# DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD

U.S. 64 Widening

Davidson and Randolph Counties

STIP Project R-2220

North Carolina Department of Transportation

Divisions 8 and 9

**MERGER CONCURRENCE POINT NUMBER 2**

***August 20, 2025, 8:00 AM***

# Table of Contents



## Figures

All Figures are located on Connect. Copy the following URL into a browser to access Figures.
https://connect.ncdot.gov/site/Preconstruction/division/div09/R-2220%20US%2064%20Widening/Project%20Development%20Collaboration/Forms/AllItems.aspx#InplviewHash7491a2da-98cb-49e1-bc9c-527b3b8ea752=WebPartID%3D%7B7491A2DA--98CB--49E1--BC9C--527B3B8EA752%7D



## Appendix

## 1. Introduction

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is proposing improvements to U.S. 64, from east of I-85 in Lexington to the Asheboro Bypass. The project is included in the 2024-2033 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as Project No. R-2220. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Section 404 Merger Process, NCDOT is seeking consensus from the NEPA/404 Merger Team (Merger Team) on the following:

- Concurrence Point 2 (Detailed Study Alternatives Carried Forward)

For Concurrence Point (CP) 2, this report provides a brief description of the existing conditions, the project proposed No-Build and Build Alternatives and gives a summary of impacts.

Team Lead: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Primary points of contact for the subject project are:

| Agency | Name | Email Contact |
|---|---|---|
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) | Steve Brumagin | stephen.a.brumagin@usace.army.mil |
| Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (Div 8) | Seth Wilcher | seth.wilcher@dot.gov |
| North Carolina Department of Water Resources (NCDWR) (Div 8) | Ryan Conchilla | ryan.conchilla@deq.nc.gov |
| North Carolina Department of Water Resources (NCDWR) (Div 9) | Kaylie Yankura | kaylie.yankura@deq.nc.gov |
| North Carolina Department of Transportation | Andrew Folk, PM | afolz@ncdot.gov |
| North Carolina Department of Transportation | Robin Pugh, PMU GESC | rpugh@rkk.com |
| RS&H | Ashley Hemming, Consultant PM | ashley.hemming@rsandh.com |

### 1.1 Project Description

The NCDOT, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing to upgrade and widen U.S. 64 from east of I-85 in Lexington to the Asheboro Bypass (see **Figure 1**). The corridor is approximately nineteen miles long and will include tie-in connections with the I-85 interchange, N.C. 109 interchange (STIP B-5777), and the Asheboro Bypass interchange. The project will include a grade-separated railroad bridge and replacement of the U.S. 64 bridge over the Uwharrie River. See **Figure 2** for the project study area.

### 1.2 Cost Estimate and Merger Plan

The proposed project is included in the 2020 High Point MPO (HPMPO) Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), the Davidson County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), and the Randolph County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). The project is also included in NCDOT's Draft 2026-2035 STIP. The current costs for the project as estimated in the current STIP are shown in **Table 1**. The Draft 2026-

2035 STIP does not include any funding for this project. Project development will be suspended following the CP 2A Merger Meeting.

The proposed updated project schedule is included in **Table 2.** The schedule and cost estimates are subject to change.

**Table 1. 2024-2033 STIP R-2220 Cost Estimate**

| Phase | Estimated Costs |
|---|---|
| Right of Way | $55,838,000 |
| Utilities | $12,285,000 |
| Construction Total | $214,124,000 |
| **Total** | **$282,247,000** |

**Table 2. STIP Project R-2220 Milestone Targets (subject to change)**

| Milestone | Anticipated Format | Schedule |
|---|---|---|
| Concurrence Point 2A | In-person with Virtual Option | December 2025 |
| Public Meeting | TBD* | TBD* |
| Concurrence Point 3/4A | TBD* | TBD* |
| Categorical Exclusion | TBD* | TBD* |
| Begin ROW Acquisition | TBD* | TBD* |
| Begin Construction | TBD* | TBD* |
| *The project is currently scheduled to be placed on hold after Merger Concurrence Point 2A. Revised timelines will be determined once the project restarts. | | |

## 2. Summary of CP 1 Project Purpose and Need

In September 2019, the NEPA/404 Merger Team met to discuss Purpose and Need and Study Area for the referenced project – Concurrence Point 1 (CP 1). During the meeting, existing conditions, the project study area, the project's need, and the project's purpose were presented. After the presentation and discussions, the NEPA/404 Merger Team reached a consensus and signed the formal Concurrence Point 1 Agreement (see **Appendix**). Under this agreement, the purpose, and need of the project are defined as shown in **Sections 2.1** and **2.2**.

### 2.1 Identified Needs

The need for the project is impeded regional vehicular mobility:

- Regional Mobility
    - Regional mobility is impeded due to the following:
        - High number of driveways.
        - Slower traffic is causing platooning.

- Inadequate passing zones.
- High percentage of rear-end crashes.
- Average travel speed is 5-10 mph slower than posted speed limit.
- The percentage of time-spent-following is high.

**2.2 Proposed Purpose**

The purpose of the project is to:

- To improve regional vehicular mobility along the entire corridor during the A.M. and P.M. peak periods.
    - Measurable Goal: Provide an average travel speed no less than 10 mph below the design speed (60 mph) along the corridor for the AM and PM peak periods.

**2.3. Project Study Area**

The Project Study Area is shown in **Figure 2**. There have been no changes to the study area since the CP 1 Merger Meeting.

**3. Informational Merger Meeting**

Due to the timeframe since the last Merger Meeting (CP1) in 2019, an informational meeting was held on March 17, 2025. The Merger Team was updated on activities that occurred since the project was paused. NCDOT had updated the traffic forecast and analysis and confirmed that the Purposed and Need remained valid.

**4. Summary of Alternatives Considered**

**4.1 No Build Alternative**

The No-Build Alternative includes minor restoration activities to ensure the safety, maintenance, and continued operation of the existing highway. It does not require additional right of way or generate impacts to human or natural resources. However, this Alternative would not address congestion and travel time issues along the corridor. The No Build Alternative would not meet the needs of the proposed project to reduce congestion and improve travel times along the corridor. The No Build Alternative provides a basis for comparing the adverse impacts and benefits of the study Alternatives.

**4.2 Build Alternative**

Two Build Alternatives have been developed:

- **Build Alternative 1 – South Widening**
  Widen U.S. 64 to the south of the existing facility for most of the study area corridor.
- **Build Alternative 2 – North Widening**
  Widen U.S. 64 to the north of the existing facility for most of the study area corridor.

A third Build Alternative can be developed by combining various segments of Alternatives 1 and 2:

- **Build Alternative 3 – Best Fit Widening**
  Widens U.S. 64 either to the south or to the north

Alternatives 1 and 2 include the following updates to the U.S. 64 corridor:

- Introducing Reduced Conflict Intersections (RCI)

- Closing the Smith Farm Road connection (plan sheet 2)
- Realigning Bryant Road and Lee Black Road (plan sheet 3)
- Adding a grade-separated railroad crossing and an at-grade crossing closure at Decker Road (plan sheet 4)
- Realigning Clarksbury Church Road (plan sheet 5)
- Adding new alignment connecting U.S. 64 to Blackberry Road (plan sheet 6)

Design options, shown on plan sheets 12 and 12a, include the following:

- Rush Mountain Road Realignment: The options shown for Rush Mountain Road are interchangeable and are not married to a specific alternative.
    - Alternative 1, shown on plan sheet 12, depicts realigning Rush Mountain Road to the west to make room for a WB U-turn bulb (as requested by Division 8) at the current intersection location.
    - Alternative 2, shown on plan sheet 12, depicts leaving the Rush Mountain Road alignment closer to its current location and adding the WB U-turn bulb to the east, closer to the Uwharrie River bridge.

      Due to controlled access requirements at the U-turn bulbs, Alternative 2 may not be desirable from an access perspective to the properties on the north side of the corridor, adjacent to the U-turn bulb. The U-turn bulb on the north side is shifted slightly between Alternatives 1 and 2, in order to fit the bulb on the south side in before the bridge. In addition, though the bulb was added on the south side in Alternative 2, access control is required on both sides of the road. This leads to access issues on the north side.
    - A third option, shown on plan sheet 12a, is to retain the current Rush Mountain Road configuration and not add a U-turn bulb in this location. However, without a U-turn bulb in this location, there would be a 0.8 mile turn around distance for the vehicles at Lake Park Road/Kindley Road to turn left.
- The Uwharrie Bridge: The bridge could be widened to the south, north or widened symmetrically.
    - Alternative 1 proposes to widen the bridge to the south side, shown on plan sheet 12.
    - Alternative 2 proposes to widen the bridge symmetrically, shown on plan sheet 12.
    - A third option has been developed to widen the bridge to the north, shown on plan sheet 12a.

A best fit alternative for the STIP R-2220 U.S. 64 widening project, referred to in this document as Alternative 3, can be developed through a comparative analysis of the impacts and benefits of the proposed widening to the south of the corridor (Alternative 1) and the proposed widening to the north of the corridor (Alternative 2), using the No Build Alternative as a baseline. To facilitate this analysis, the corridor was divided into 11 segments so that south or north widening alignments can be combined to form a best fit alternative, referred to as Alternative 3. This analysis will evaluate right-of-way impacts, stream and wetland impacts, relocations, traffic operations, and costs to identify the most effective alignment that meets the project's goal of reducing congestion and improving travel times.

### 4.3 Alternative Eliminated

- 2 +1 Concept: The 2+1 roadway design refers to a three-lane highway configuration with two lanes in one direction and one lane in the other direction, where the passing lane direction alternates every few miles. This design aims to provide passing opportunities on a two-lane road without the cost of a full four-lane highway. Divisions 8 and 9 weighed in on this option, determining that the 2+1 typical would not satisfy the needs of the corridor.

  While the 2+1 concept would reduce the percent time following along the corridor and offer some improvement in travel speeds, it would not fully meet the corridor's operational goals. With 12,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day and 7% truck traffic during peak hours, U.S. 64 continues to experience travel speeds more than 10 mph below the posted limit in several segments. The intermittent nature of passing lanes does not provide consistent relief from congestion, especially during peak periods.

  Additionally, because passing lanes only offer periodic opportunities to overtake slower vehicles, they do little to address the frequent rear-end and sideswipe crashes caused by driver impatience and aggressive lane changes. In contrast, widening the corridor to a four-lane facility is expected to deliver more reliable and sustained improvements in travel speed and reduced platooning, while also offering greater reductions in these types of crashes due to more consistent lane availability and smoother traffic flow.

### 4.4 Design Criteria and Typical Section

The Build Alternatives were developed using AASHTO and NCDOT guidelines for a freeway using a 60-mph design speed. Four 12-foot lanes, two in each direction, will be provided along U.S. 64. The project corridor is proposed to include a 46-foot grassed median and 4-foot paved shoulders. The project also includes superstreet concepts and access management along the corridor. The mainline typical section is presented in **Figure 3.**

The width of median is based on recoverable side slopes for drivers, required ditch width of 30-foot and adequate depths for drainage, and the ability to allow for future lanes using a 27-foot median with a concrete barrier. The 46-foot median was formally the minimum depressed median requirement for NCDOT. The minimum width has subsequently been increased to 51-foot minimum in the latest version of the Roadway Design manual. After discussion with the project team when the project restarted in 2023, Divisions 8 and 9 decided to leave the median width at 46-foot.

Based on the Davidson County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), the NCDOT Integrated Mobility Division (IMD) recommended coordinating with Davidson County to determine if a SUP (Shared Use Path) along U.S. 64 between Conrad Hill Mine Road (plan sheet 2) and Kepley Road (plan sheet 3) should be included in the R-2220 design. After coordination with Lee Crook/Planning Director and Zoning Administrator for Davidson County and Andrew Edmonds/Transportation Planning Administrator with High Point Metropolitan Planning Organization (HPMPO), the SUP was eliminated from the design concepts. Mr. Crook polled the Board of Commissioners to determine interest in the SUP. The results of the poll indicated the Board does not wish to pursue a SUP along U.S. 64 at this time. A specific reason was not provided. However, Mr. Edmonds suggested that he heard in previous County meetings that the County does not wish to add the SUP to their maintenance.

## 5. Analysis of Build Alternatives

### 5.1 Traffic Analysis

The Traffic Analysis (May 2024) analyzed the 2045 Build scenario which includes an additional through lane in each direction on U.S. 64 creating a four-lane divided typical section. Additional improvements to the Build scenario include turn lane improvements at several study intersections and signalization of the two ramp terminals along U.S. 64 at the I-85 and U.S. 64 interchanges.

- The intersection improvements included in the Build scenario are as follows:
    - Signalizing the U.S. 64 left-over movements at the I-85 northbound and southbound ramps (plan sheet 1).
    - U.S. 64 at Heath Church Road/New Bowers Road (plan sheet 2) is converted from a full movement intersection to a reduced conflict intersection: restricting side-street movements to right-turns out; providing for left-overs along east and westbound U.S. 64; and allowing eastbound U-turns approximately 900 feet east of the intersection.
    - U.S. 64 at Old U.S. 64 (plan sheet 11) is converted from permitting left- and right-turns from the side street to only permitting right-turns out (drivers wishing to turn left from Old U.S. 64 to travel westbound may conduct a U-turn at the adjacent intersection to the east).
    - U.S. 64 at Gallimore Town Road (plan sheet 11) is converted from permitting left- and right-turns from the side street and eastbound left-turns from the mainline to right-turns in and right-turns out only (the restricted movements are provided at the adjacent intersection to the east).
- Reconfiguration of turn lanes and permitted movements at the following intersections:
    - U.S. 64 at Old U.S. 64 is converted from permitting left- and right-turns from the side street to only permitting right-turns out (drivers wishing to turn left from Old U.S. 64 to travel westbound may conduct a U-turn at the adjacent intersection to the east).
    - U.S. 64 at Gallimore Town Road is converted from permitting left- and right-turns from the side street and eastbound left-turns the mainline to right-turns in and right-turns out only (the restricted movements are provided at the adjacent intersection to the east).

All study intersections operate at LOS D or better under 2045 Build conditions, except for the stop-controlled median left-over movement from U.S. 64 eastbound to Heath Church Road northbound which operates at an LOS E in the AM and PM peak hours, and the unsignalized northbound and southbound approaches along Conrad Mine Hill Road which operate at LOS F and LOS E in the morning and afternoon peak hours, respectively.

With the addition of one lane in each direction, the capacity is increased along U.S. 64. The average travel speeds also increase as a result. Highway Capacity Software (HCS) was used to analyze traffic flow, travel speed and capacity. The average travel speeds for the U.S. 64 corridor are reflected in the 2045 Build analysis which can be found in **Table 3** following.

**Table 3. R-2220 HCS Analysis Results for Average Travel Speed 2045 Build Conditions AM/PM Peak Hr**

| Segment | Average Travel Speed (mph) |
|---|---|
| US 64 W of Conrad Hill Mine Rd | **53.9** |
| US 64 W of Clarksbury Rd | **52.2** |
| US 64 W of NC 109 | **53.0** |
| US 64 E of NC 109 | **51.8** |
| US 64 W of Old US 64 | **54.4** |
| US 64 W of Gallimore Rd | **57.0** |
| US 64 W of Bescher Chapel Rd | **56.3** |
| US 64 W of Hoover Hill Rd | **53.7** |
| US 64 W of Lexington Rd | **53.2** |
| US 64 W of Spencer Meadows Rd | **55.1** |
| US 64 E of Spencer Meadows Rd | **53.7** |

*Source: Traffic Capacity Analysis Technical Memorandum – Approved May 2024*

### 5.2 Environmental Features and Property Impacts

The following **Table 4** shows environmental features and other impacts within the Project Study Area of each Alternative proposed to be carried forward. The impacts are calculated based on the Merger Segments identified in the Detailed Study Alternatives located on Connect and also shown on the Environmental Features Map (**Figure 2**). Measurements were quantified using slope stake limits plus 40 feet. Streams and wetlands represent 2019 field delineated resources, though they have not been verified by the agencies at the time of this report. As the design progresses and an Alternative is selected, further minimization efforts will be explored to reduce the number of environmental impacts and relocations.

#### 5.2.1 Historic and 4(f) Resources

Four resources were identified within the project study area that would be subject to Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966: the Lake Reece Park and Recreation Area (plan sheets 12-13, EF sheets 10-11), the North Carolina Zoological Park Dedicated Nature Preserve (plan sheets 14-15, EF sheet 12), the Robbins property (plan sheet 14-15, EF sheet 12) and the Kearnes property (plan sheet 15, EF sheet 12). These resources are located in Randolph County.

The Lake Reece Park and Recreation Area is owned by the City of Asheboro and is located adjacent to U.S. 64 on both sides of the corridor. This park is operated and administered by Asheboro Cultural and Recreation Services. Design impacts, as shown in **Table 4**, total 0.9 acres for Alternative 1 and 2.1 acres for Alternative 2 based on a boundary of the slope stakes limit plus 40 feet.

The North Carolina Zoological Park Dedicated Nature Preserve was acquired with funds from the Natural Heritage Trust Fund (Grant # 200810706), which is now known as the Land and Water Fund. The Natural Heritage Program recently submitted a dedication amendment adding property to the dedicated area.

This amendment included a clause which stated that NCDOT may use a strip of land up to fifty feet (50') wide outside and adjacent to the road's existing NCDOT right-of-way for the purpose of improving the NCDOT road. A strip of land approved under this provision shall not be longer than 1,000 feet. This amendment is anticipated to be added to the agenda for Council of State review in 2025. Alternative 1 will result in impacts to this property of 1.8 acres. Alternative 2 will impact 0.3 acres based on a boundary of the slope stakes limit plus 40 feet.

Two resources have been determined eligible for the National Register, the William P. Kearns House and Farm and the Jesse Robbins House. The State Historic Preservation Office concurred with this finding on March 21, 2024. These resources are subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as well as Section 4(f). An Assessment of Effects is required.

As the design progresses and an Alternative is selected, further minimization efforts will be explored to reduce the impacts to these properties. All efforts will be made to minimize harm to these resources.

## Table 4. Resource Presence in Project Study Area

| Merger Segment Number | | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental Features Map Sheet Reference | | Sht 1-2 | | Sht 2-3 | | Sht 3-4 | | Sht 4-6 | | Sht 6-7 | | Sht 7-9 | |
| Design Plan Sheet Reference | | Sht 1-2 | | Sht 2-4 | | Sht 4-5 | | Sht 5-7 | | Sht 7-9 | | Sht 9-11 | |
| | | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 |
| Length (Miles) | | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2 | 2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Wetlands (Acres) | | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Streams (LF) | | 990 | 990 | 260 | 400 | 0 | 40 | 3,060 | 2,320 | 2,470 | 2,050 | 1,240 | 1,140 |
| Floodway (Acres) | | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Floodplain (acre) | 100-Year | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | 500-Year | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Relocation (Residential) | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Relocation (Business) | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Section 4(f) - State-owned Zoo Property (Acres) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Section 4(f) - Lake Reese Recreation Area (Acres) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Historic Architecture - Kearnes Property (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Historic Architecture - Robbins Property (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Historic Architecture (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Archaeological - Cemetery (Parcels) | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Environmentally Sensitive Area (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| School (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| School (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Church (Parcels) | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Church (Acres) | | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Fire Station (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Fire Station (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Hazardous Materials Sites (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Parcels Impacted | | 25 | 25 | 65 | 50 | 24 | 25 | 69 | 69 | 63 | 66 | 46 | 45 |

*Note:*

*1. Measurements quantified using a buffer of the slope stake limit plus 40 feet*

*2. Property Impacts are rounded to the nearest 0.1 acre*

*3. Streams are rounded to the nearest 10 ft*

## *Indicates lower value between Alt 1 and Alt 2*

## Table 4. Resource Presence in Project Study Area

| Merger Segment Number | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | 11 | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental Features Map Sheet Reference | | Sht 9-10 | | Sht 10-11 | | Sht 11-12 | | Sht 12-14 | | Sht 14-15 | | Alt 1 | Alt 2 |
| Design Plan Sheet Reference | | Sht 11-12 | | Sht 12-14 | | Sht 14-15 | | Sht 15-16 | | Sht 16-18 | | | |
| | | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | Alt 1 | Alt 2 | | |
| Length (Miles) | | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 19.8 | 19.8 |
| Wetlands (Acres) | | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 9.0 | 5.8 |
| Streams (LF) | | 1,860 | 1,850 | 1,120 | 1,060 | 2,080 | 1,060 | 1,120 | 1,040 | 1,460 | 1,800 | 15,660 | 13,740 |
| Floodway (Acres) | | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 9.2 |
| Floodplain (acre) | 100-Year | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 10.2 |
| | 500-Year | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Relocation (Residential) | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 14 |
| Relocation (Business) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 6 |
| Section 4(f) - State-owned Zoo Property (Acres) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.8 | 0.3 |
| Section 4(f) - Lake Reese Recreation Area (Acres) | | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 2.1 |
| Historic Architecture - Kearnes Property (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Historic Architecture - Robbins Property (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Historic Architecture (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 7.8 |
| Archaeological - Cemetery (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Environmentally Sensitive Area (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| School (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| School (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Church (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Church (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 4.5 | 5.3 |
| Fire Station (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Fire Station (Acres) | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Hazardous Materials Sites (Parcels) | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| Total Parcels Impacted | | 36 | 36 | 50 | 50 | 33 | 30 | 26 | 24 | 34 | 31 | 471 | 451 |

*Note:*

*1. Measurements quantified using a buffer of the slope stake limit plus 40 feet*

*2. Property Impacts are rounded to the nearest 0.1 acre*

*3. Streams are rounded to the nearest 10 ft*

## *Indicates lower value between Alt 1 and Alt 2*

**6. Summary of Public Involvement**

A newsletter announcing the start of the project was mailed in February 2019. The Newsletter included contact information for the Project Team, project overview, project costs, and project schedule. A project website was also launched in March 2024 to provide up-to-date project information and to collect public input. No public meeting has been held to date, and all additional public involvement has been paused as the project will be suspended following the CP 2A Merger Meeting.

**7. Avoidance and Minimization**

During the development of the design, impact minimization efforts were made for Alternatives 1 and 2. For comparison purposes, minimization for Alternatives 1 and 2 are discussed together and include the following:

- Minimization of wetland impacts is reflected through the roadway widening design shift to the north from Smith Farm Road/Heath Church Road (plan sheet 2) to Asheboro Street (plan sheet 4) shown in Alternative 2. This shift shown in Alternative 2 minimizes impacts to wetlands near Station 100+00 (EF sheet 2, ID: WDJ) and 135+00 (EF sheet 2, ID: WDD, WDE). Shifting the roadway widening back to the south minimizes impacts to the wetlands near Station 215+00 (EF sheet 4, ID: WDC).
- The design was developed to widen on both sides of U.S. 64 more symmetrically from east of N.C. 109 (plan sheet 6) to Kennedy Farm Road (plan sheet 9) for Alternative 2 which minimizes impacts to environmental features on both sides of U.S 64 which include multiple stream sections, wetlands and an underground storage tank (EF sheet 5, 6 ,7 ,8). The design in this location of the corridor differs between Alternatives 1 and 2 in that there is a slight shift in the alignment for Alternative 2 near STA 330+00 (plan sheet 6) that adjusts the standard Alternative 2 widening to the north to a symmetrical widening. Alternative 1 widens to the south in this area.
- Tabernacle Volunteer Fire Department (plan sheet 11, EF sheet 9) - The roadway widening was shifted south for both Alternatives to avoid streams (ID: SW) wetlands (ID: WAS, WAK, WAJ) impacts. The design immediately adjacent to the fire department property is approximately the same on both alternatives.
- The Alternative 2 design widens both sides of U.S. 64 more symmetrically from Bescher Chapel Road (plan sheet 11) to Rush Mountain Road (plan sheet 12) to minimize impacts to streams (ID: SS, ST, SU, SV) and wetlands (ID: WAA, WAB, WAC, WAE, WAF, WAG, WAI, WZ) on both sides of U.S 64 (EF sheet 10). Alternative 1 widens to the south in this area.
- The design for Alternative 1, between Mt. Shepard Road (plan sheet 14, 15) and Club View Drive, is shifted south to reduce impacts to historic properties (plan sheet 14, 15, EF sheet 12) on the north side of U.S. 64. The state-owned zoo property (plan sheet 14, 15, EF sheet 12) and the environmentally sensitive area (plan sheet 15, EF sheet 12) located south of U.S. 64 will have greater impacts with Alternative 1 compared to Alternative 2.
  The design for Alternative 2 in the same location is shifted north to minimize impacts to the parallel stream (ID: SM), state-owned zoo property, and the environmentally sensitive area. This shift also reduces impacts to wetlands (ID: WL). However, Alternative 2 will have greater impacts to the historic properties located on the north side of U.S. 64.

**8. Next Steps**

Based on the proposed Merger Plan for the project, NCDOT proposes the next Merger Meeting to be CP 2A (Bridging Decisions and Alignment Review). Prior to the next Merger Meeting, NCDOT will complete the Hydraulic Planning Report. It is anticipated that the CP 2A meeting will be held in December 2025. Merger Team members will be notified of any changes that require a revision of this timetable.

# Appendix

**DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATES CARRIED FORWARD**

U.S. 64 Widening

Davidson and Randolph Counties

STIP Project R-2220

North Carolina Department of Transportation

Divisions 8 and 9

**MERGER CONCURRENCE POINT NUMBER 2**

***August 20, 2025, 8:00 AM***

# R-2220 NEPA/404 Merger Team Meeting Agreement

## Concurrence Point 1: *Project Purpose & Need and Study Area Defined*

**Project Description:** US 64 Improvements from east of I-85 in Lexington, in Davidson County, to the Asheboro Bypass in Randolph County. **NCDOT STIP Project No. R-2220.**

## Need for Proposed Project: Regional Vehicular Mobility

***The Need for the Project is based on impeded regional vehicular mobility.***

***Regional mobility is impeded due to the following:***

- o Average travel speed is 5-10 mph slower than posted speed limit
- o Percent time-spent-following is high (up to 79% of the time)
- o Inadequate passing zones
- o Slower traffic causing platooning
- o High percentage of rear-end crashes
- o High percentage of freight (up to 20%)
- o High number of driveways

## Purpose of Proposed Project: Improve Regional Vehicular Mobility

***The purpose of the project is to improve regional vehicular mobility along the entire corridor during the AM and PM peak periods.***

o Measurable Goal: Provide an average travel speed to within 10 mph of the design speed (60 mph) along the entire corridor for the AM and PM peak periods.

# R-2220 NEPA/404 Merger Team Meeting Agreement

## Project Study Area

The R-2220 study area corridor begins east of the I-85 interchange in Davidson County and ends at the western terminus of the Asheboro Bypass, in Randolph County, and is primarily 500 feet in width. The project study area boundary limits are shown in the attached **Figure 4**, dated August 2019.

**The project NEPA/404 Merger Team met on September 11, 2019 and concurs with the R-2220 Project Purpose & Need and Study Area Defined (attached Figure 4, dated August 2019).**

| | |
|---|---|
| Federal Highway Administration | DocuSigned by: Donald W. Brew |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | DocuSigned by: B96E8CF089TE42C... Andrew Williams |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | DocuSigned by: 293904DE61CF4F9... Amanetta Somerville |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | DocuSigned by: 4A37089ED457408... Gary Jordan |
| North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission | DocuSigned by: 501BAD677C42452... Travis Wilson |
| North Carolina Division of Water Resources | DocuSigned by: 31585D0B682E436... April Norton |
| North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office | DocuSigned by: 03BAC6376A6340D... Renee Gledhill-Earley |
| High Point MPO | DocuSigned by: C26A1556A275464... Gregory W. Venable |
| Piedmont Triad RPO | DocuSigned by: C76643E084564B8... Kelly E. Larkins |
| North Carolina Department of Transportation | DocuSigned by: 46C50EEA43A64D8... Karen Reynolds 512F0E5DF1024CB... |