock area for the base that connects to nowhere. So I want to propose something out there that might be something for consideration.

is there might be a multi-use trail that starts at the Stones Creek entrance and heads, what is that, east and south?

into the toward the 172 intersection that way by us going down to the Dixon High School area where which encroaches on the range training area.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:20:45

I think that could work too. I'm not saying to not have a multi-use path at all. What I am saying is the East Coast Greenway would change their alignment so that it would run as the same alignment as the mountains to sea trail because a mountains to sea trail comes down 17, comes onto this trail that runs through the game lands or whatever that is, and then runs on 210. So in my simplistic mind, my thought is, okay, well, then, you know, both of them are running concurrently on 210. So if you're on either one of those trails, you would just go on the new MUP on 210 that picks up at Betty Dixon Road.

But if there's already a trail that needs a connection from Stones Creek.

I mean, I think we could start it there too. I just don't know if I see the benefit of impacting the bridge and the stream and all of that for the MUP in the section from Betty Dixon without considering the Marine Corps trail from Betty Dixon to 17.

I think that's can we pull up like an overall map with my Google map standpoint?

Yeah, right, maybe the map you had shown the different trails. I think that.

Um, I'm just so I can track what we're talking about. Yeah, but the um, mounts is the trail back up there. Well, where did you bring that up, Travis? Do you have a problem?

ww Wilson, Travis W. 1:22:21

Yeah, a couple, but it's really piggybacking on what Tim was just talking about. First off, the number one is do not make the assumption that the trail would be allowable through the game lands. It's going to depend on what kind of trail.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:22:25

It.

Yes.

***** names.

ww Wilson, Travis W. 1:22:41

We do not allow anything like a multi-use path or asphalted trail ADA accessible kind of pathway through the game lands. That would not be consistent with game land use and the use of that property.

HS**Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:49

Steve.

That's not, Travis, that's not what I'm referring to. There's already a trail that runs through the game lands. It's that brown line on the map right there. So the mountains.

WW**Wilson, Travis W.** 1:23:03

Yeah, I know the Mountains to Sea Trail runs through the game lands, but I'm just, you know, at this point with this project, going ahead and assuming that the use of the multi-use path and the East Coast Greenway would be consistent with the Mountains to the Sea Trail.

It is not an assumption that needs to be made right now, and kind of what Tim was saying is...

East Coast Greenway and the multi-use path, I envision is two different things. If the multi-use path need is being driven by the East Coast Greenway, that kind of seems a little excessive from what needs to be constructed. If the East Coast Greenway could be concurrent with the same type of trail and use to the mountains to the sea, You know, then maybe that's a conversation, but I don't think it's a conversation needs to be had with this project.

I think that's a conversation that honestly is outside of this project. Conversation is...

HS**Headrick, Hannah S** 1:24:02

From my understanding, the multi-use path was brought up by the East Coast Greenway. That is, that is where that conversation came from. They were the initiators with IMD for the multi-use path on this project to accommodate the East Coast Greenway.

And to add on to that, the bike lanes were evaluated instead of the multi-use fab to be included along this section from US 17 to Betty Dixon Road. But because the closet speed line is 55 mph and the ADT is over 40,000, vehicles per day. IND is against having on-road bike lanes. So that had to be eliminated from a safety standpoint. And so the only other bike accommodation that we have is the visible to use that. That's the only other option that we have. And so that's how we

That's how we got to the MVP.

SD Stewart, Alex D 1:25:11

So this is Katie Height from Division 3. If I could have a moment real quick. So I know there's been some conversation about the multi-use path. I know there's been conversation about maintenance related activities.

From my understanding, the multi-use path is not part of the purpose and need. Is that correct?

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:35

Correct. Not from 2019, Katie, no.

SD Stewart, Alex D 1:25:36

They were not right.

Are we trying to add it today? I may have missed that part.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:25:43

That's why we're debating whether we need to enter it or not at it.

SD Stewart, Alex D 1:25:46

Okay be.

So before, something I would like for the group to consider and to understand is that NCDOT does not maintain off-road facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. So therefore, for there to be a multi-use path within our right-of-way, or a sidewalk within our right-of-way, there must be some other agency or jurisdiction that would maintain it. So if we don't have, if the county is not able to maintain it and we're not incorporated, because I know Needs Ferry is not incorporated and the base is not, planning to maintain that facility, then I think we should be very cautious on putting that in a purpose and need when we cannot deliver if we don't have a maintaining party.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:26:51

Thanks, Katie. Yeah, this is Seth. Seth, my recommendation is to find out, get a definitive answer on that one way or the other before we sign anything. So we were made work.

We need to get that.

Thanks, and my.

Because it has some maybe unintended ripple effects that could call some layers.

If the schedule allows, I would suggest that.

I mean, I think and it kind of sounds like it might be unlikely. Yeah, and I think we could maybe have a definitive answer what time we reach this go to CP2 and then we can address it then same CP1 same time.

What's that thing?

Yeah.

She.

Everybody's comfortable with that. We just wait and see if we can get a definitive answer and we just move forward.

DDs.

K.

It says in concurrent sign and leave them alone until we get a defensive answer about the multi-use pass, then we'll address it if we need to.

Amend the purpose of need, we'll do that at CP2, you know, submit CP2 signature form as well. So we'll just plan on moving forward to CP2 and hopefully we'll have y'all answer about it.

I do that.

That would be May next year. That's right. We're aiming for May for the CP2A, CP3 combined meeting. Well.

We may need to reevaluate that.

Because based on Travis's comments, I think seeking food is going to require some field investigations with the murder team. So they're talking about DNA.

So, I think we might need, as a team, consider separating CPG to see if we would have separate CPG, because usually...

So that CB2A, I'm sorry. That's a separate field investigation with the merger team members that would like to see what we're discussing for the major hydraulic process. So I think we need to separate it, see how we can do that. I cannot do it now.

So.

I believe Amanetta has a question.

So this is Amanetta with EPA. So I just want to make sure I'm clear. We're not sure if we're moving forward with the multi-use path and we will find out before we get to CP2A if we are.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:30:00

Correct. And if we are, if it's moving forward, we will amend the purpose and need statement and have the merger team resign.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 1:30:02

Okay.

Okay, and we're not expecting, I guess, any update until the spring of 27?

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:30:14

If we can get an update sooner, we will definitely share the team. I'm just given CP2A as the deadline.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 1:30:21

Okay, that sounds great. Thank you.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:30:23

If we're not doing a multi-use path, because it's not maintainable, then so how I would just sign what's solid, so that is correct.

Zach, I just wanted to ask, what would the county, with the communication with car that you talk about, what does the county need to?

The bit to the maintenance, like, do they need to see the design, then go in and kind of figure out an estimate for what it would require, type of equipment?

or they would sign any type of premium.

So from NCDOT's perspective, we would need to have a signed municipal agreement delivered to the county, but it would have to be signed and approved by the county and then signed by our chief engineer. And as far as the information that also county.

need to have to be comfortable signing that agreement. It's really going to depend on their level of confidence.

In previous projects with these multi-use path maintenance agreements, I haven't provided that kind of information to the to the county before.

I can, I can discuss it with the county with Carter Metcalf, see what kind of information he would need to have.

That might mean I have, but I would need to discuss what we have to see what his confidence level is. Can you include us on that, please?

Yeah, we almost need something in writing saying they will agree to sign a decrease.

This way, add that as, I don't want just a verbal follow up something in writing.

We're having a hard enough time threading a needle on this thing, so...

Any other questions or anything, comments, before we let y'all go through the rest of your day?

And nothing, we thank you for your time and look forward to seeing you all in May at CP2A.

The.

 **Wilson, Travis W.** 1:33:01

Thank you, mate.

 **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:33:03

Thank you.

 **Stewart, Alex D** 1:33:04

Thank you.

 **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:33:04

Thank you.

 **Lane, Stephen** 1:33:06

Thank you. Have a good day.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription