

1 **OFFICIAL PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT**  
2 **Public Hearing Transcript**  
3 **R-2559/R-3329 Monroe Connector Bypass**  
4  
5

6 Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I would like to welcome you all to the North  
7 Carolina Department of Transportation's Public Hearing on the Monroe Connector  
8 Bypass Project, also known as State Transportation Improvement Program Project  
9 Number R-2559/R-3329. Just as a side note that at one point these were two separate  
10 projects, but due to their mutual relationship and some other factors, we decided to  
11 combine these projects into one.  
12

13 Now, my name is Jamille Robbins. I am a Public Involvement Officer with the  
14 Department of Transportation and I will be your moderator for tonight's public hearing.  
15 Before I move any further, I do want to take the time to cover some housekeeping and  
16 ground rules.  
17

18 *(Moderator is having technical difficulty with the audio system.)*  
19

20 The restrooms are just outside the door to the left, make a left and the restrooms are on  
21 the left. Also, if you have a cellphone on please turn it off. This preceding is formal and  
22 being recorded, so we don't want to interrupt anything with ringtones.  
23

24 Now, as far as ground rules go, I only have one rule and that is the "golden rule" and that  
25 is to treat others as you would like to be treated. And I say that instead of having a long  
26 list of rules for tonight. I feel like we're all adults here and following the golden rule  
27 especially on a project like this where you have different viewpoints, you have people for  
28 the project, and you have people against the project or different aspects of the project. So,  
29 if someone gets up to speak during the comment period that you disagree with, please  
30 provide them the same respect that you would like if you got up to speak.  
31

32 And also, one other note this is not a debate. I'm not here to argue with anyone. I have  
33 information that we are going to present and get your feedback on that information. So,  
34 when you come up and you want to get into an argument, I'm not going to argue with  
35 you.  
36

37 Also, before I go any further, I do want to let everyone know there's a lot of NCDOT  
38 staff and some of our consulting staff here tonight, who've assisted a lot of you tonight.  
39 You can recognize them with the white name tags on. I'm not going to introduce  
40 everyone here in the interest of time, but I do want to acknowledge our Division  
41 Engineer, Mr. Louise Mitchell, who is here tonight and our Assistant Division Engineer,  
42 Mr. Rick Baucom. He's in the back; and our Division Public Information Officer, Ms.  
43 Jen Thompson.  
44

45 And also from NCDOT we have our Project Manager, Ms. Jennifer Harris. And the  
46 Consulting Firms helping us here tonight, we have Atkins, Carl Gibilaro and his staff has

47 been here. They have assisted us with the preparation of the environmental document, as  
48 well as the maps that you see here tonight. We also have the firm, Michael Baker  
49 Engineering here. We have Mr. Scudder Wagg here, who is the Project Manager with  
50 them and several of their staff here assisting us tonight. And they assisted us in the  
51 preparation of the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis, which is part of the  
52 presentation. So, we will talk about that in just a few.

53

54 Alright, so let's go ahead and get started. Just tonight just to let you know we will start by  
55 talking about the purpose of tonight's hearing. I'll cover the project overview, which is  
56 the history, the description of the project. We'll talk about the litigation that has taken  
57 place and the recent activities and we'll talk about schedule. And then we will open it up  
58 for comments.

59

60 Now, the *purpose of tonight's hearing* is simply to make you, the public a part of the  
61 project development process. We want to get your input on the maps that you see here  
62 tonight. As a note, the maps have not changed since 2009. These are the same maps that  
63 were presented at the public hearings in 2009.

64

65 Really tonight we want to get your input on the new environmental document, the Draft  
66 Supplemental Final EIS or Environmental Impact Statement. So, that's really the main  
67 focus of tonight, which was the result of the litigation, which we'll talk about in just a  
68 second.

69

70 Now, copies of the maps that you see tonight as well as the environmental document, the  
71 Draft Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement have been available at the  
72 following locations. And these locations are listed in your handout. But the document, as  
73 well as, the maps are available on the project website. And the document has been posted  
74 at these locations since November 18<sup>th</sup>. Now, as a side note to that the document was  
75 published in the Federal Register on November 22<sup>nd</sup>.

76

77 Now, as I stated before the purpose of tonight's public hearing is to make you, the public  
78 a part of project development process. Your input in that process is important. And you  
79 do that by having your comments recorded here tonight during these formal proceedings  
80 or by writing them on the attached comment sheet or by submitting written comments  
81 either via email or fax, however. But you can send comments in to myself or Ms. Jennifer  
82 Harris and our information is listed in the handout that you have. And we are taking  
83 comments through January 6<sup>th</sup>.

84

85 So, *what are we going to do with the input?* In about six to eight weeks, we will hold  
86 what is known as a post-hearing meeting to discuss all the written and verbal comments  
87 that have been received throughout this comment period. At this meeting, again, we will  
88 go through each and every comment and take that into consideration as the project moves  
89 forward.

90

91 But I want to be clear that the Department of Transportation cannot just take public  
92 comment into consideration in making decisions. We have to balance that against good,

93 sound, engineering criteria. We have to balance that against cost, traffic service. We have  
94 to look at safety. We have to look at the impacts to the natural and human environment.  
95 Again balance all that out to make sure what we put on the ground is the best product for  
96 the traveling public.

97  
98 And also minutes of this meeting will be prepared and made available to the public. So, if  
99 you desire a copy of those meeting minutes, when you send in your comments, just put a  
100 note that you would like a copy. Once they are completed and finalized, I will make sure  
101 that you receive a copy. And also let me know how you would like to receive it, via email  
102 or snail mail. And we will also try to get that up on the project website as well.

103  
104 Let's talk about the *project purpose*. This is the "why" of the project. Why are we  
105 building this project? This statement is really known in transportation terms as the  
106 *purpose and need of the project*. This is basically the cornerstone of the project  
107 development process; because all of the alternatives that are developed have to meet the  
108 purpose and need. They are all measured against the degree to which they meet the  
109 purpose and need.

110  
111 And I'm going to read this verbatim because this comes straight from the environmental  
112 document. The purpose of this project is to improve mobility and capacity within the  
113 project study area by providing a facility for the US 74 Corridor from near I-485 in  
114 Mecklenburg County to between the towns of Wingate and Marshville in Union County  
115 that allows for high-speed regional travel consistent with the designations of the North  
116 Carolina Strategic Highway Corridor Program and the North Carolina Intrastate System,  
117 while maintaining access to properties along existing US 74.

118  
119 Again, the project is to build or proposing to build a fully controlled access toll road  
120 again from near I-485 in Mecklenburg County east to US 74 between the towns of  
121 Wingate and Marshville and that is about a distance of...the project is about 20 miles  
122 long.

123  
124 Again, this is the preferred alternative based on the updated analysis that we'll touch on  
125 in a few minutes. The preferred alternative is unchanged from the Final Environmental  
126 Impact Statement that was completed in 2010. This is still the preferred alternative that  
127 you see here and I'll go through that in just a second when we review the maps.

128  
129 But before I do that I just want to touch on the "typical section" of the project. This is  
130 another word for the "cross section" of the roadway. And this is what the roadway would  
131 look like if I cut a piece of it out and turned it up on its side. At the top, this is the cross  
132 section or typical section for the first mile of the project from I-485 to east of Stallings  
133 Road. As you see here, we have 6-lanes, 3-lanes in each direction separated by a barrier,  
134 a jersey barrier with one-way frontage roads on either side. And that varies from two the  
135 three lanes.

136

137 At the bottom is the cross section, typical section for the majority of the project. The  
138 majority of the project is on new location. And for that we are proposing two 12-foot  
139 travel lanes in each direction separated by a grass median.

140  
141 Now, as far as map review I'm not going to spend a lot of time on the maps. But if you  
142 turn over here, look at the map here, everyone could look. Again, these maps have been  
143 out since 2009. I do want to point out the preferred alternative, which is the green, the  
144 orange, and the dark greenish-blue. I don't know what that color is, but anyway this is the  
145 alignment of the preferred alternative.

146  
147 This is I-485 here. Here is Indian Trail. This is Indian Trail-Fairview Road here. Here is  
148 Unionville-Indian Trail Road. This is Rocky River Road. Here is US 601. Here is  
149 Morgan Mill Road or NC 200. Here is Austin Chaney Road. And here is Forest Hills  
150 School Road. And this is US 74. To the east, here's Wingate and Marshville. And those  
151 roads that I pointed out are the locations of the interchanges along the project. And then  
152 of course, the interchange on the western end of US 74, again for that first mile would be  
153 that first cross section where the road is elevated with the frontage roads to provide  
154 access to existing properties in this area; again just past Stallings Road and it takes off on  
155 new location.

156  
157 Alright, let's back up and talk a little bit about the history. I've touched on a few of those  
158 things. But as I said, in 2007, the decision was made to combine the two projects into  
159 one. In January 2007, Federal Highway Administration issued a Notice of Intent to  
160 prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the combined project. In June 2007, we  
161 held our first series of public meetings where we introduced people to the project and got  
162 input on the purpose and need of the project.

163  
164 In April 2009, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was approved. We held public  
165 meetings in May of that year to present the 16 detail study alternatives that were  
166 evaluated in that Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Again, each of those  
167 alternatives was compared against the purpose and need and then the other criteria as well  
168 as some others that I mentioned earlier.

169  
170 And following the public hearings, additional environmental studies were done. And  
171 based on the public comments that we received, the input from some resource agencies,  
172 the preferred alternative, which was Detailed Study Alternative D in the Environmental  
173 Impact Statement, was selected as the preferred alternative. And that is the alternative  
174 that I just covered.

175  
176 In August 2010, the Record of Decision was signed. In November 2010, the SELC, the  
177 Southern Environmental Law Center filed a lawsuit against the Federal Highway  
178 Administration as well as NCDOT alleging that we did not comply or the study that we  
179 did not comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

180  
181 In October 2011, the Federal District Court ruled in our favor. Subsequently, we awarded  
182 the contract to a Design-Build Team in November of that year. The Design-Build Team

183 actually had meetings in December of that year. Following that court ruling in our favor,  
184 the SELC filed an appeal.

185  
186 In May 2012, the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the lower court's decision  
187 saying that we failed to take a hard look at the environmental consequences. Following  
188 that decision, we suspended construction right-of-way activity.

189  
190 In June 2012, the Department of Transportation filed a petition for a re-hearing. We also  
191 had public meetings to update the public where the project stood. On June 29<sup>th</sup> of that  
192 year, our petition for re-hearing was denied. And subsequently, the Federal Highway  
193 Administration rescinded the Record of Decision on July 3<sup>rd</sup>.

194  
195 Now, the full appeal can be found on that website. All you have to do is search for the  
196 Monroe Connector. Now, the ruling stated that the Department failed to disclose the  
197 underlining assumptions in the socio economic projections that were used. Therefore, we  
198 did not take a hard look at the environmental consequences.

199  
200 Now, since that time, we've been working hard to address those issues that were rose by  
201 the courts. We've done field reviews and environmental studies and all that has been in  
202 preparation of the Draft Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement, which is  
203 the reason we're here tonight. Again, that is the new information that we are presenting to  
204 you tonight to get your input on.

205  
206 Now, in the new document that Draft Supplemental Final Environmental Impact  
207 Statement on the topics that were re-evaluated were for the purpose and need, which was  
208 reconfirmed based on our updated analysis. We looked at traffic. And this is all the  
209 information we look at in any of our environmental documents. Farmland, we look at  
210 utilities. We look at cultural resources, impacts to the natural and human environment,  
211 noise impacts, air quality, and so on.

212  
213 Now, central to the litigation was the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis or ICE  
214 Analysis. And the purpose of the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis is to  
215 understand the impacts of a project that are further in the future that impacts an  
216 environment that are beyond the direct impacts of building that project.

217  
218 So, when we're doing this analysis we have to look at what the environment is now. We  
219 have to look at what the environment will be in the future without the project. And we  
220 also have to take a look at what the environment will be in the future with the project.  
221 And for all of our projects we do what is known as a Qualitative ICE Analysis, which  
222 looks at the changes expected or the general magnitude for those changes that are  
223 expected.

224  
225 And the Qualitative ICE Analysis was completed on this project in 2007 and included in  
226 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. In total with resource agencies and others, it  
227 was decided that we needed a more in-depth analysis, which is known as a Quantitative

228 ICE Analysis, which is a more precise and more accurate estimate of changes and  
229 potential impacts of the project and would be the result of the project.

230

231 And again, since this was central to the litigation it was ruled that the methods used in  
232 that analysis that was a critical issue in that litigation. And so, in order to address those  
233 concerns, we completed a new Quantitative ICE Analysis. The first Quantitative ICE  
234 Analysis was included in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. But again as a result  
235 of litigation, we had to do a new analysis. And to talk about that analysis we have Mr.  
236 Scudder Wagg, who prepared that for us.

237

238 Scudder Wagg: Thank you Jamille. And can you all hear me on this  
239 microphone?

240

241 Audience Members: Oh yes.

242

243 Scudder Wagg: Thank you very much. I want to start by just saying that  
244 I'm going to be touching on some detailed and technical aspects of our analysis and it's  
245 challenging to summarize all of that in this short presentation. Our report is here though  
246 tonight if you want to read it on our website. And if you have any questions about our  
247 reports or analysis after the presentation I will be here after the presentation. Jamille and  
248 our staff will be here. And other staff members that are on the team will be here to  
249 answer questions. I just want you to know that we are here to answer those questions that  
250 you may have.

251

252 I just also wanted to point out that we really wanted to hit on this...we really wanted to  
253 touch on this because of how essential this issue was to the litigation. In fact, we were  
254 reprimanded for not being as open and transparent as we could be in all of the  
255 assumptions that went into that.

256

257 So what are ICEs? Jamille touched on it for a moment, but for most of the impacts that  
258 we talk about in the EIS process are mostly direct impacts. So, if you go to build a road  
259 and someone's house is there and you take that house, it's a direct impact. Indirect  
260 impacts are something like if you're building a new road with an interchange and a lot of  
261 new development occurred around that interchange and there was some protected species  
262 habitat in the area. Well, if all of that new development is only occurring because you  
263 build the road, then that's an indirect impact to that protected species.

264

265 Cumulative impacts are similar but they're a little different in that you assessing the total  
266 impacts from what occurs just because you built the road plus what's occurring no matter  
267 what. And that no matter what is what's going to occur in the "no-build" scenario that  
268 Jamille talked about.

269

270 In all of this we're assessing over a very long time, we're looking out to 2030 to estimate  
271 what's going to happen pretty far in the future. So, as you can imagine there's a lot of  
272 uncertainty in all of that estimation. We have challenges of trying to identify changes that  
273 are going to happen perhaps far away from the road and far away in time, identify

274 changes that are going to occur with or without the project, and you know identify  
275 changes that are going to occur because of decisions by other people, other than besides  
276 NCDOT, by a private landowner, by local governments, and so on. So, there are lots of  
277 challenges in trying to assess all of those potential effects.

278  
279 As with any ICE there are certain issues that are identified as being critical issues. And  
280 the scoping process that was conducted in the 2008-2009 time period for the Quantitative  
281 ICE, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the EPA, the Wildlife Resources Commission, and  
282 the public at large had an opportunity to say what was important and what were critical  
283 issues.

284  
285 And some of those identified issues were before protected species that Fish and Wildlife  
286 was in charge of protecting the endangered species; but also general impacts to wildlife  
287 habitat and potential loss of agricultural land and forested land. So, those are the things  
288 we were trying to assess. Here you can see those forest species and in the process to  
289 update our report as well as the general report we've done new surveys of those species  
290 to see what's out there and no new populations have been found. So, there's been no  
291 change in that assessment of where those species are.

292  
293 But in trying to assess the problem, again, we have to look far beyond the road itself. So,  
294 we looked about 5-miles around the proposed roadway. The whole study area is 202,000  
295 acres. It covered 5-miles approximately around the road. And so you have to look at how  
296 to break that up into reasonable chunks that you can analyze and also into chunks that  
297 makes sense for the problems you're analyzing.

298  
299 And in this case, one of the key problems we're trying to understand is how things will  
300 affect the Carolina Heelsplitter, which lives in streams. And so watersheds were our main  
301 area of analysis. If you've never heard of a watershed before, basically it's the area of  
302 land that the water that drains from it all runs in the same place. So, in this case looking  
303 at the brown area on the top of the map there that's the Goose Creek Watershed, which is  
304 one of the watersheds where the Carolina Heelsplitter lives. And all the water that falls on  
305 that land in that area drains through the Goose Creek and eventually to the Rocky River.

306  
307 So, we looked at these 18 watersheds. And our challenge was to predict what's going to  
308 happen by 2030 without the road and with the road to all of the land in that area; and then  
309 to compare the differences and to assess the cumulative impacts to that species, all the  
310 farmland and so on and so forth.

311  
312 As you can imagine it's very challenging, it's very uncertain to try and guess what's  
313 going to happen in 2030. We need to estimate, you know, how many people might be  
314 living in these areas in 2030; how many people might be working in these areas so we'll  
315 know how many homes there may be or how many jobs there may be. We need to know  
316 it at that small of an area; so, how did we actually analyze that question.

317  
318 Well, first we looked at the existing situation, which was relatively easy to do. And then  
319 we looked at the two future scenarios, the no-build and the build and compared them, and

320 look at the differences and assess if those differences are substantial enough to cause an  
321 impact. Just because you have a difference doesn't mean it's actually causing a problem.  
322 So, we've actually have to assess those differences for how substantial they are.

323  
324 For the existing land use, that's pretty straight forward. Union County, Mecklenburg  
325 County have very good data about what kinds of land uses are out there using their tax  
326 parcel data sets. We have access to good quality aerial imagery and in our updated report  
327 we were updating to create a land use scenario reflecting 2010 conditions on the ground.  
328 Our prior report was using a base year of 2007. So, we've updated that part of our report,  
329 simply because of the change in time.

330  
331 Now, projecting out to the future, obviously you have a challenge. And we need to look  
332 at 2030, then each of these watersheds with or without the project. And we need to find  
333 out how many people will be there, how many jobs will be there, and a lot of research  
334 firms, a lot of government agencies develop what we call "projections" or "forecasts" of  
335 people or jobs at the county level. So, you can find many different sources for estimating  
336 how many people might there be in Union County in 2030.

337  
338 How many people there might be in Mecklenburg County, but we're looking at a smaller  
339 level. And in most areas, including the Charlotte Region, there's only one source that  
340 actually develops projections or forecasts in the future that tell you these things at  
341 something smaller than county and that's Metropolitan Planning Organizations or MPOs.  
342 They work on these estimates as part of their larger traffic forecasting and transportation  
343 planning role. So, that's the only easy source for data at that level.

344  
345 So, the question we have to ask ourselves then is - is that data the best data to use? Is it  
346 reasonable and how can we use it? So, just a quick to let you know what it really means  
347 when I say an MPO projection. Well, the map here is showing our study area, US 74 kind  
348 of running through the middle there, I-485 and Mecklenburg County up in the top left.

349  
350 The MPO does projections for all or part of 11 counties in the Greater Charlotte Region  
351 across North and South Carolina. They break up that area into over 2900 zones and they  
352 develop these estimates of the current population and future population for each of these  
353 zones. In our study area here, we have 383 of those zones that fall within the study area.

354  
355 So, they give us an estimate for each zone, and this is just an example of zone 9082, a  
356 random one right here at the corner of US 74 and US 601. And their estimate in 2010 is  
357 1,006 people and 344 jobs. Their estimate in 2030 is 1,041 people and 647 jobs. So, it's  
358 very detailed both in the geographic scale and in terms of the specificity of the numbers.  
359 And it's even more detailed than our watershed areas. So, it gives us a good basis to try to  
360 estimate potential impacts.

361  
362 But of course, we have to find out, are these estimates good and what kind of picture are  
363 they painting? Are they painting a picture of what the future looks like without the  
364 Monroe/Connector Bypass being built or with the Monroe/Connector Bypass being built?  
365 And that's where we got into and in our updated report in particular, we did a very



366 detailed assessment of the quality of the projections, how they were done to assess that  
367 question as fully as possible in particular due to the Fourth Circuit opinion.

368

369 So, we basically looked at it from five angles. Number one we looked at exactly how they  
370 were developed, how those projections were created. The timeline shows you the  
371 forecasts were developed over about a 7 year time period starting in approximately 2003.  
372 They were most recently updated and adopted in 2010; so relatively recent. They're in  
373 the middle of another round of dates right now. But the data we used was completed and  
374 adopted in 2010.

375

376 So, in looking at exactly every aspect of how they were developed, we found of the three  
377 major components that they used to develop those projections two of them had no  
378 influence on the project whatsoever. What's called the LUSAM Model process that they  
379 used to do updates in 2008-2009; there were no influence from the project. For what they  
380 called their "top-down" control totals that they developed in 2003 at the very beginning  
381 of the process, there was no influence from the project.

382

383 When we looked at the third piece of the puzzle called the "bottom-up" projection  
384 process, we found that there was potentially some influence from the project. And this  
385 again was a key part of the issues in the litigation. Specifically, in that aspect of the  
386 process there were eight factors that they used to try to estimate where people might live  
387 and work. And one of those factors was possibly influenced. And we wanted to get down  
388 into the details of exactly what level of influence it may have had.

389

390 That factor was called the "travel time to employment" factor. Now, this is our map 6  
391 from our report, which you can read. We showed a similar figure to this in the 2012  
392 public meetings we came to and talked with you all. This is a slightly updated version  
393 that actually shows the employment centers and I know I'm really getting detailed here,  
394 but this is again a key aspect of the litigation and I want to make sure that we're clear on.

395

396 The MPO was trying to assess how close are different parts of the county to jobs, because  
397 people want to be able to get to work. So, they want to presumably live within a  
398 reasonable distance of work. So, they were looking at what's the travel time to all the  
399 major employment centers. And the red splotches you see on the map are the  
400 employment centers that they were calculating travel time to. So, they were calculating to  
401 the nearest employment center.

402

403 So, for example, if you lived down in Wingate down here, which is right here, it's  
404 calculating your traffic time to the nearest employment center, which is that industrial job  
405 center just east of Monroe. If you lived in Stallings, which on the map is right up here  
406 that model that they used would calculate your travel time to Matthews. So, you can  
407 guess maybe it's not the best design methodology for trying to assess for a specific  
408 roadway project, because they were looking overall at regional growth.

409

410 And if you look at the results, this is the actual original results that they produced. You  
411 can see the slightly darker green right along the Monroe/Connector Bypass there in the

412 Hemby Bridge area, which suggested there was some influence on travel time in that  
413 model. But if you look out near Wingate, you can see there's not that same river of green  
414 kind of following the road, which suggests that out there the roadway wasn't influencing  
415 travel time. So, that suggested that there really wasn't an influence.

416

417 But to truly understand specifically if this affected the project at all, NCDOT worked to  
418 get the original researcher from UNC Charlotte, who developed this entire model and did  
419 the bottom-up process projection, and worked with him to reassess it and rerun it. And he  
420 did so and he found when you took the project out of his process and reran all of his  
421 numbers, there was no change at all in the numbers that came out or the number of  
422 people, the number of jobs estimated. So, we concluded then that it was no effect on the  
423 estimates from this or any other factor that went into the MPO projections.

424

425 So, that still leaves the question though, are there any other ways to look at the data that  
426 suggest what kind of picture is it painting. So, we looked at the actual pattern of  
427 development that the projection showed. This is a map of the population density and  
428 household density across our study area on US 74 and on down through the middle of  
429 Monroe right here. Now, it may not be obvious from this, but if we look at the area along  
430 the proposed roadway project, we don't see higher densities of development at those  
431 interchange areas along the corridor, relative to the density of other areas south of US 74.

432

433 So, in essence we're not seeing what you would expect to see if you were creating  
434 projections that reflected the road being there. And so that made us think that these  
435 projections do not reflect a situation where the road was built or they reflected a situation  
436 of the no-build scenario.

437

438 The other...which we'll step back for a moment. The other thing we did...we also looked  
439 at a couple of things. We looked at how other researchers had used these projections. In  
440 particular, one researcher had used these projections to try and develop a build scenario.  
441 And when he did he made specific adjustments to those projections, changing and  
442 increasing numbers in certain areas particularly in central to eastern Union County; which  
443 again suggest that they don't reflect a build scenario on their own.

444

445 We also looked at the accuracy of the projections comparing these to projections  
446 produced by other agencies or other firms and by comparing the projections to the actual  
447 counts of 2010 and in both cases we found that the projections were accurate and within  
448 mid-range of other projections.

449

450 And we also looked in general at what are the factors and trends in Union County and  
451 how they compare to other counties. And all of those factors pointed to the likelihood that  
452 Union County or I should say all of the factors that we looked at Union County was high  
453 or highest relative to other counties in the region on factors that correlate with high  
454 growth. Which means it's likely that while growth may not be high every single year but  
455 over the long term it's likely that Union County is probably going to remain one of the  
456 faster growing counties in the region.

457

458 So, based on that assessment of the data we concluded that the MPO data was best used  
459 as a basis to develop a no-build scenario. Now, it's not that we used those numbers as is.  
460 We had to convert them into acres of development in order to do a land use assessment,  
461 which we did using information from local planners, local governments told us, from  
462 local planning documents and created a no-build land use scenario.

463  
464 Within that assessment, what's the world going to be like if you did build a road? What's  
465 the study area going to look like then? And we used a couple of different methods, which  
466 I'll talk about in a moment to assess that. Looking at the watershed level, the no-build  
467 scenario, the orange bars, by watersheds show that the percentage increased in developed  
468 area. The brown bars and the green bars show the decrease in agricultural land and  
469 forested land by watershed.

470  
471 Detailed numbers are in our report, but the important thing that I want to point out in this  
472 is that you see in every watershed there's an increase in developed area. The highest  
473 increases are generally concentrated in western to central Union County. You see in  
474 Mecklenburg County the percentage increases are not that great. That's largely because  
475 much of that area is already built out. So, you may still be adding a number of people, but  
476 you're not developing that much more land because you're either redeveloping existing  
477 land that's already been developed or the overall level of development is already so high.  
478 So, that's the no-build.

479  
480 How do we assess what happens if we do build the road? We used a combination of four  
481 methods. And the first of those is basically assessing the improvement and accessibility  
482 or travel time. So, we used a fairly simple travel time model to look at how much faster  
483 will you be able to get to the I-485 Interchange if you build the road. Now, we looked at  
484 that particular point because planners and other folks had told us that was a common  
485 place that most people think of when they're thinking of how this road will improve their  
486 daily commute or daily their access.

487 When you look at the results, first of all, this analysis is not intended to be, you know, the  
488 final say on how travel time actually will be improved. What it is, is trying to give us an  
489 idea of what areas will see the greatest travel time improvement relative to others. And  
490 we see the darker colors are generally in central and eastern Union County, particularly  
491 east of U.S. 601.

492  
493 The second and third things we did was working from what local planners have told us  
494 and local planning documents like the Wingate/Marshville County Development Plan and  
495 the updated Union County Comprehension plan. What did they say about what they  
496 expect to occur if the road is built? What did they say about exactly what types of  
497 development do you expect to get at different interchanges and around those  
498 interchanges? Then use that in the scenario writing approach to assess what's likely to  
499 occur, what's likely to change?

500  
501 We also looked in a Build-out Analysis, basically looking at the capacity, how much  
502 more room is there for development in certain areas? Think back to that density map I  
503 was showing a little but ago, the densities are higher in western Union County and

504 Mecklenburg County. So, there is just less capacity for growth there. So there is a lot  
505 more capacity generally in eastern Union County. So, you put the two pieces of  
506 information together, there is more capacity in central and eastern Union County and  
507 there is a lot more desired interest in those parts of the county for additional  
508 developments. So, those suggested that if you build the road that you're going to see the  
509 greatest impacts and the greatest increases in those parts of the county.

510

511 We also use a method called Hartgen Analysis, which is named for a researcher from  
512 UNC Charlotte, which combines a couple of different pieces of data such as traffic  
513 volumes, the distance to the nearest town, the availability of sewer and water, and so on  
514 to give you a general idea of what kinds of commercial development you might expect at  
515 different interchange areas. So, this helped to give us an idea of the level and type of  
516 commercial development we'd see at the specific interchanges.

517

518 We put that all together into the estimate of induced growth of what will happen in the  
519 build scenario and the results show that we'd expect about 2,100 acres of additional  
520 development with the road than without the road. So, if you take the build scenario,  
521 subtract the no-build scenario that's how much additional development you would incur,  
522 would expect to occur. That's on top of building the road itself takes up about 1,200 acres  
523 of land. So, it's important to note that direct impact. Again, not the focus of our report but  
524 it's important to note.

525

526 Most of that is expected in additional residential development of about 1,800 acres,  
527 which would yield about an additional 4,900 households. And then we've estimated  
528 approximately 300 acres of additional commercial development and 100 acres of  
529 additional industrial development. Now, those numbers are certainly not small by any  
530 stretch of the imagination but in the context of the very large study area we're talking  
531 about and in context of the rather large amount of the development that we can expect to  
532 see even if you don't build the road. It's relatively small.

533

534 So, the total additional development is only about 1% of the total acreage in the study  
535 area. And the location is mostly expected to be in central eastern Union County. Again,  
536 like the previous graph I showed, the orange bars show the additional development, the  
537 brown and green bars show the decrease in agricultural and forested lands. Crooked  
538 Creek, Stewarts Creek, and Rays Fork Creek watersheds all see some small increases in  
539 development. Richardson Creek (up, middle and lower) and Salem Creek watersheds see  
540 the largest percentage increases in development.

541

542 And this is generally consistent with the prior Quantitative ICE Report and the  
543 Qualitative ICE Report that had been done previously on this study. Now, the differences,  
544 again the differences are only so important. It's the impacts that matter. And when you  
545 look at the impacts, an induced growth impact is that you have a concentration of that  
546 induced growth in eastern Union County. But it is not likely to affect any of the protected  
547 species we talked about earlier and those losses in farmland and forest while not  
548 necessarily small in a total number, relative to the overall study area and relative to  
549 what's going to happen without the road, it is pretty marginal in that context.

550

551 Looking at the specific protected species issues, the Carolina Heelsplitter is only found in  
552 two watersheds, Goose Creek and Six Mile Creek watersheds in our study area. And  
553 we're not expecting any induced growth in those watersheds. So, we concluded that the  
554 project may affect the species but it's not likely or unlikely to adversely affect the species.

555

556 For the other three species, the sunflower, we've concluded that it may affect but it's not  
557 likely to adversely affect because there are some populations in the vicinity of the project.  
558 The coneflower and the sumac though we expect to have real affect from the project from  
559 the ICE Impacts and the direct impacts.

560

561 Now, I know that was a lot to summarize in a fairly short period of time. So, I understand  
562 if you all have questions afterward, the public hearing comment time is for comments.  
563 So, Ken, myself, and others will be available after the meeting to answer specific  
564 questions about the ICE Report. At this time, I want to let Jamille wrap things up.

565

566 Moderator: Thank you Scudder. I just want to touch on the *schedule* going  
567 forward. Again the comment period extends to January 6, 2014. Again, I touched on this;  
568 we will review all your comments that come in through the public hearing process. We  
569 are anticipating approval of the combined Final Supplemental Final EIS and Record of  
570 Decision in the spring of 2014. And we do anticipate sometime after that, that  
571 construction and right-of-way activities will resume.

572

573 Now, just to touch on the *right-of-way process*, once decisions are made regarding the  
574 final design of the project, the limits of the project will be staked in the ground. If you  
575 are an effected property owner, a Right-A-Way Agent will contact you to explain the  
576 plans to you, how the project affects you, and your rights as a property owner. If  
577 permanent right-of-way is required from you, then an appraisal will be done on your  
578 property and basically the fair market value of that property, at its highest and best use,  
579 will be offered as monetary compensation.

580

581 During this process, the Department of Transportation must:

582

- Treat all owners and tenants equally.
- We must pay just compensation in exchange for property rights.
- We must fully explain the homeowners rights and;
- We must provide relocation advisory assistance.

584

585

586

587 That is, if your home or business has to be acquired as part of the project an additional  
588 assistance in the form of advice and/or monetary compensation will be available. And we  
589 do have Right-of-Way and Relocation Brochures available at the sign in table. So, if you  
590 didn't get one and you are interested in that process, feel free to pick up one on your way  
591 out.

592

593 Again, I've touched on this, we are accepting written comments. Just want to let  
594 everyone know verbal comments count the same as written comments. We don't want to  
595 penalize people that aren't comfortable speaking in front of a crowd. So, in the handout

596 that you received there is a *comment form*, feel free to fill that out. Again, we do have  
597 my email address and Jennifer's email address. So, feel free to send us an email. It  
598 doesn't have to be on that comment form. Send comments on your own stationary. But  
599 whatever you do, this is a public hearing; we want to hear from you. So, please make your  
600 voices heard by sending in those comments. Again, you have until January 6<sup>th</sup> to get  
601 those in to us.

602  
603 There's also a *Title VI Form* that you may have received. That is a completely voluntary  
604 form. That is some information that helps us capture some demographic information of  
605 people attending our public meetings. And we hope to use that information in the future  
606 to better serve you.

607  
608 Again this is my information and Jennifer's information. The project website link is listed  
609 there and there's a general project email listed, the project hotline, there's email for the  
610 right-of-way team and a phone number for the Right-of-Way Office. So, I want to make  
611 sure you can get in touch with us, but again our contact information is in the handout.

612  
613 Now, it is the public comment time. I'm going to first open it up to those that signed up  
614 to speak. I would ask in the interest of time that you please limit your comments to 3  
615 minutes. Once everyone has had a chance to speak, if you didn't get to finish what you  
616 were trying to say or your thoughts, I will allow you to come back up to complete that,  
617 complete your thoughts.

618  
619 If you have questions, I will let you know I may not have all the answers for you tonight.  
620 But if you ask a question tonight that doesn't get answered, that's something that we'll  
621 take back to Raleigh with us and get an answer for you. A lot of the questions or  
622 comments that we receive through the comment period will be addressed at that post-  
623 hearing meeting that I talked about earlier. Again, when you come up please state your  
624 name and address. First, we have Mrs. Kate Asquith. Is it on?

625  
626 Kate Asquith: I'm not sure. Maybe I'm just too short.

627  
628 Moderator: A little bit closer?

629  
630 Kate Asquith: Can you hear me now?

631  
632 Audience Members: No.

633  
634 Moderator: Can you check right there?

635  
636 Kate Asquith: How about now?

637  
638 Moderator: Can you hear her now?

639  
640 Carl Gibilaro: Yes.

641

642 Moderator: That's better?  
643  
644 Kate Asquith: This is Kate Asquith and my address is 601 W. Rosemary Street.  
645 And I have just a comment and a question. What I've been hearing tonight and  
646 throughout the bypass is that there is a common sense that building the Monroe Bypass  
647 will ease congestion, the current levels of congestions of US 74. In fact, the contractor of  
648 the bypass just recently released a press release saying yesterday. But in contrast to the  
649 EIS shows that US 74 is expected to get more congested with or without the bypass. So,  
650 could you take this opportunity to clarify on the record whether or not you expect correct  
651 levels of congestion on US 74 to be resolved by the bypass.  
652  
653 Moderator: Well, I think it will help congestion. But again, the purpose and  
654 need of the project is what we're focusing...well is what the purpose of the project. Let  
655 me get back to you on that. I'm sorry ma'am.  
656  
657 Kate Asquith: I guess the specific focus of what I am saying is that what we hear  
658 is that current levels of congestion on US 74 are unacceptable for people that live here  
659 and drive on it every dayand it doesn't sound like in certain parts of the EIS, what is being  
660 presented is that the bypass will not resolve current levels of congestion? So, what you  
661 are saying is that the purpose of the project is not resolve current levels of congestion. Is  
662 that right?  
663  
664 Moderator: Right, the purpose of this project is to improve the mobility and  
665 capacity within the project study area to allow for. Okay it's not going back.  
666  
667 Kate Asquith: I think the problem here is that a lot of people in this room  
668 probably think the bypass is supposed to ease congestion on US 74 as it is now. So, what  
669 you're saying though is that is not what the bypass will do. Correct?  
670  
671 Moderator: Well, it will add capacity and it will alleviate some congestion.  
672  
673 Kate Asquith: The current level of congestion? No?  
674  
675 Moderator: I am not sure. I don't know how to answer that.  
676  
677 Staff Member: I guess I am just trying to understand the question.  
678  
679 Moderator: Yeah, I'm a little confused myself.  
680  
681 Audience Member: We can't hear.  
682  
683 Jennifer Harris: Okay. You're asking if the bypass will resolve current  
684 levels of congestion.  
685  
686 Kate Asquith: Yes.  
687

688 Jennifer Harris: Traffic on 74 is expected to increase through the future  
689 years. If you don't build the bypass, traffic will get worse quicker.  
690

691 Kate Asquith: Okay, I understand that.  
692

693 Jennifer Harris: Okay, if we don't build the bypass that traffic will get  
694 worse quicker.  
695

696 Kate Asquith: But is it going to make US 74 any better for drivers that are seeing  
697 that it's a problem right now?  
698

699 Jennifer Harris: I don't have all the traffic information in front of me. But it  
700 will improve capacity when we are through building in the study area.  
701

702 Kate Asquith: You were the lead on the project right? So, you're probably  
703 *(inaudible)*.  
704

705 Jennifer Harris: I don't have the traffic numbers in front of me. We aren't  
706 preparing the future conditions for US 74, but that's not the sole purpose of the project.  
707 *(inaudible)*.  
708

709 Carl Gibilaro: We can't hear in the back.  
710

711 Kate Asquith: It's alright. It sounds like *(inaudible)*. That right?  
712

713 Audience Member: We can't hear you at all back here.  
714

715 Kate Asquith: Pardon.  
716

717 Audience Member: We can't hear you at all back here.  
718

719 Jennifer Harris: I think I'm beginning to have a one on one conversation in  
720 front of a large audience. So, I would like to speak to her.  
721

722 Audience Member: No, we want to hear that one on one conversation.  
723

724 Kate Asquith: Okay.  
725

726 Jennifer Harris: I just don't have...standing up here with no papers or  
727 documentation in front of me, I'm not able to answer your question until *(inaudible)*.  
728

729 Kate Asquith: Right. *(Inaudible)*  
730

731 Moderator: But that's something that we will go back and we'll get an answer  
732 for you.  
733



734 Kate Asquith: Thank you.  
735  
736 Moderator: Okay, sorry about the confusion. Next we have Mr. Robert Stedje-  
737 Larsen.  
738  
739 Robert Stedje-Larsen: Correct.  
740  
741 Moderator: Did I say your name right?  
742  
743 Robert Stedje-Larsen: Very close, very close. My name is Robert Stedje-Larsen. I  
744 live in Union, North Carolina.  
745  
746 Audience Member: We can't hear you.  
747  
748 Audience Member: We still can't hear the mic back here.  
749  
750 Audience Member: Turn around and face us.  
751  
752 Moderator: Hold on, let's try this one. I think this one works a little bit better.  
753  
754 Robert Stedje-Larsen: My name is Robert Stedje-Larson. (*Technical difficulty*  
755 *with the mic*)  
756  
757 Moderator: I tell you. We'll get it right.  
758  
759 Robert Stedje-Larsen: My name is Robert Stedje-Larson and I'm from Union  
760 County. We talk about process and that this is supposed to improve the access on  
761 Highway 74. And I'm in Wingate and if I look at Wingate and the development that's  
762 going to come around the intersections, there's a business district in Wingate that's on 74  
763 now. And the development that's going to come is just going to drain that business  
764 district because of the intersections that you're going to have in there.  
765  
766 These that I look at it say "okay, now you're going to hurt my business". Are you really  
767 taking traffic off of 74 when part of the constraints was what is the commercial, semis,  
768 tractor trailer types, are looking to a tremendous amount, *when I drive*, come right up US  
769 601 South and merge right into US 74. And they're still going to have to drive on US 74  
770 before they can find an interchange at (*inaudible*) or on Highway 601.  
771  
772 North Carolina, Union County had the growth on Old Highway 74, Charlotte Highway  
773 now or Old Monroe Road depending upon where you live and that group grew. All that  
774 growth went onto what is now 74 and I think we're looking at something that's going to  
775 happen, the same thing, with this.  
776  
777 The town has US 601. It has US 74. It has NC 75. It has NC 84. It has Route 200, Route  
778 205, Route 207, and Route 218. If the state's put the money in the existing highway that

779 it has, this road would not be a waste it's going to be, a very expensive 18 point  
780 something miles. Thank you.

781

782 Moderator: Next we have Rick Becker.

783

784 Rick Becker: Thank you Jamille. My name is Rick Becker. I'm here as an  
785 individual and also as the Mayor of the Town of Mineral Springs. I live at 6603 Sadler  
786 Road with a Waxhaw mailing address.

787

788 The first point that I want to address is just that there were four resolutions adopted by  
789 the municipalities in Union County so far, seeking alternatives to this particularly on a  
790 cost basis. As the previous speaker said that we were looking at a \$900M expenditure for  
791 a project which wasn't really projected to do much for Union County needs whatsoever.  
792 And those resolutions were not included in the EIS as far as I understand. So, I did want  
793 to make sure that the Mineral Springs resolution was again submitted and perhaps  
794 included in the EIS.

795

796 That was based on economic matters why we felt or why my counsel felt that there would  
797 probably be alternatives that would be better and more cost effective than this. The  
798 second, now I'm not reflecting the town these are my personal viewpoints. But my  
799 biggest concern I think is the EIS's build scenario being way, way, way underestimating  
800 the impacts, the indirect impacts.

801

802 They talk about 1,800 additional acres of residential development by 2030. That's it.  
803 That's 200 acres per interchange and that's a small amount. That's a medium sized  
804 subdivision. These types of expressways and interchanges heading directly to an  
805 employment center like Charlotte are magnets for developers. It's like leaving your trash  
806 out at the campsite with woods full of bears. They're going to flock to it. We're going to  
807 have tens of thousands of commuter houses built at those interchanges. Each of those  
808 commuter houses are going to have kids in them that are going to have to go to Union  
809 County schools.

810

811 And recent developments Union County showed that we're another \$91M in the hole.  
812 And there's no facility for paying for the hundreds of millions of dollars of new schools  
813 and other infrastructure needs in the county that these interchanges will spur. So, I don't  
814 believe the EIS adequately addressed that additional indirect growth. I think that it's  
815 underestimated it radically.

816

817 Just looking at the I-485 Interchanges in Mecklenburg County, when it wasn't there in  
818 south Charlotte, it was woods, it was farms. I-485 went in, interchange went in,  
819 Ballentyne Interchange went in...BOOM. You've got 10,000 residential units within five  
820 years. So, to think that that's not going to happen in Union County is I think too be naïve  
821 and just turn a blind eye to a problem that's not being addressed.

822

823 And so you have economic impacts and you have environmental impacts with all of that  
824 development. It hasn't been addressed in the EIS and I think that needs to be re-

825 evaluated. Just in the Town of Indian Trail alone is working on a new comprehensive  
826 plan. They have two interchanges. They believe that anywhere from 20,000 to 35,000  
827 additional residents will occur in the next 15 years. That's the result of those  
828 interchanges. That's a lot of people. And I think it's a very feasible thought because the  
829 toll lane will give (*inaudible*) a trail to I-485. So, that's a pretty big lure to lots and lots  
830 of Charlotte commuters.

831

832 My final concern is that, I think both speakers have addressed it, the public really  
833 believes that this is going to help them move around Union County faster. It's going to  
834 help US 74. It's going to help those cross streets. It's going to help all that time you sit at  
835 the lights where there's no turn lanes and there's waiting and waiting. Well, all I see is it  
836 getting worse.

837

838 And every interchange is going to feed traffic on those north/south roads and they can't  
839 handle the traffic that we've got now. Where's the money going to come from to improve  
840 those after we've spent \$900M on the bypass connector throwing all that additional  
841 growth into the county, residential growth in particular? The money is gone. Are we  
842 going to have another \$900M to improve the surface streets? I think the EIS has to look  
843 at the future costs. And that's a very, very important consideration.

844

845 The old EIS and I have looked at the new one in detail, but it's very clear that the project  
846 was not intended to improve congestion on US 74. In fact, it wouldn't. In fact, one  
847 workshop it was said that we wouldn't want US 74 to be improved too much because it  
848 might serve as a competing interest to the toll road. And that's kind of a cynical way of  
849 looking at it I think. I think we need to look more at the needs of the Union County  
850 residents. The host county needs more benefit than it's going to be getting from this road.  
851 I'll turn the mic over to somebody else and thank you.

852

853 Moderator: Thank you Mr. Becker. Next we have Frank Holleman.

854

855 Frank Holleman: Mr. Robbins, I sort of want to echo what the last gentleman  
856 said (*inaudible*). But when you look at the document that the department has put out,  
857 there's not much analysis of how much of the traffic on US 74 is local, how many of the  
858 trucks are local, and where they're going. And as the gentleman said, the document and  
859 the lady said, the document says US 74 is going to get more congested if you build a  
860 bypass.

861

862 The emphasis of the document as you're going in is analysis (*inaudible*), so that emphasis  
863 is primarily is going to have wall to wall people from Charlotte to the beach.

864

865 Carl Gibilaro: Mr. Holleman, move the mic away from your mouth just a little bit  
866 so it's not so...

867

868 Frank Holleman: Like this?

869

870 Audience Members: A little bit further.

871

872 Frank Holleman: Like this?

873

874 Audience Members: Yes.

875

876 Frank Holleman: What I was saying is looks like the emphasis is spending  
877 the \$900M to build a bypass to move people from Charlotte to the beach. And so, the  
878 question I would say is has the department looked at how much more benefit there would  
879 be on congestion on US 74 if you spent the \$900M or some portion of it on improving  
880 US 74 and the local roads instead of building a Charlotte to the beach road. That's the  
881 question.

882

883 Moderator: Thank you sir. Again, part of the purpose and need of the project is  
884 that US 74 is part of the Strategic Highway Corridor. And it is meant to provide the  
885 mobility and it serves a regional purpose. So, it is meant for higher speeds and more  
886 mobility, not necessarily access.

887

888 And one of the gentlemen earlier talked about the project improving access to US 74 and  
889 that's really not part of the purpose and need of the project. It is to maintain access to  
890 properties along US 74. Those are just a few things I wanted to address.

891

892 Now, I will call people up one by one at this point because that concludes our list of  
893 speakers. I'll call this gentleman up first.

894

895 Audience Member: I'll just speak loudly from here.

896

897 Moderator: No, no, I want to make sure we get you. It's recorded.

898

899 Lance Dunn: Hi, my name is Lance Dunn, 1400 Goldmine Road, Monroe. This  
900 is just a simple question. You keep referring to the 74 Corridor. When I drive from here  
901 to the beach I see a lot of signs for the new Interstate 74, which doesn't seem to even go  
902 through this area. I was wondering if you could clarify what the difference is between  
903 that 74 Interstate Corridor and the one that you're referring to, since they seem to be...

904

905 Moderator: What I'm talking about US 74 Corridor in through this area. I  
906 don't think that this will be signed as Interstate 74 because it would be a toll road.  
907 Someone else?

908

909 Carl Stevens: My name is Carl Stevens. I live in Wingate. Okay, how many  
910 people in this room know that this bypass is going to be a toll bypass? Okay, one of the  
911 first things on this toll bypass is we need to find out how it's going to be monitored and  
912 how we're going to be paying for it.

913

914 I did some phone calls today but was informed by an individual yesterday that in the  
915 process of these tolls we're going to be billed monthly by the tag number on your car.  
916 Okay, I'm a car dealer. I do wholesale. They're going to bill me every time a car goes up

917 and down the road? And some of the questions that people are asking right now, you  
918 need to start looking into the questions before you ask them and you'll get better answers  
919 to them. I want to thank you for your time.

920

921 Moderator: Thank you sir. Anyone else? Keep in mind written comments carry  
922 the same weight as verbal. Here you go sir.

923

924 Kinsey Cockman: Good evening. My name is Kinsey Cockman and I live in  
925 Wingate. I'd rather speak because I'm lazy and it is easier to talk than it is to type. A  
926 couple of questions I had basically in terms of...I looked at the website earlier and it said  
927 the United States Army Corp of Engineers rejected or denied the 404 Environmental  
928 Permit because of delays in construction. My concern is how long is it going to take to  
929 get that cranked back up?

930

931 And what I really want to know coming here tonight was with the environmental impact,  
932 the environmental group that's suing the Department of Transportation are they done?  
933 Are they finished?

934

935 Moderator: Well, we're done with the prior litigation. And so the  
936 environmental document we're presenting here tonight is addressing those concerns.  
937 Right now there's no other litigation. Now, we do expect the combined Final  
938 Supplemental Final EIS and Record of Decision to be signed in the spring.

939

940 Unless some additional litigation or additional suits is brought against Federal Highway  
941 and North Carolina Department of Transportation we do expect to move forward. But as  
942 it stands the current litigation is over.

943

944 Kinsey Cockman: Thanks. As far as the 404 letter from the environment, from  
945 the Army Corp of Engineers, do you know how long is that going to take, for the permit  
946 404?

947

948 Staff Member: Upon us submitting a new application I think generally it takes  
949 four to six months (*inaudible*).

950

951 Kinsey Cockman: Have you applied for it yet?

952

953 Staff Member: We cannot apply for it until the (*inaudible*) Record of Decision.

954

955 Kinsey Cockman: Okay, I just wanted to get the chronology of events down.  
956 Thank you.

957

958 Moderator: Thank you sir. Anyone else. Going once, going twice, alright, well,  
959 I want to thank you all for coming out tonight. Please drive safely going home. I don't  
960 know if it's still raining out there or not, but be safe. Thank you.

961

962

Hearing Adjourned.

963

964

965

966

967

968

Jamille Robbins, Moderator  
Public Involvement Unit  
December 9, 2013

Typed by Johnetta Perry