

BR-0183 CP2aCP3 Combined Merger Meeting- 20260121_100143-Meeting Recording

January 21, 2026, 3:01PM

47m 16s

- **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS Headrick, Hannah S 0:03

And I'll go through the folks online, Morgan Weathersford with the Environmental policy unit here in NCDOT.

Then it's been introduced.

Yeah. I think Bill, Leslie planning lead would finish.

Laura Fisher with Danish.

Mine is Eric Spalding with Danish.

That's part of the roadway team.

Liz Workman with three Oaks engineering.

And they wanted to Hannah Hedrin environmental policy unit Katie Varville NCDOTE PU.

Beg pardon. The division of Water resources.

Good morning.

I am Gary Jordan with the US Fish Wild Service, John Jamison with dot environmental policy.

All right.

And then online, we got Kathy Brigham.

BC Brittingham, Cathy 0:55

Morning. It's Kathy Briddingham with the division of coastal management.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 1:00

In Lee.

CL Cannady, Lee 1:02

Hey, good morning.

I work with DCM and I'm the field Rep for Division One.

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

But Ethan?

ES **Ethan Sommers** 1:13

Summer is the transportation planner for Amar PO.

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

Christine.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 1:19

Hi, Christine Farrell, Environmental policy unit.

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

Glad you could join us, Christine Kyle.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 1:29

Army Corps of Engineers.

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

Steven.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:34

Stephen Lane, division of coastal management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:37

All right, Steve, we can barely hear you.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:41

How about this?

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

Umm.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:43

Can you hear me now?

Is that better?

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

I could.

We'll turn up the volume in the room, see if we can hear better. You try again.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:54

Yeah. Let me change.

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

Oh yeah, here we go.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:56

Change location.

Is that better?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:58

Yes, Sir. It's great. Yeah. Thank you.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 1:59

Yeah. Gosh, thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:03

Douglas.

PD **Parker, Douglas** 2:04

Hey, I'm Douglas Parker with benish.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:08

Daniel.

RS **Royster, Daniel S** 2:09

Hey everyone, Daniel Royster, division of marine fisheries on the fisheries resource specialist.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:16

Brian.

SL **Shook, Ryan L** 2:21

Ryan suckners.

Decision One bridge program manager.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:26

Holly.

SH **Snider, Holley** 2:31

Holly Snyder, Division of Water Resources 401 buffer permitting branch.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:36

Thanks for joining us today, Polly.

Amanetta.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 2:42

Everything for good morning everyone.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:48

We had a hard time hearing you there.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 2:54

Is that better?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:55

Yeah, that's better. Thank you.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 2:57

OK.

Good morning.

It's amanetta Somerville with EPA Region 4.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:02

Good morning, Paul.

WC **Williams, Paul C** 3:07

Yeah. Paul Williams, NCDOT Division One environmental officer.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:13

Travis.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 3:15

Travis Wilson, NC Wildlife Resources Commission.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:19

And then we saw Emily.

We just saw you sneak in.

RD **Richards, Emily D** 3:23

Hey, Emily Richards and CDOT public involvement.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:26

Thank you.

Did I miss anybody else?

All right, Kyle, before we start, as the murder team lead and.

The federal lead.

Do you have anything you want to start with?

I just want to get into it.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 3:46

Not right off the bat, I didn't hear.

Is there anyone from Shippo on here?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:52

Nobody from Chipper was in this meeting.

They have an affix meeting going on this morning.

We did talk to them yesterday and they don't have any concerns.
Katie, if you wanna.
Well, Katie talked to him, but I don't know if they didn't have anything.
Because they the effects for this were resolved at the previous meeting and so
they were happy with state of the packet and are willing to sign the curbs after the
meeting today.
Sorry, didn't put you on the spot.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 4:24

Good deal.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:28

Thanks for bringing up, yeah.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 4:29

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:32

Alright, well, I'll hand it over to Bill.

Yeah, unless Ryan, you have anything else? And then we'll let the team go through
the packet.

Hey everybody. Thanks for joining us today.

Know we've had some delays, schedule changes, holidays and everything, but
hopefully we can have a nice productive meeting, continue to advance this project.
Just a little agenda.

With your team introductions meeting purpose, we'll go through project history,
costs and schedule.

Give some project updates that have happened since the CB1CP2 meeting. That'll
move along in the current point 2A.

We'll have some discussion and pulling for concurrence once we concurrent .2 a
move on to concurrence .3 and that specific information.

Discussion for concurrence, and then we'll move on to next steps.

Any action items and any updates for the merger plan.

We'll move right into it.

So, project introduction, obviously Army course key better latency is project state

funded.

We're replacing bridge #2 over Pembroke Creek on US 17 Business W Green Street in Edenton, NC, currently have 60 foot existing dot right of way and the bridge is currently posted 45 mile an hour speed limit W Queen Street is a minor arterial with around.

5500 cars.

A day.

Spanning that bridge, existing structures at 316 foot reinforced concrete bridge with timber piles. It's got 212 foot lanes and three foot concrete curves.

Replacement structures gonna be approximately 406 feet with two 12 foot lanes and a 10 foot multi use path on the South side of the bridge.

Skip on? Yeah, project history.

As projects listed in dot Division, One Spot program.

Right away is scheduled for April 2027. The construction scheduled for March 2028 got some cost estimates below the difference between the state's construction replace approximately 1.4 million.

Total costs.

We've been updated it's project schedule.

Currents .28 and three is taking place today with 4A4B and 4C to be determined once 3 concurrence .3 is finished, we'll move on to building the Cabinet of Exclusion.

With that to be determined as well. And then as mentioned earlier, right away, acquisition will begin in April 2027 and construction started to begin March 2028. So a little past merger meeting summary, we had the combined CP1CP2 meeting back in March 2025. During that meeting we got verbal concurrence from all parties followed by signatures. Once some of the necessary updates were made to the merger package.

Including update to the purchasing statement.

I'm not going to read that out loud, but just wanted to have the updated purpose in each statement in there for anybody that wants to see it. It's also in the packet.

We talked about some preliminary cost estimates.

Some more included in CP1CP2 meeting.

Those were provided following the meeting with subsequent process showing that alternative 2, the approximately 15% more expensive than alternative one.

But we've had some design updates since last March. Since the first merger meeting.

We've got.

So at the request of the vision and due to some public interest, we did a small study into increasing the original proposed bridge clearance.

We were originally looking at raising the grade at the proposed bridge approximately 4 feet.

We revised that and added additional 3 1/2 feet or seven and a half feet between bottom cord and water surface.

And there's been a proposed posted speed reduction from 45 miles an hour to 35 miles an hour. So it's a separate action.

Done by the town of Edenton with the speed reduction, it allowed us to increase the grade of the bridge without adding any major impacts to the.

To the approaches on either side.

All right.

So before we move on to CP2A, I also want to note that we've had a public meeting and a section 106 effect assessments meeting since our last version meeting.

Those that we talked about in a little more detail during the rest of the presentation, but just wanted to provide that before we move into it.

Does anybody have any questions about the design updates or anything before we move on into CP2A?

Alright, we'll move right along.

So these are the two alternatives impact maps.

So for CP2A, impacts were calculated using the slope stakes plus 40 foot buffer alternative 2 on the right stage construction, alternative one on the left.

I know that might be a little hard to see, but we'll get into some details here on the next slide.

So we have our alternative 1 alternative 2 impacts.

Most everything you see is going to be the same besides the linear feet of stream impacts and the wetland impacts.

So for alternative 2 with the 40 foot buffer.

We have an additional 9 feet of linear stream impacts and an additional just under a 10th of an acre of 404 wetland impacts with no changes to the camel wetland impacts everything else.

Is very similar.

We'll get into historic property impacts.

During.

The rest of the presentation.

So CB2A talks about major hydraulic crossings.

Because this is a bridge replacement, we only have one major hydraulic crossing. The structures proposed to cross perpendicular to Pembroke Creek will have a length to have a noise effects on the floodplain.

Yeah, just going over some of the costs, some of the potential stream of wetland impacts for each alternative, but it's pretty straightforward.

Like I said, bridge replacement, single hydraulic crossing.

Just a couple photos of said hydraulic crossing.

Version #2 we've got the view from Pembroke Creek on the left and the view looking E at the South Bridge rail on the right.

And then we got just the Google Earth snapshot of the crossing itself.

And that's it for CP2A.

I wanted to open the floor up for any questions or concerns before we pull for concurrence for CP2A. Does anybody have any, any comments, anything they want to add any, any questions for the group or anybody on the team?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 12:10

Hey, this is Kathy Rootingham.

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

Hey, Gabby.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 12:12

I'm just curious if you can talk a little bit about the little bit more about the avoidance and minimization measures that you've taken.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 12:25

Yeah, of course.

And in terms of?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 12:32

I guess I mean CP2A, we've we've taken the alternatives that were looked at and then we're trying to apply some avoidance and minimization measures to reduce environmental impacts.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 12:32

Well, sorry.

Yeah.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 12:43

And so I'm wondering if you can talk a little bit more about that step of the process and how we got to where we are now.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 12:50

So I think there were a couple of different initial alternative alternatives that were looked at and I, you know off the top of my head, I think we've looked at different placements of the bridge.

And Bryan, you can if you have any anything else you want to comment on that. But literally the the number of alternatives that.

That we had to choose.

Strong. You know we're we're with the the resources on the side of the bridge. There were there are only so many that we looked at and so going through also evaluating the height for the bridge and trying not to increase the footprint too much while also.

Staying within the public comments and the the wishes from the the public side so. Does that help answer your question? A way to go a little bit more in depth with that. You need us to.

WC **Williams, Paul C** 14:01

Hey, Kathy, it's Ryan.

One thing you know that the very first thing we looked at was doing like a temporary detour bridge on site.

You know, when we first started just going through our different options in there, we're looking at on site Detour Detour and then also stage construction.

So when we looked at the resources that we had basically on all four corners of this project.

We knew that the temporary on site detour wouldn't be a viable option.

Just with the impacts that it was going to create. So that was the first one.

I guess if you say that we took out, you know of the alternatives. So that was one. But

also you know looking at off site Detour versus the stage construction obviously minimizing stage construction as much as possible. But you know going to public comment and speaking with the.

Town and concerns. And you know we're going to talk about that on the later.

Point, but just the EMS. If I can pit traffic, you know, school buses, churches, day cares, things like that were taken into account.

But the biggest avoidance and minimization was that of temporary on site bridge.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 15:24

This is Kyle with core.

I don't know if if going into it here is is the best spot, but in avoidance with.

That might help that where you're going up with height of the clearance, the bridge.

But yet we're also utilizing.

If I'm correct sheet pile 4 on the West side of the bridge for raising the Causeway or raising the approach, and therefore that avoid.

Impacts to the adjacent wetlands in the park, correct?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 16:00

Yes, that's correct. Yeah.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 16:02

OK.

I don't know if that that helps in showing some additional avoidance minimization.

You know by not impacting those wetlands by design of.

Construction.

To use the sheet pile for the increase in the height of the approach.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 16:23

OK.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 16:27

Does does that help any with anything Kathy?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 16:32

Yeah, I was.

I was kind of asking a broad question just because that's I guess that's what sometimes happens at this step is that we kind of document what has changed from CP2 in terms of avoidance and minimization related to the major hydraulic structures.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 16:49

Right, that that's where I was bringing that.

You know, do we want to talk a little bit of the design change in the avoidance to show the avoidance and minimization going from CP2 to CP2?

A.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 17:09

So this is amanetta with EPA. I think you guys provided a lot of really good information and I know some of it was in the the packet, but I don't think all of it was.

So can we just make sure we capture it all in the meeting notes so that we have the documentation that shows like what Kathy said, the changes from CP2 to CP2A?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 17:29

Yep. Yeah, we'll have all this.

All this included.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 17:42

And I guess I'll just conclude my comments by just pointing out that there are coastal wetland impacts on this project and DCM does look very closely at coastal wetland impacts.

And so, not necessarily at this stage, but just a heads up for the future. We'll be wanting to talk about any additional measures that can be taken to avoid and minimize those impacts to coastal wetlands, in particular from a coastal management point of view.

WC **Williams, Paul C** 18:12

Hey, and this is Paul Abuda. At a later day, we may need to look at this coastal wetlands again considering that it's just a dense patch of cattails and salonis really not that high. I think we need to look at that.

Status of that coastal wetland.

You know, closer to when we actually permit this project, but that can be discussed at a later date. So I just wanted to throw that out there too.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 18:39

Yeah. No, I think that would be good because we would potentially be looking at mitigation for coastal wetlands.

Depending on that assessment, and as you know, that can be challenging.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:58

Yeah, it sounds like you'll have some more conversations as the design gets provided a little bit future.

Are there any other questions related to?

The two way packet.

One other thing I wanted to to just point out for the minimization efforts, the lowering of the design speed, we're able to really reduce the horizontal vertical restraints from a design perspective.

So we were able to lower some of the impacts and and some of the transitions leading up to the bridge.

Off of the park property and the townhouse and the and some of the wetland areas as well.

So I just wanted to.

To bring that back up, I know it was briefly mentioned about the speed limit earlier, but I did want to just throw that back out there as another effort that was made.

With the speed reduction, I appreciate you explaining that because I read it a little bit.

Take care.

All right.

Umm wanna call for concurrence?

Yeah. Well, if we could hold for concurrence.

Kyle.

You feel comfortable moving forward.

Regarding some.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 20:27

Yes, the core is good with it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:32

Amaneta is the EPA good with moving forward?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 20:36

Yes, the EPA is good with moving forward.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:39

Gary yes, Fish and Wildlife Service is good.

And then DWR, yes, DWR is going forward.

Travis.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 20:54

WRC can concur.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:58

DCM.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 21:01

Since TC Miss, an umbrella permitting agency, I think the one of our commenting agencies we haven't heard yet from his DMF. So I'd like to hear from them first.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 21:11

OK.

RS **Royster, Daniel S** 21:14

Yeah, a DMF concurs.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 21:19

And DCM concurs as well.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 21:22

Don't believe we have anybody from fisheries.

We know that historic preservation offices, good with moving forward.

It's RPO. I assume they will be occurring.

 **Ethan Sommers** 21:38

Get back to kar.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 21:41

I'll wait.

OK, awesome. Thank you.

All right. All right, buddy. We'll move on to concurrence, .3.

The least environmentally damaging, practical alternative.

So move right along.

Start off with some of the public involvement efforts that have happened prior to CP2 and CP3.

Just a brief overview on that.

Public officials and general public meetings were both held on May 22nd, 2025.

The public officials and the general public.

Preferred alternative to the packet gets a little deeper into the quantitative analysis of that and and how many people exactly.

And then there were multiple requests that mentioned earlier from the public to raise three of the bridge, some higher than others. But that was a general request that we heard.

Many times, Ryan, I don't know if you have anything to add.

I know you.

You were at the public meeting and you talked to some of the other land owners and and public in general.

 **Williams, Paul C** 22:53

No, just other than you know, they're they're excited about a project.

You know the the height of the bridge, you know, seemed to be an issue. And also maintaining one lane of traffic.

Was a concern.

Those were the, honestly, the two most.

Items that I heard about.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:13

Yeah. Thank you.

All right. And as mentioned earlier, we also went through section 106 tax assessment. It was held on December 4th, 2025.

We presented alternative 2, the state's construction alternative due to the slightly higher resource impacts that alternative two had.

Finding of no adverse effects was issued for both the Eden to Marina and Eaton station.

You can see the impacts below in the table.

They're also in the packet.

It does include a little more detail.

So for CP3, the impacts we calculated were based on slope Stakes plus a 25 foot bumpers.

So it got pulled in slightly from CP2A.

Those will be shown in the numbers.

So impacts calculated with slope stays plus 25 book buffer.

Alternative Two has an additional about .03 acres of camel wetland impacts and .09 acres of four four wetland impacts.

And then with alternative 2, there's actually a reduction of about 15 linear feet of stream impacts. That's due to the shift to the South and how the slope site lines interact with the stream bank in that southeastern quadrant.

But everything else generally stays the same.

So Division One is recommending alternative 2 as the preferred alternative to the fact that it allows direct access into downtown Edenton during construction minimizes potential delays for EMS response times and also for school buses.

Also eliminates the Detour school buses onto US17, which is a highly trafficked high speed Rd.

Alternative two is preferred by the public and public officials, and there are minor differences in impact quantities.

Between alternative two and alternative lock.

That brings us to concurrence, but obviously want to open the floor for any discussion, questions, comments. Many of the agencies.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 25:36

But but this is amanetta I may have missed.

It was there a final height.

That was.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 25:42

Yes, seven and a half, seven and a half feet.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 25:44

OK.

Thank you.

SH **Snider, Holley** 26:05

Hey, guys, this is Holly with DWR.

I'm curious when you guys, you know I'm coming into the project a little bit late.

And we talked about the coastal wetlands needed needing to be evaluated again.

Were the mitigation costs calculated?

You know, based on a current wetland APJD or adj done by the Corps, and if so, when was that done and will it be updated closer to permitting and your mitigation cost be based on that?

Over.

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

Just remember, when the theater was done, tap your head.

In the Hackett I I don't know that we calculated any mitigation cost based off of the post wetlands versus the core wetlands.

But we can look at that and put it in the meeting minutes, OK? Yeah.

Oh, does that.

Does that answer suffice? If you heard that?

SH **Snider, Holley** 27:06

Yeah, I mean, I'm I'm kind of with Kathy. When you go back to what the roles and responsibilities are and the guidance for this, you know there's something we should be considering when we start talking about it. And with there being some question, I guess as to the.

Value of those wetlands? I'd just be curious.

How I mean was AI was a Wham conducted at the beginning when you guys first started evaluating all the I'm assuming that.

But again, this is my first real sit in on one of these concurrent point threes.

So I'm just curious about that.

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:38

Yeah, of course.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 27:43

This is Kyle with core.

The wetland determination there was a PJD that was issued for this project.

That assuming that all the we didn't modify that as far as.

The full extent of.

You know the making the determination that there that we might come back and change some of the the cameline it was issued as.

As we reviewed in the field, I don't really think we had any changes from the packet.

The A consultant did a full review with Wham and Sam in that packet that we agreed upon and and concurred, and there was a JD issued if that helps.

SH **Snider, Holley** 28:35

And I'm guessing when we went through as as we got to this lead process, we also evaluated what the mitigation cost would be associated with those impacts to those wetlands, correct.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:49

I don't think that the mitigation costs were included in that in our cost estimate.

SH **Snider, Holley** 28:55

I think that's an important thing that should be included.

Over.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 29:03

It doesn't necessarily have to be for the lead put choice, and that that does sound kind of odd, but.

As far as the alternative, it's the amount of impacts, not always the offsetting mitigation that we can make a choice of leadpa.

SH **Snider, Holley** 29:27

Understood.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 29:30

This is Cathy.

I'd like to put Stephen Lane on the spot.

Stephen, can you talk a little bit about the coastal wetlands that I guess it was my impression that you'd been out there somewhat recently to look at those?

LS **Lane, Stephen** 29:46

Can you guys hear me?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 29:48

Yeah.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 29:49

OK, fantastic. So yeah, I believe when I went out there, it's been a while since I've done this, at least a little bit over a year at least I would.

If I remember correctly though, I believe I met Paul and one of his coworkers out there at a site.

I believe when I went out there, I believe the consultant had already delineated the coast of wetlands and I believe we paired back those lines. We felt like they were a little overly conservative at the time and so we did pair those lines back and, you know, red.

There's coastal wetlands, so, and I don't know, there's a whole lot going to change at this point because I think they were like I say, done within the last, you know.

Couple years or whatever. So.

You know, but, but yes, they there are definitely some coastal wetlands out there adjacent to the Causeway, you know, and so.

Yeah, I think that was.

You know, certainly something we need to be thinking about.

Not like I said, Cal.

I'm not sure that there has to be necessarily determined fully at the at the lead, but

but it's certainly something we need to be thinking about long term. You know as we go through the process of those mitigation costs.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 31:10

That field date was in June of 2024.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 31:15

OK.

Thank you.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 31:26

Yeah, I I.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 31:26

Yeah, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 31:28

Oh, I was just gonna say I'm just trying.

I'm struggling with DCM.

Agreeing with alleged that has.

More coastal wetland impacts, albeit not a huge amount, but still more.

WC **Williams, Paul C** 31:45

So I just I want to point out that this project's letting in 28 and I know coastal marsh is very especially this far inland got a nebulous and I don't know if we should let that hold up. This kind of decision on this project.

You're talking about what, 3 hundredths of an acre? I think if I remember correctly.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 32:10

About 1300 square feet.

WC **Williams, Paul C** 32:12

Yeah. So and also this may be an area we're going to Sheed off anyway and not have any impacts, so.

That can be brought into consideration as well. We may not have any cost to whatever impacts.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 32:25

That was actually a point I did want to ask about. When you're determined these impacts, what kind of slopes was that based on currently?

Is that 3 three to one, 1 1/2 to one what?

What kind of slips did you use to figure these numbers?

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

Those were three to one slopes.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 32:45

OK.

So. So you're, I would agree with what your statement is there, Paul.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 32:47

So.

WC **Williams, Paul C** 32:50

Yeah. And I think that's plus 42. I think that was slope steak plus 40, is that correct?

LS **Lane, Stephen** 32:50

In in some regard.

It.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 32:56

For two a slipstick plus 40 for three, it's slipstick plus 25.

LS **Lane, Stephen** 33:01

However.

You know, we typically would not be using 3:00 to 1:00.

We would adjacent to coastal wetlands, we would.

Be at least a 2 to one, potentially 1 1/2 to one. Or as Paul suggested, if we had to, you know the the sheet pile.

So that is that is something that those numbers may change and that may be something that.

You know, just want to factor in that decision or.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 33:32

Yeah, that's definitely something that would be looked at in, in the final design is bringing those slopes in and and reducing those impacts even more for sure.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 33:44

So maybe that's something we could document in the meeting minutes is to kind of a commitment to a recognition that these aren't the final impacts because it's plus 25 and a commitment to further reduce the impacts in coastal wetlands and other wetlands too. But in coastal we.

Using the steeper fill slopes and potentially sheet pile and then just the acknowledgement that there may or may not be requirements from DCM on coastal wetland mitigation.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 34:14

Yeah, we definitely, definitely have those in minutes.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 34:15

I like that.

This is Kyle.

I like that idea, Kathy.

We we keep it noted in the Minutes.

And that carries for carries forth with the project itself, and going to CP4.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 34:32

Yeah, we can definitely do that.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 34:38

I guess another I had two other questions. While I'm unmuted, did what does the no adverse effect from ship out is that?

Yeah, I know you mentioned alternative 2:00, but that would also be true for alternative one.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 34:51

Yes. Yeah, that's correct.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 34:54

And I saw that there's a moratorium in the packet.

Are you committing to follow that moratorium?

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

Yes.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 35:02

OK.

Cool. Those are my questions.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:13

Other questions?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 35:16

It's Kathy.

One more.

Can you talk just?

We might have said this and I miss it, but can you just talk a little bit more about the benefits of raising the height of the bridge?

Purpose of that?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:31

Eric, do you wanna take that?

Yeah. So there were, I guess, two reasons.

One was to account for future sea level rise and then two was to just provide more clearance under the bridge for users.

For non motorized water users, essentially.

Did you imply earlier that raising the bridge would cause less impact on the lands around it?

Like the speed reduction, so the speed reduction allows the grade to be raised

without additional impacts.

So normally we're raising the grade at the same speed impacts would increase looking at it with a 40 mile an hour design speed instead of 50.

Kpa all that contained to the same Mm-hmm.

In fact, it's because of the curves were less gotcha.

And the town also wanted that reduction in speed.

Thank you.

Appreciate that, beautiful. Thank you. OK.

Separate from our project.

 **WC Williams, Paul C** 36:35

Yes, Sir, Kathy.

Hey, Kathy, I'm also so our approaches are staying relatively the same elevation that increase in.

Pipe experience height is not affecting the approaches or the field slopes.

So basically, you're going from a flat bridge to having a bridge with kind of an elevation in the middle.

So there's a little bit of a rise over the Greek.

 **BC Brittingham, Cathy** 37:03

Mm-hmm.

 **WC Williams, Paul C** 37:06

So then just so that I'm clear, the approaches are the elevation of the approaches are gonna raise based on the type of materials that are being, you know, used for the bridge with the girder system.

What I mean by their additional elevation is gained.

Is not really changing that approach elevation based on those new girders.

 **BC Brittingham, Cathy** 37:35

I guess one of the reasons I ask is that we just need to in the camera process, think about cumulative impact.

So it's not like you've got a Marina planned upstream that needs the additional clearance.

There's there's nothing like that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:47

Done.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 37:49

OK.

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:51

You said it was on non motorized boaters and recreational.

Stand up paddle boarding.

Yeah, the paddle trail, yeah.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 38:01

OK.

Well, we definitely support that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 38:12

You might even let her do.

Yeah, yeah, I got to open a cross section following the meeting.

The team just so they can look at the the raising of the grade.

All right.

Any other questions?

Wanna get the?

Oh, it will get the polling.

To concurrent's on CP #3.

Is the core.

Favor moving forward.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 38:53

Yes, the core is in favor of moving forward.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 38:56

Is EPA.

Good moving forward.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 39:01

I ask.

EPA is good with moving forward.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:05

Areas Bishop, wildlings. Yes.

Her.

Babe, yes, DWR is favorite.

Travis, WR. So you can think.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 39:20

WRC can confir.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:20

Our.

DMF.

RS **Royster, Daniel S** 39:25

EMF can concur.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:27

DCM.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 39:31

Yes, we concur.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:36

And then the RPO Ethan.

ES **Ethan Sommers** 39:41

Yep, we concur.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:46

All right.

No, you're still here.
We'll send out the packet.
And for signatures, along with the meeting minutes.
To ensure that everything that we send the meeting will and then we agreed upon just accurately reflected.
I guess before we do close out this meeting, I did want to discuss the possibility of this being taken out of Berger and kind of gauging.
Where people's feelings are.
On that. Now that does not preclude us from having future discussions.
Just maybe not in the Burger City.
I think a lot of what pushed this into it was.
The historicics with some of the competing resources.
But now that's been resolved. You know, I think the the main driver sounds like it's gonna be mostly the the coastal welling impacts and so you know whether that. Is necessitates an entire murder team talk about that.
So I just wanted to have a candid conversation to see what people's thoughts on that were.
Hey gals. You wanna have a discussion offline before we go into that, we can do that.
But I just wanted to throw that out there and discuss it by the merger team's here.
Does anybody have any?

KB **Kyle Barnes** 41:16

From from this call with core.
Is it a timing issue?
Can you expand a little bit as to why you would want to abandon the merger process at this point?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 41:31

Well, I think it was just.
It's not necessarily a timing thing.
I don't think.
And again it it's.
I think it was just a preference that whether it's needed or not, we want to appropriately fit the process with the project and that's that's really all.
Good. Another option would be to keep it in, but just do it online through e-mail.

We've done that before and not actually have a sit down meeting.

Yeah, I mean that would definitely be an option.

Guess what?

I'm gonna start with the e-mail option is that I know that Kathy and and my own branch will probably have a lot more questions just regarding the coastal wetlands.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 42:10

Up.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:19

I mean, Kathy didn't need to cut you off there.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 42:22

Go, go, go ahead.

I'll I'll follow after you're done.

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

So I think there would just have to be some kind of commitment to like having virtual in person meetings with with us to make sure that everything is still taken along.

Yeah. And one thing that we do recommend is.

Having a four BA, 4C tied meeting, just not necessarily.

I'm currently like yeah, it's the involved. Mm-hmm. But.

It's just the main agencies, but.

That's on the leaf. The door open for, like, more comment from us than just, you know.

Exactly. I think you were gonna say something.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 43:07

Oh, I think I know the answer, but I was just gonna state it for clarification.

I think sometimes there's a benefit in doing merger in terms of the cores permitting, but in other words they can use the RGP 31.

But I'm I'm guessing in this case, Kyle, you you could use the RGP 50, so there's not that benefit in keeping it in merger.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 43:29

Yeah, with the impacts where they are right now, you know we the 50, the 14, I think there's there are permitting options.

Available, we wouldn't.

We wouldn't abandoned this.

And then go into an IP.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 43:47

OK.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 43:47

So.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:54

Does division have a preference on that?

WC **Williams, Paul C** 44:02

Yeah. So the divisions preference would be, you know unless merger is needed for this would be just to take it out of merger and just go through the normal.

Permitting process with the core and obviously CAMA and the same communication that we would have, you know in any other project that would have custod wetland impacts or core wetland impacts.

That definitely wouldn't be something that would go to the wayside.

They would be kept up to date during the design process.

And also you know during the permitting process because the last thing we want to do is submit a permit application where we've not had any communication on prior to.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:55

So is anybody against moving this out of burger?

CW or not, we no DWR is not.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 45:15

That would, as long as there's no objection, I would support taking it out of merger just because I think that's one of the goals of the new merger process is to, you know, not have agencies feel like once something gets in merger, it has to stay there

forever.

That if we get to a point where it no longer makes sense for it to be in merger that that we can take it out for efficiency purposes.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:43

I guess Kyle.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 45:44

This is Scott.

Yeah, this is Kyle.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:46

Is.

KB **Kyle Barnes** 45:46

I I agree with that.

Yeah, it's always nice to see a project that you know at the beginning looks like it may have.

Impacts that would keep us in a a upper level permit. If you want to call it that and be able to be reduced down to where we could address it in the regional general permit or nationwide permit.

So I I the core doesn't have any problems with.

For moving for murder.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:19

OK.

Thank you.

Does anybody else any other agencies that part of the murder team have any objections?

No. OK.

We'll we'll make that as part of the the meeting minutes that this will be taken out of order.

We appreciate everybody's time. Today, we'll be sending out the the, the meeting minutes and have people comment on that. If they see anything that needs to be better reflected and to now the the signature the other than that.

Thank you all for your input today.

Greatly appreciate it and I'll get the final code and transcripts out today as well.

Thank you.

Excellent. Thank you. All right.

 **Kyle Barnes** 47:08

Thank you.

 **Somerville, Amanetta** 47:09

Thank you.

 **Royster, Daniel S** 47:10

Thanks y'all.

 **Lane, Stephen** 47:10

Thanks guys.

 **Brittingham, Cathy** 47:11

Thanks.

 **Snider, Holley** 47:13

Thanks.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription