

R-2615 - CP 2A - Watauga County - US 321US 421 Junction Near Vilas to SR 1107 (105 Bypass), Termini of the proposed Boone Bypass (U-2703), Widen to Multi-Lanes-20260520_130022-Meeting Recording

May 20, 2026, 5:00PM

1h 24m 24s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:03

A minute or two, or you know we can probably start and go through just introductions, and then if anyone joins us, we'll try.

So, I am going to...

And.

Just run through introductions. This is the R2615 merger meeting. In case you want to make sure you're in the right place. CP2A. I'm going to just go through the list of... Actually, we'll go through the room first, and then I'll run through the list online. And if there's not too many people, we'll let them introduce yourselves. So Marissa Cox, NCDOT, Environmental Policy.

Seth. Excuse me, Seth Mulcher, pretty common environment specialist with Federal Lab. Martha Register, a planner with WGI. Rob Ridings, DWR. Olivia Pilkington, Project Management Unit, NCDOT. Wes Gardner, PMU, DOT. Tyler Yellen, PMU. Mike McCarrick, Monica.

Brian VHV Hydraulics. Heather Smith, VHV, Natural Resources. Eva Hendrick, Bono Policy.

Mark Hamill, WGI. Like these PMU.

Bill Barrett and CBOT Environmental Coordination Program.

I'm going to call you out online alphabetically. We've got Daniel Adams. I don't know who you're with Daniel. Thanks.

AR **Adams, Daniel R** 1:37

Daniel Irons, Division Eleven.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:39

Thank you, Daniel. Then we've got Christine Farrell, she's with our Environmental Policy Unit. Frank Fleming with... I'm here. You're here. Like, we just, I just heard your name. John Jamison with the Environmental Policy Unit. Lori Beckwith with the Board of Engineers. Martha's also here, she's online.

Dave McHenry with the Wildlife Resource Commission. Mike, I need my reading glasses. He's here as well. Also here. Miranda.

Who's Miranda with? Miranda, you wanna introduce yourself?

MS **Miranda Salzler** 2:13

Sup.

Hi there. Miranda Selzler with VHB Water Resources.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:19

Thank you, Miranda. Teresa with DWR, correct? Yeah. Amanetta. Thank you, Teresa. Amanetta Somerville with EPA. Trent Huffman, also with the Division WGI.

SP **Sarzaeim, Parisa** 2:28

Yes, that's correct.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:39

and Holland Youngman with the Fish and Wildlife Service in Nashville. Did I miss any money online?

Okay, I'm going to just turn this over to Martha then. Okay, so as I mentioned, I'm Martha Register and I'm with WGI. I've been the planner for PMU with this project. Pulled together this presentation, but please feel free. I want this to be an open discussion.

Do we want to start off with does FHWA or Corps of Engineers have any comments? But you take it away.

Boring.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 3:21

I sent in any overall comments. No, I just, I know you got a couple emails. You got one from me, one from Dave McHenry. I don't know if you received any other ones, but

If you'll just address those at some point, that would be great. And we're good to go.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:35

And.

Thank you. Yeah, thank you for the comments. Appreciate that. We'll hopefully get answers to for you. I know that Frank has seen Dave McHenry's and we can talk through that also.

MR **Martha Register** 3:49

You can talk through that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:53

On.

All right. I'll rewind and just that reminds me, I wanted to say thank you to Lori and Dave, because it's always helpful to send them in advance of the meeting and that way you're well prepared to respond, not be kind of caught up guard in real time. So thanks for the comments in that two week period.

And that's been expressed by a couple people. John Jamison just typed in and said the same thing. So thank you very much. We appreciate all the feedback. To that end, I've gotten comments on the packet, various and sundry things. A match line was misplaced.

We had to add a church to the to be meet and to the to be map. There was a label misplaced somewhere. So there is an updated packet, which I've given to Hannah.

We didn't want to put it on the, throw it out there to get anybody confused prior to this meeting. But I think when we send everything out,

Um, we'll we'll replace and update the packet, so that...

Any small errors are not there. OK.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 5:00

The.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:01

We're going to go with, does somebody have a couple? I've got it. We're going to try a cherry Starburst. Thank you. Something was ticking my throat in here too. So I've got a PowerPoint presentation. Hannah, am I not sharing?

As I hit the share button.

Let's see.

Ohh.

On my teams.

Apparently I didn't make the screen.

I'm on computer.

There it is!

and there's a little bit of a lag.

Okay, R2615 US 321-421 winding west of Boone. Today we're going to talk about alternative alignment review and bridging discussions. So again, goals of the meeting to talk about the alignments and then hopefully talk through major structures.

and get concurrence on that. I'm going to run through the 1st 10 slides, which is just sort of a where the project's been and a little bit of back history. And then

We can we can stop at that point in time and decide how we want to proceed with the rest of the discussion.

As I mentioned, the project's in Watauga County. It's west of Boone. We have a fairly large study area that has to do with the mountains and chasing slopes.

The federally funded NEPA categorical exclusion and the currently the design year is 2050.

Most of you have seen this slide before. It's just a general idea of existing conditions. Projects approximately 3 miles long. It's A two-mile, or excuse me, it's a two-lane roadway with shoulders.

Generally A 60 foot variable right away, posted 45 to 60 miles an hour. It's in mountainous terrain. It follows Brushy Fork.

which is on the photograph, it's running right up the right side of the image. So you can see how close to the roadway it gets on the right side of this image. Generally, it's rural, but there is development right up alongside the road because of the mountainous drain.

Current schedule has the environmental document, summer of 2027. The EOT is talking about when they want to start the right away process and the let's programmed out to 2040 plus.

100 and fifty-six million for the construction estimate, and that is 2 years old, so it will be updated shortly. Next slide.

Like.

It's a lag. Yeah, we've been a lag.

See if we can, here we go, alright.

For this particular discussion, particularly since we were talking hydraulics and other things, I pulled forward to this information regarding the waters. So we're in the Watauga River Basin.

We have three named tributaries: Brushy Fork, George's Branch, and Linville Creek. Their tribe watersheds, but there's no outstanding high quality or outstanding resource waters or water supply watersheds.

This is the current IPAC list.

A lot of these are unresolved and they'll be handled and surveys will be completed as we get further into design and we have a better sense of what the footprint is going to be.

Some of the environmental features we know, this is a 8 year old project. We haven't surveyed for archaeology yet. We do know that we have a historic property that abuts the corridor. That's the Gradient Artist Greenhouse. There are six churches in the corridor, at least three cemeteries, a post office, an EMS station, roughly 50 businesses, 130 residences, and approximately 14 geo-environmental sites. So most of these are USTs.

The proposed typical sections for the main line is 2 12 foot travel lanes with a grass median. We want to have a 5 foot paved shoulders to allow more bicycles. And then through the village of Vilas,

Because the residences are so close to the roadway, we were looking at potentially a smaller footprint. So this one has two 11 foot travel lanes with a six foot concrete median in the middle and it's a curb and gutter section.

So that's just a general history of sort of project progression and the information that we've gathered to date.

And then...

just to step off into where the discussion wants to start today and back and forth. In 2019, we got to concurrence point #2, which was discussing a best fit alternative and looking at that alternative that will utilize, that will shift either to the east or to the west or symmetrically to avoid and minimize impacts. That was agreed to generally as a concept. And we were to, in coordination with the resource agencies, as we develop that alignment, discuss the progression leading into the lead fund. So we're going to do some of that today.

So, I have...

The maps that are in the packet, I have summary data tables. I have detailed data

tables. We can progress this as you all see fit.
to try and get to the details and the comfort level of where we are with the alternatives. I just want to reiterate that when we were talking about when the maps are made,
using the best information that was available. We used the preliminary best fit alternative, which includes bylines, and to try and pull back and gather some data on the right and the left alignment. Those are concepts, and those concept drawings do not include

My lights on.

And this is a summary of all of the data that I gathered using those.
concept drawings and I've got all of the maps that were in the packet and I know I'm bouncing through these fairly quickly.

But...

At this point, I guess my question is...

How do you want to proceed to discuss?

each of these map segments.

And what details do you want to see, Lori? You had a lot of questions about...

Alternative development.

How would you like me to proceed?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 13:15

Well, I guess the best way would be to go through my questions, that those are my issues, but then also make sure you address any endangered species issues, any anything that

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 13:22

Two.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 13:30

I guess WRC would be interested in. It sounds like the 401 issue. You know, talk about any of those things. Talk about historic properties as they apply. But just generally, like you look at these different sections and you'd say, okay, we came up with this plan and go down because it avoids this, because it avoids this, or it'll impact.

is and just explain what the rationale was behind it, keeping in mind the environmental concerns of the merger agencies. Does that make sense?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 13:53

Best.

Yes, ma'am.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 14:03

Okay, thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 14:05

So I'm going to start with each map segment, put it up on the screen, and then I'll stop at the best fit and we can discuss. And if you want me to then go to the summary table, I can do that. So

In the discussions to develop all of this, there was a left concept and a right concept developed. And then looking at, as Lauren mentioned, you know, what features were there. We did a preliminary thought concept on

what a best fit would look like. So this is the left alignment that's shown here. And left is East. East, thank you. Left is East. I have to remember that my left and my East create have E's in them. And the right alignment is generally to the west.

Now, this corridor doesn't always go north and south, so it sometimes is a little bit odd to look at. What we put on this map was the FEMA floodplain, the 2025, 2026 stream and wetland data post Halene.

And then the big yellow BLOB in the middle is the cut and is the alignment. It shows cut and fill slips plus a 40 foot buffer on it.

Um...

Here's the next one. This is the right alignment.

Shame it, same image.

Same parameters. And then here's the best fit alignment. And just to reiterate again, if you go back to one of these previous alignments, you can see it says end project and it ends at the top of this white building, which happens to be Skate World.

If I go into the best fit, it now has white lines on it.

So there's some additional impacts associated with the Y lines.

Lori, to get to some of your questions, the church is located right here, right at the intersection of the two alignments. The EMS facility is located right under the US 321

shield.

And the post office is down here, real close to the match line.

In this particular alignment, if I go to the summary table.

Again, best fit alignment has Y lines on it. So.

Looking at the map, the Y line crosses George's Branch. You go into some of the data that I posted, and it's in the appendix. That's an additional 130 feet of stream impact.

If I go over here to Abbey Lane and look at the Y line here on Abbey Lane,

It bumps up against Brushy Fork.

down here. And there's additional little stream down in here. That's an additional 80 feet of stream impact of impact. Excuse me, Brushy Fork has got an additional 80 feet and wetland or stream F has an additional 30.

You add all those together conservatively, you get 240 feet.

If you subtract 240 feet from this alternative up here, that puts the stream impacts real comparable to the left widening.

So that, you know, to get to some of the questions, and I know there was a lot of conversation about, you know, what does the Y line do to these designs? There's 240 feet right on just that one map.

The EMS facility, because it's on the Y line, is showing up as an impact here.

where it's not showing up on the other two.

And then there's extra residential, there's extra residential properties up for 21 that are.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 18:19
So...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:27
on the Y line that are not on the other two alignments. Yes, there was a question.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 18:33
Oh.
This is Lori. So, okay, I want to make sure I understand. For the right alignment, left alignment on all these, you don't have any Y line impacts, right?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:38

It.

That is correct.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 18:49

Okay, so, so we're really comparing apples and oranges then.

Can you, and it would be good if you go through, I mean, I think so you've shown that the impacts are going to be about the same for this segment because best bit has Y line. And so if you did that for the right and left, there would be even more impacts than what's shown on your chart, right?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 19:15

Correct.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 19:16

For those two, okay. So could you do that going through each one like you have here and then at the after this meeting?

because the files need to be solid.

If you could calculate the Y line impacts into the different alignments for each section and send those out, just so, because a number of us have to write supporting documentation.

for this alternative. If you could do that, and that, it's tough to do when it's not, when it's apples and oranges, if you could just make it all standard, that would be great.

Can you do that?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 19:47

Hey.

So.

I have a question, Lori, before we answer that. Is it also possible in order to create apples to apples to remove the side streets on the best fit and that way then none of the quantities are included in all three tables rather than add?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 19:58

Okay.

Well, since...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:15

We don't have Y lines on the right, so remove the Y lines. Lori understands why we're asking, right, right, right, rather than adding to two, subtract from one.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 20:15

Okay.

Well, I want it to reflect the reality of what's really going to happen.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:28

S.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 20:32

So I don't know that subtracting would work since you are going to, under best fit, you would impact the Y lines. Is it, I mean, how much, are we talking a huge amount of work or to include?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:35

Okay.

Okay.

A decent amount.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 20:47

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:47

Yeah, the tie-ins would be a decent amount for all those side streets.

But we can do that.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 20:52

To estimate it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:56

To clarify, how do we know it for the best fit and not for the other ones? I guess I'm a little bit confused.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 20:57
Look.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 21:03
So, so 2019, I mean.

we progressed, the alignment has progressed. So the way we built, the reason why we built that, a lot of times when we start out in roadway, what we'll do is we'll throw a left or a right conceptually, and so, and not include the Y lines because the major impacts are going to be on the main line and your Y lines.

really on this type of facility are going to be whatever traffic requires. And then you're going to shorten them if there's something that deems you have to. So the thought behind it was, let's throw a left and a right on there, get the right type of people in the room and start building.

Uh, what to why to shift here, where to shift there, and um...

And so that's the reason why it started out with the left and right don't have wild lines and then it was progressive, the best fit, assuming that it matched.

And that makes sense to me. Does that make sense to you, Lori?

Like the explanation.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 22:13

Except, yes, except the part about having the, I'm paraphrasing because this isn't the exact word you use, but having the necessary people there. For rd design, yes, I understand what you're talking about, but for merger discussion, the agency should have been involved at some point.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:26

Yeah, sorry.

Thank you.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 22:31

And I just want to make that clear. I don't mean to hammer on this again and again, but I just want to make sure that everyone understands, especially that they're merger agencies. And also if one of these projects you have in the future, that the agencies are brought in a lot earlier because they're, you know, environmental

factors you have to consider. I understand constructability and all that. But you need to factor in our stuff too if you can.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:54
Two.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 22:57
That makes sense.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:58
No, that no, that makes sense, Lori. I guess back to your what your original ask and then the response from Pamia that it would would be a lot of work. Like the what the example you just gave was just really like, there's an additional 200 feet right here. Like, is it really more than do you really need more than that, Lori? Or do you just need?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 23:09
Oh.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:18
a quick look and an estimation of the impacts. Like it seems like it's not a lot of work, I guess. To design it and get. Well, not design. She's not asking for design. She's just asking for an estimate of the impacts. So if you know it's 200 feet, she just wants to be. That's not a heavy lift.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 23:29
No, just an estimate.
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:37
Yes. To design two additional. She does not want design. She just wants an estimation of the impacts. If it's about 200 feet, then that's what she wants to see. I think what the easiest. Like it really feels like a GIS. Yeah. It's a little bit of a GIS size. I think Lori, if we can agree to.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 23:44

Yes.

You.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 23:51

Just.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:57

So I flipped the screen, you know, so here's the here's the project match line at the top of Skate World. And you know, it just it doesn't even go down the 321 wide line over here at all. If I'm over here at Vista Overlook, which wiggles around down and comes in here,

And over here in Abbey Lane, you know, there's just a fairly straight cut and fill slope, and that's what the dashed lines are.

If I go and just clip these, you know, straight across here, straight across here, take some of this out.

And then there's this actual hook down here on Abbey Lane. We can just run straight across.

and take your Y lines out that way. And then I can count what's in those pieces.

and add it to all. Do you want to add it to all, or do you just want me to pull it out?

You want me to give you a fourth column with those numbers in it, and then the left, right, and best fit minus?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 25:00

Ohh, ohh.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 25:13

I guess, correct me, Lauren. Yeah, go ahead, Lauren.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 25:15

I, I...

Okay, I don't want anything subtracted.

I want things added to the left and right. And Marissa is 100% correct. It's an estimate. I want you to do any design work. If you just lay a GIS down and just

estimate. That's what I'm interested in. And for me, wetlands and streams are what I'm interested in. I, again,

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

Got it.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 25:44

just factor in what all the different environmental agencies, what their resources and factor any additional impacts from the GIS overlay, if there are any like historic properties or, yeah, that's what comes up. But it's easy. It should be relatively easy. It should be a GIS exercise. Marissa is exactly right. Thank you for translating.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 25:58

At.

We can definitely do that.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 26:07

Marissa.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 26:08

No problem, no problem. Here it out.

A lot of language all in English. Well, do you have anything to add? I was just going to say we actually had this very same discussion last month in a merger meeting for Division Four, one of their projects where there was a higher degree of design showing impact, more impacts for the best fit versus the north and south allotments there.

this is deja vu for me. Yeah, yeah. We're just getting, we're just getting so good at this. We're getting ahead of ourselves for doing too much before we show it to the agency. So we know you don't want us to do this. So yeah, I think to summarize for Lori, streams, wetlands, probably we'd like to see, go back to your table. Can I, can we look at that real quick? Does it show your residential?

It does, yeah, so just...

Again, very GIS level overview to adjust those numbers. I can adjust those numbers. And I'm going to get into something practical here. Do you want me to just update the packet and then give that packet to Hannah to

be posted and you all can comment on the package.
Is that where we're going? Lori, what's your preference?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 27:24

No, for me, no. You can just summarize it in the meeting minutes and you can even put the tables in the meeting minutes. We don't have to agree on it. It's just, you know, if we go through here and in fact, the best fit widening has the least impacts to, again, this is my concern, wetlands and streams.
or as close, you know, if other factors come in, like a lot of residents or something like that. As long as we go through these and there are no questions, then I'd say just put the updated numbers and the meeting minutes and I'm good.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:58

We can do that. That's readily, readily, easily enough. All right. To go through, to go through the maps and the other tables.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 28:03

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:10

This is this is the next section coming past Linville Creek Road, which has that conservation easement on Linville Creek. This is the left alignment.

Um...

This is the right alignment.

And then Mike, correct me if I'm wrong, we actually shifted a little further to the right to in hopes of getting off Rushy Fork Creek down here.

Correct. Down by Lonnie Henson Road. So this alignment, the best fit alignment has shifted even a little further to the right to get off Lonnie Henson Road. Let me point out to you where the Y lines are on this one, just so you have some idea of what we're talking about.

And.

Right up here.

At the top of the page, this little thumb that's sticking out. This is 194 This is a scenic overlook rd. It switches back. You can't see that for the trees, but this is a tie-in and you can see there's wetland and streams right along the side of this.

Road here.

If I come down over here, this is Foxtrot Lane, and again, there's a switchback here. There actually is a, excuse me, I've got to switch back backwards. The switchback is this way.

So, there's a fair amount of impacts there, and...

Ohh.

I'm not gonna, my computer is not behaving with me. My apologies. When you say switch back, you mean of a road or of the driveway? A driveway. It's more than a drive. It's Foxtrot Lane and there's a U-turn to switch back in the hillside here.

There's another rd down here that's off the edge of my screen.

So if we're looking at this one, again, 194 there's some wetland and stream impacts here that aren't shown in right and left.

The other numbers on this one tend to be fairly comparable to each other.

Even with Foxtrot Lane, the numbers are fairly consistent with residential properties.

Going on to Mac C.

Um...

And this is getting into the town of Vilas.

So where we started.

Do you want to go back to just to point out some of that strength? So if you look at go up to the right at the bottom where she was pointing out the brush sheet, you can see the purple area still hits the Greek, but the dash is about where the slope stakes would be. If you go up to the widen to the right, alternate.

Ohh, yeah.

The dash for the slope stakes actually go into the screen. It's because the screen's right, you know, off the shoulder. And so while that buffer hits it, the intent was to shift it to not put the slip space in the screen. So your right and left is hold the right edge or hold the left edge. And in this instance, best fit is not in between them. It's even further right. It's all the left edge. It's further right. Be clear that best fit is. Sometimes outside of your right or left. Right, and all I was trying to say about that is I think the buffer, just because of the level of design, still hits it, but the intent was intent to not. We get if we have to, but it's not impacted, but with the level of offsets and buffers.

It's so, isn't it, right?

Sorry, Marco. That's okay. No, that's perfect. That's the help I need. Make sure that

I'm hitting all the salient points.
Lori, is did that come through?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 32:35
Yes. Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 32:36

Okay. The other thing I want to point out here is starting near the match line that says BC and Lonnie Henson Road. This is where we consider the beginning of the town of Vilas, which is an unincorporated verb town community. So this is the western edge of

Vilas right here between Lonnie Henson and this match line. So when we talk about violas in the violas section.

We started right here near Lonnie Hudson Road.

When we go through these next three maps.

The best fit alignment defaulted to symmetrical because with all of the businesses and with the stream behind the houses, and this is a hillside over here to the south side of my, to the south side of the screen, we really struggled to try and figure out what the alignment was going to be. So starting at Lonnie Henson and going through the community to around the Dollar General store, about 1/2 a mile, and that's what we consider the town of Vilas. And that best fit on these maps is defaulted to symmetrical.

Um...

However, we've gotten some additional information, and I'm going to put Frank and Miranda on the spot to explain what's going on in the community of Vilas at the moment and where we are with the alternatives. Sure. So I'm going to put the spot on Miranda.

MS **Miranda Salzler** 34:17

No problem. No problem at all. So, you know, you don't have to back up the slideshow at all, Martha, but I did just want to give a little bit of context for what we've done at VHB with the preliminary modeling of Brushy Fork. So Brushy Fork is a FEMA detail study stream. And in this corridor, it

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 34:17

Okay.

Yeah.

MS **Miranda Salzler** 34:36

It encompasses almost the whole thing. It begins at the downstream end, the beginning of our study was at that first site that we were looking at, where the 321, 421 split is. So our process was to go ahead and do the best fit as a starting run of our entire model. And what we were finding is with this best

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 34:40

The.

MS **Miranda Salzler** 34:56

bit in the symmetrical alignment that we all of these buildings here, not all of them, excuse me, many of them are already in the floodplain. And we were seeing rises of half a foot or more in some cases of brushy fork base flood elevations. which immediately FEMA would never approve a clomer for something like that, unless these buildings were complete takes. So we did go back and we took a look at another option where we widened right, and that we were able to successfully eliminate all of the impacts actually throughout VILAS. We backed that widened right up to about around the area where VILAS begins, probably just off of this sheet here to maybe to the west of B a little bit. But yeah, we're down to 0 impacts with

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:40

Sweet.

MS **Miranda Salzler** 35:56

with this wide and right alternative and I and we do not see another way as it gets closer to brushy fork that we would have any feasible option towards FEMA compliance without having the right alignment.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:10

And a quick clarification, just for the people in the room. When she says impacts, she's talking water surface impacts for FEMA, not other impacts.

MS **Miranda Salzler** 36:21

Yeah, sorry, that's my silo. The base flood elevation at all these buildings are in the floodplain and they cannot have any adverse impacts to their the base flood elevation.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:35

So your conclusion, we kind of eliminated the left and the symmetrical as being viable through violence from a FEMA compliance standpoint.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 36:49

Yeah, and so this is Lori. This is Lori. That's the kind of thing, like I said, if you provide really detailed meeting minutes, I mean, if you want to revise the package, that's fine based on this. Or if you want to put it in the minutes, that's all fine with me unless DOT has some objection to doing it in the minutes. But just if you would just include really detailed alternatives,

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:49

So.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 37:10

I mean, reasons like that and explain it and say which section it applies to or sections, then stuff like that would be really helpful to have on the record.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:21

Yeah, thanks, Lori. I was just going to say the same thing, that that's really a good explanation of like avoidance immunization efforts that were done that we just need to have documented for her. Yeah, I think that that was just completed within the last month or so. So this is new information.

Like I said, we've been struggling with exactly what to do with this community for a long time, and I think we now have an answer. One, if this road goes forward, where the alignment has to go.

That's going to change this a little bit. Right now, the best fit alignment is...

It says 344 feet of stream impacts. This is symmetrical.

If we if we reorganize all of this and and if everybody's comfortable calling the best

fit alignment now the right alignment through five lists.
I can change these numbers.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 38:31

I'm not sure what you mean about changing.
How would the numbers change?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 38:35

So.
I mean, do you just leave the best fit and we just call the right class into the selected alternative for this community? We can do that, yeah, I think.
Yeah, as part of the meeting minutes, we can say that the everybody agreed that right is where we're going through through violas.
That'll work.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 38:58

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:01

We have no concerns. No, but at the moment.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 39:05

I will say something and I don't know. I'm trying to think of the technicalities here.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:07

I.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 39:12

The, okay, we can't say at this point if we were asked whether or not you could use RGP 31 for this, because that decision won't be made until the project has completed the merger process. But if you were heading that way,
It does, it does authorize best fit.
projects. So I don't know if this would create any kind of...
issue. It wouldn't for me and not just to give you a heads up, I'm not going to be here. I'm going to retire and I'm not going to be here when you guys do the lead

pub. And I just want to make sure there's no problems. If you called the right widening, right widening instead of the best fit alternative. Maybe I'm thinking about this too much. I'm not sure.

Um...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:03

I think, no, I'm with you, Lori, because basically the, if I'm understanding that the process here, you're right widening now is your best fit. So it's more just tower, right left symmetrical and we're going to pick right. Yeah, the right is going to be the best fit and the right is going to be the best fit. Yes.

We defaulted to symmetrical through the community for want of to showing something on the map, right? Because there.

Everything else was generally equal. We had nothing to hang a hang a decision point on, so it was it was symmetrical so that we could have a conversation point, right?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 40:41

This is, this is Amanetta with EPA. I would recommend that we just keep it the right, because if someone wants to look at this document in the future, it would be very, very confusing on how.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 40:43

Well, can you just call it?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:46

Ohh.

Yeah.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 40:55

We got to that alternative. Does that make sense?

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

I'll work with. Yeah, I think we should. Yeah, no, I agree with you. I'm not saying we should change the way it's worded here. I'm just saying we need to clearly document that based on that whole floodplain came out study stuff that the right ends up being the best.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 41:06

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 41:14

No, the selected. Can you rename the best fit symmetrical because we know it's not the best fit. The right is the best fit. So don't call the best fit. Right, you know what I mean? I understand that one map. I understand where everybody is going. Yeah, yeah. Mark and I, part of our job is to figure out language and...

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 41:26

Yeah.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 41:27

No, I agree.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 41:36

clarity, and we will work with Wes, Olivia, Mike, and y'all collective team to make sure that what we're presenting is clear to everybody and to get to Amanetta's point that we're not creating a confusing path. So definitely, I've got some work cut out for me, not a problem.

But yes, we can do that.

So, yes, wondering if I had it wrong all this time.

I'm having like, no, sure. Go ahead. I mean, my understanding, I may be about to make myself look really stupid. I don't know. My understanding the whole time was there's like a symmetrical option. There's a like a left and a right or south, whatever you want to call it.

And the best fit means you're giving yourself the ability to meander as needed. And it could be center line, it could be up, it could be down. That is, we all agree with that. That is correct. That is correct. The issue though is. I just heard many wonder if that's really true. So.

in the community of Vilas.

You can't really go one way or another to be best with the information we had at the beginning. So it was just as symmetrical to continue to develop the best fit, which we do not really know in full. We have now done our flood study and that has provided

a better choice. We are in the process of getting a well and septic study to see impacts to homes and communities, their communities and businesses, which will be an impact as well. And so we still, we've got a symmetrical option because we don't really know. I guess, so it's totally acceptable then for sometimes your best fit to also be.

The left or the right? Yes, OK. Yeah, but in violence, we don't really have a best, right? So, so what ended about? I mean, I think it it ended like it what?

When we were building it, we needed to connect the alignments just because of the CAD. So rather than doing a fourth cube file, we did, we just put the symmetric one in the middle one. So really could easily for section C be called left, right, symmetrical, and just delete that word.

Yeah, no, packet minutes.

So, I think that's where you ended the great point.

But I think also just to circle back to Lori's point, was she was referring to potential use of that specific permit that allows for best fit. So she just wants to make sure we are utilizing that term if we want that option in the future. Is that correct, Lori? So open to a meeting is your best.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 44:28

Yes, yes, to address Amanetta, I wonder if you could create.

And again, the meeting minutes or the revised packet, whatever you want to do, like amend this map or revise this map and call it.

You know, best fit.

or something like right alignment, parentheses, you know, now called best fit as of this meeting, and then do the same thing for the, you know what I mean? Explain that this is where it changed. Because the best fit is the best fit. It's like saying the preferred alternative, you're really gonna go with alternative A, which isn't the preferred alternative, but now it is, but you're not gonna call it that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:59

S.

Yeah.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 45:16

You need to call it what it is, and this meeting changes it.

So I understand about not being confused. I don't know, Amna, if this would address your point of explaining that it's changed in this meeting, what the best fit is.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:21
School.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 45:29
As long as it's, as long as it's documented, so if we all left tomorrow, whoever picks up the project understands what's going on. It makes it, I just think that's the more prudent approach because we've all jumped in on projects where we spend a lot of time.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 45:36
Sure.
Sure.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 45:45
Refiguring out what was.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:45
Sure.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 45:47
It.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:47
No.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 45:48
Agreed upon previously.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 45:49
Yeah, with the left date that was shared at the beginning of this meeting, that's my fear of calling you the best fit. Like if you call it symmetrical and then the results of

this meeting are the right is the best fit, then it's documented which of the three we want people to use going forward.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 45:54

Yeah, yeah.

Well, then, whatever is what...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:08

Yes, and and this and this in this location. Lori, I'm with you. I'm right with you retiring, so it's not gonna be you for me. So somebody's got to be clear. Go ahead, Lori.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 46:12

What?

Well, what out here?

Here, here's.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 46:19

Sadly, Almanetta can't retire for a very long time, so I would not like to inherit the confusion in the future, please.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 46:23

It.

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:26

Yeah.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 46:27

The endpoint is just if someone looks at this and they look at the best fit, it's actually one that's chosen. Again, just like the preferred alternative or the proposed action, it is what it is. If it changes, then you call the new thing that. You don't call something best fit and then not choose that part.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:34

S.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 46:45

At least that's the way I've understood this for I don't know how many years. So I would say document it and change it. You know, make the changes and document why it was changed.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:49

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Yeah, I, I, yeah.

We'll work on being very clear in the meeting minutes. Mark and I will work on wordsmithing. Y'all can review and make sure that everybody is comfortable with what we wrote. And then we'll call it the new best fit.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 47:12

Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 47:16

Yeah.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 47:17

Okay, yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 47:19

All right. No worries. So just to say where the community of violence generally ended, and you can see the FEMA floodplain ends right here on the on the CD line. We generally consider the community of violence to end right here.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 47:19

Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 47:38

on the Dollar General.

And then, Lori, to get to another one of your questions.

And one of the one of the issues with this project.

Um...

This nice blue purple BLOB is a historic property. The boundary of the property is the top side of the back of the ditch on the north side of the highway. Right now it looks like we're hitting it with all the alternatives. And that's just

because this is an order process and we haven't, you know, sat down with the SHPO and everybody else to really figure out, you know, what the best way to minimize impacts on this property is. The structure is up here in the woods. You can see one, but it actually

The house is up here in these trees. It's an old farmhouse. The biggest concern right in this vicinity, obviously you can see the creek is on the other side of the road.

There's another church right here. This church gets an awful lot of parishioners on Sunday service. So as part of the process, the division has asked us to look at converting this to a full RCI corridor. So one of the things that we have to consider with all of this is where to put a U-turn hole.

Oh.

So...

We know that this location is problematic.

If we want to, I don't know what we want to discuss about this at the moment.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 49:26

Would you pull up the table again, please, for this section?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 49:29

For this section, and and my.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 49:31

The the impact table. Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 49:33

And while you're doing that, I believe Renee may have joined us, like she wasn't on during introductions, but are you on the call now, Rena?

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 49:44
Someone call? Yes, OK.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 49:44
Maybe I promise. OK, Renee. Thank you. I thought you joined. OK.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 49:52
Okay, for the core, I don't have any comments. This is 1 I didn't have any comments on. So.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 49:57
Okay.
Um...
So, Renee, I'm not sure how familiar you are with this project or where we're going with this, but that big dark purple BLOB is the historic boundary.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 50:15
Right, I understand, I understand it, yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 50:17
Yeah.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 50:21
But the house is set to the back. I think the thing that would be important would be what is it that is within your corridor, but, you know, depending on what needs to happen, I see the stream there. So
Um...
Depending on what needs to happen, I think that you could possibly get to a condition of no adverse effect for this one, given all the other things that are going on.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 50:55
Okay.
OK, do we have a street view? Do you make sense?

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 51:04

And.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 51:06

Do you want me to find it? I suspect I can.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 51:09

No, that's okay. It's perfectly okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 51:11

Okay.

Thanks for that.

I will tell you, having driven in this corridor quite a bit, the house is uphill from the road. Obviously, in this particular section, you can see all the streams are flowing what is effectively S at the moment. So there is a, you can see the stream.

here. So if you're on this roadway, the church that's over here is about 15 feet below grade.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 51:52

Mm.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 51:53

And then when you get over here and you're looking this way, you're looking up a cut slope.

just to give you some some.

sense of where all this is.

Okay.

But move on to the next map.

And you can see this one goes down.

clear lane and you have a fair amount of white line impacts coming up this direction.

Sorry, my brain is still processing that. So you mentioned that the ball out. Was that in your impact? It is not.

The division had asked us to include the turn bulbs, and we've got some preliminary.

We would prefer it in this general vicinity. We would prefer another one in this

general vicinity. They want them approximately one mile apart. We were going to go with curb and gutter.

in Vilas. So we put one on either end of Vilas. So one near Lonnie Hudson, one near the Dollar General. They wanted to put one, a couple here near the church. And then I think they were asking for roughly 7 total.

That's it. I didn't notice the bulb out on there, so no, it's not on these. They have not been other than the ones at by on either end of ILIS that were just sort of preliminary stuck on there, so that we could.

There wasn't really an obvious place other than violence, and so division really wanted to hear from the public where they felt the U-turns would be most useful to them. So, I guess you're thinking of the church having maybe 100 people or something going in and out at the same time, that's a good spot.

Or, and I'll take that one into some of their thoughts with her.

I'll say if you know that one, just curious. Yeah, no, it's definitely a stay tuned because between the historic property, the stream, and the church that is below grade, which if anybody wanted to know, this is the church that we had the public meeting at last time, this is Brushy Fork Creek Baptist Church.

And so I don't know how many people came to the public meeting last time, but that's that is the church that we have the public meeting at.

So Lori, this is section, this is Map 8. Did you have anything you wanted to talk about on Map 8 specifically?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 55:06

Just the same issues as with all the other ones, except for the one shown on map 7 where I didn't have any comments. Basically, it wasn't clear why the left widening wasn't chosen as the best fit. But I assume do Y line impacts make a difference to where the left and right actually would have more impacts than the best fit?

I mean, no, I'm sorry, the...

Let me see here.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:32

Spectrum.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 55:34

Let's see. Okay, it wasn't clear why the left widening isn't the best fit, wasn't chosen

as the best fit. So

with the Y line impacts that you haven't added in to the right or the best, would those then have more impacts to waters?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:57

I don't have the specifics on this map. I do know that this is one of the other churches that we were trying to avoid here on John Mountain Road, John's Mountain Road. And as you shift more towards the south, you get closer to the creek. And here we are down here on Greer Lane.

Real close to brushy fork again.

But I will, we'll cut these wide lines out and add those impacts and say that we're talking apples and apples.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 56:27

No.

Yeah, you're going to add all the wireline impacts for all the all. OK. OK, thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:33

Yes, ma'am.

And then this is the this is the last map and I'm going to point this one out to you just just to show you the impacts of the Y lines. So this is left. This is right.

And then...

This is the best fit alignment with the Y lines attached. If you add the impacts with the 40 foot buffer on both sides of the cut and fill slopes on SR 1107 going into town on 321 and up Bristol, Old Bristol Road, which Old Bristol Road wraps up around and it comes down and it parallels

the highway down here. There's 13 houses on those three pieces of Y line that are in my quantities.

So there's a huge, particularly on this one, there's a huge bump in how many residential properties I'm potentially hitting. But if I take 13 and add it to 22, all of a sudden I'm up at 35.

So this is the impact of white lines.

So, we'll get those numbers.

Okay, this is the summary table. Again, I just put it back on here again. There's 900 feet less, even with the Y lines of stream impacts.

under the best fit of winding alignment. Now, we're going to shift that a little bit as we go through by listen, so that that number may change. So just to reiterate, Martha, you said.

As all the other tables, the only ones that are including the Y line quantities is still the best values. OK, yeah, yeah.

Per.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 58:35

So it's not going to change. So even when you add the Y line impacts to the left and the right, the best fit is still going to have the least amount of impacts to streams and wetlands, correct? Or well, except for the wetland, the.03 acre, yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:36

See.

Oh.

Yeah.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 58:51

Okay. Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:53

No worries. We'll fix those up. We'll get meeting minutes out that makes all of that real clear. So.

That's my portion of this meeting and my conversation. I'm going to turn this over to Frank and Miranda and let them walk you through where they are with the hydraulic structures. And you let me know what you want me to do. Can I just say one more thing? When it comes to adding all that stuff back into those tables,

It doesn't have to be like, well, you can just select the to 10 feet, like it doesn't have to be you to, you know, like it doesn't have to be a super accurate. You're talking to engineers here. What Lori's asking for, come on. Heather and Frank got on me and I actually wrote it.

I I rounded up from three decimal places on some of the quantities to just two two hundreds. That was the way that was the way my GIS technician gave them to me and said I put them on the table that way. I said what I said. Do we want do we want tenths?

Do we want hundreds? Is there a preference? Did you say 10s or 10s? I know what you said. Yes. No, I was saying it doesn't it to the nearest 10 feet. Like it doesn't have to. It'll get more like we're trying to show also along the way of minimization and reduction in quantities that like.

You don't need to be down to the decibels and then for this exercise that you're going to do to make the apples to apples comparison. I think you just, my character brain just blew up. Lauren, you disagree? That's how we want all designs. Why do it with the?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:00:40

Did you ask me something?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:42

I was just telling them for adding the. I was just saying that for the exercise of adding the impacts back in, it doesn't have to be to less, like it doesn't have to be down to the decimals.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:00:58

Yeah, correct.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:00:58

Mike, Mike, Mike said, "Close enough," for sure. I mean, yeah, we want it, well, yeah, every time we go, yeah.

Yeah, for sure, and yeah, just that I was on.

Okay. Okay. Let's talk about the structures. You can go to the next slide. Just for everybody who had not been involved maybe for this entire project, I believe 2019, we did the hydraulic preliminary report. And at that time, we used a study area, of course, that

was pretty large. So we had a number, I think it was like 15, 17, 15, I believe, sites that potentially could be major structures. So, but once we developed, Mike developed alignments and got things tighter, we started looking at left, right, best fit.

symmetrical and all that. We have got it narrowed down to three structures that are particular, would be considered major structures based on 30 square foot of area.

And they would be site number one, site 2,

In site 7.

And I'm going to go through those three sites.

Does that make sense? Everybody, what about that? Two, three, and seven? One, two, and seven. That was so plus. Okay. I rounded up to the 10th. All right, plus 7 is 10. Okay. Site one, it's existing 6 by 5, so it meets the criteria of a major structure being 30 square feet.

Is George Branch is right on the wire line that Martha was talking about at, I guess, 421. Yeah, it's at 350 feet, roughly 350 feet west of the junction. There you go. There you go. I can see it. So this is considered a major structure.

Hydraulically, we're recommending a 6 by 7, replacing it and getting your burial in there. Next slide. This is a drainage area of .3 square miles, and it doesn't rise to a bridge size structure. So we're recommending another box cord.

Move it on site two.

Slide 2 is Brushy Fork. This one is at the furthest downstream, if you will, at the beginning of the project, but furthest downstream part of Brushy Fork. Five square miles, pretty good size area. Existing, you can see it's 3 at 8 by 9.

We discussed this with division about the constructability of putting a bridge here, replacing that culvert with a bridge and they are not in favor of it. They're worried about destructability and brought up the long term maintenance of bridges also. So right now we're hydraulically we're proposing 3 at 8 by 13 bear to foot.

And keep it in the boxed over.

That's another picture of it.

Is David home? Is Henry home? Henry was on, yes. David, anytime, please. If you want to see some other photos, let us know.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:04:26

Appreciate it. Yeah, I figured you had photos.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:04:29

Right, yeah.

But yeah, this is the only one that could rise to a bridge that structure, but constructability is a problem. Driveways around the church, driveways for residents, and in right where we're considering a roundabout, it's going to be problematic to get that built. So

We're recommending they replace it with another box cover.

Site 7? Site 7, the last site.

is also brushing forward, which is right at that connection or boundary when you're coming into Vilas from the east is where Martha pointed out that the creek was crossing. This has a very low feel.

Um...

and raising a field to try to get a bridge size structure in there, which is blow up the FEMA modeling because it's just a dam across the creek. So we want to maintain as much as possible the existing runway grade as close as possible and replace this structure with two and 12 by 6 by sculler.

This is the one, David, you pointed out the...

The outlet scoured away, so...

I believe in the hydraulic report, we had a smaller structure called for, but once we got into the FEMA modeling, a little bit more due diligence, we increased the size of this boxcaller.

So those are really the only three major structures that rise to the size of possible bridging.

In site 7, it's just impossible to get a bridge in there because of the topography and and

the low grade on the existing terrain.

This is just a chart showing the comparison. I think I've said all these words already.

Do you want to talk about this bullet down here, 0.6 with the extra?

300 feet of strength. Yeah, so if. And I can pull up one of the aerial maps, sorry. On site 7, because of the width of the footprint of the alignment going in with the typical going in, the proposed, if you just drew a line from proposed slip stake at the creek on each side, it would be a very long culvert.

So, in final design, we're going to suggest that we...

get into some stream relocation and some maybe some on-site mitigation if possible, but at least some relocation to shorten up the culvert itself and have more open channel.

It does look on one of the pictures that like the stream is running into the road bed and tried to alleviate it with some Indian baskets. Yes. Which it was a big red flag in my mind whenever I see those. It's been eaten away at the banks.

I bet it has.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:07:56

What, this is Lori, what kind of on-site mitigation are you talking about?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:07:56

But.

I messed up that. Yeah, it may, you know, we can probably talk about that further down the road, but what I'm really suggesting is doing some stream relocation to shorten up that box culvert so it's not so much culvert. I mean, we're talking 700 feet. If you went from such thick line to such thick line.

Instead, if you, if we can get some additional 300 foot or so of stream relocated, we can shorten that box cover up.

Whether it comes to medication or not.

That's gonna be, do you have a better, probably not for credit here, like an awesome impact reduction, yeah, impact reduction, that's a better word. OK, here, it's a reduction of sediment in the long run, yeah, this a map.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:08:48

Just.

Yeah, something to something to keep in mind when you're talking online, if you're talking compensatory mitigation for stream impacts, something to keep in mind is is you it it doesn't sound like there's a great opportunity for it, but I don't have a lot of details. Just don't just don't get bogged down in that 'cause.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:08:58

Alright.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:09:12

because depending upon what you propose or propose it early, because it'll slow down project review on our end. And also, so that factor in how important it is, how much you're talking uplift you might

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:23

Ohh yeah, yes.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:09:31

achieve, but also, you know, if it's just it never seems to be a good deal when we do

on-site compensatory mitigation right near a road or right near something that's going to be changed in the near future or I don't know, just keep that in mind.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:09:45

Mhm.

So, this is this is the best image that I have that would show where you can see the gap here where the current culvert is. But you can see if you go from slow state line to slow state line, how long that is. Yeah. Not the existing, but proposed.

Yeah, this is this is best fit, but yeah. So, you're just talking about pulling it out. Yeah, somebody either on the inlet or outlet doing some relocation to shorten up the covered part of the stream.

A street.

See, and you can see coming out of this where.

The street, the stream is right next to the slow stakes.

So does anybody have any comments on?

On.

Frank's proposals in terms of going forward, but Dave has his PM raised hand. OK.

Date.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:10:54

Yeah, thanks, Martha.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:10:56

So.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:10:59

Actually, I stopped by her last Friday, too. I was actually in the area. I wasn't planning on it, but got to look around, so...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:07

Were you fishing?

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:11:09

Not quite. I had to talk to stream a little bit. I've actually found one rainbow trout in that stream.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:11

But.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:11:16

That was it. It's pretty rough, but there's lots of fish in there, though. Sal matters.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:16

Thanks.

Okay.

Nice, nice.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:11:25

Up.

What I was going to say is that...

Yeah, site two, it looks like it's functioning pretty good, other than the outlet's been dug out pretty severely. I guess it cleaned up after a flood, but...

Wes, thanks for calling me. Wesley, sorry if it's Wes or Wesley Carter.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:47

Go ahead.

Yes, sir.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:11:51

Yeah, thanks for calling me. I understand that from our conversation that, you know, if these are box covers going forward, there's still some tweaks in terms of design that, you know, like seals, baffles, benching, that sort of thing. Is that still the case?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:12:08

Yeah. Yes, sir. Absolutely. Sorry.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:12:10

Okay, cool.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:12:12
Lots of head nod. Teamwork.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:12:15
Yeah, um, site 7, yeah, that's...
As far as the channel relocation, I think it kind of needs to be messed with a lot on the downstream, and for sure it grade, so...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:12:19
Go.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:12:28
you know, even with a new box cover, you're going to have to do something that help tie in the grade. I hope it wouldn't be a complete class 2 line ditch, but I'm sure you have to use a lot of rock to stabilize the...

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:12:34
Mhm.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:12:43
transition from the box covert to a channel, but yeah, I'd like to see some work down on that outlet, try and get some.
Fish passage through there, if we can, you know, in accordance with the hydro guidelines.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:13:01
Yep.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:13:05
That's all I wanted to say. I don't.
Anything, anything else?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:13:12
Thank you. Thanks.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:13:12

Oh, sorry, one more question. Sorry, my brain ain't working too good as normal.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:13:14

Yeah, yeah.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:13:20

So you talked to division, so they want to go ahead and replace all these for sure.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:13:26

Yes, so far, yes, and hydraulically they need to be.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:13:28

Okay, so yeah.

Okay, gotcha, yeah, there.

Then they got to be like 50 year, I guess, or something like that for.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:13:38

Yeah, there'll be a correct. There'll be a 50 year design. We have to get FEMA compliance from the detailed study part, but also we got to be concerned about backwater on the upstream of the FEMA study. So especially this one here, I'm sorry, pointing at my computer, especially site 7.

being just downstream of the church and the U-turn bulb and where that's going, we're going to have to study that and make sure we're not adversely affecting that church. But that to me is getting into the final details.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:14:16

Yeah, something tells me, looking at aerials at site 7, I mean, it was, it's been scouring, that's not just a lane thing, it's been doing that for a while.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:14:17

Two.

No doubt it. I got pictures from 2019. It's definitely big time scour there. It's undersized.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:14:31

Oh, sure, yeah. Sure enough. And that is kind of what you just said a minute ago reminds me, I mean, like I said,

Please consider, you know.

One thing we like to even notice is getting to be, it's rural, but it's pretty much gonna be urban before we blank all through there, but...

We do like you whenever possible, try and get at least one of the cells if you can, keep it dry. I know actually right now at 7, the outside box is dry. It was Friday anyways, there's so very little water out there. And it's like to, you know,

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:00

I.

Bye.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:15:12

Outside of the triple, the left side looking down is dry right now, too, if you can.

Look at trying to keep that situation with, you know.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:23

Hello?

Right, understood, yep.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:15:25

Mm.

Anyways, I don't belabor that stuff, but anyways, I appreciate it. Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:32

Hey, Dave, this is Marissa. I don't remember seeing your comments specifically. Did you guide them to the guidance document?

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:15:41

Ahh.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:42

Bye.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:15:43

Think I referenced it, but I'm not sure.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:15:45

Okay, cool. I just want to make sure that y'all know we have a wildlife guidance document. Oh, yeah. Bye-bye.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:15:51

Hey, is is is the cover replacement gonna correct the scour? Is it gonna be in the in? Or how do you plan on correcting the scour?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:00

But...

But that is the intention. The intention is to create an opening that doesn't increase the velocity so much that the native material doesn't move.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:16:14

I, but I mean, do you need to fill in the scour hole or or what?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:15

It was like.

Well, that's all gonna be covered up anyway with the new new road.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:16:20

That's okay. That's what I wondered. Okay. All right. Thanks.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:16:22

Let's go.

On site 2 the triple barrel, you said it was a lot of constructability issues that the visual I was brought up on. My bridge was not a good idea. I didn't see those mentioned in the documents, but I'd like those like report and so that we're saying,

hey, we.

We need to agree here. We got the culvert thing. Yeah, yeah.

Frank and I will get together. We'll add that information, yeah, for your request to the to the meeting minutes.

That's where, but no worries.

That is appropriate, nice. Sure, sure, just as long as we can put it in the file, that's why I ask.

OK, that gets us to sort of the list of avoidance and minimization. This is based on.

Oh, I think you put his hand down. I think it in teams now you have to put your hand up. Okay. So where we were with the best fit alternative coming into this meeting, we were trying to minimize impacts to the churches, businesses, residences, wetlands and streams.

We'll update those data tables so that those minimization efforts are more clear. We want to avoid adverse impacts to the FEMA floodplain. We'll add that discussion and revise the description of the best fit alternative through the community of Ilis.

to now be the right alternative for avoiding floodplain impacts.

We also are very aware that there's a conservation easement on Linville Creek going up Linville Creek Road. So we're not going to go anywhere north of the Sky Drive Bridge, which is the south side of that conservation easement. And we know that we're going to look at and continue discussions.

to minimize impacts, hopefully to avoid them and get SHPO concurrence with the with the green historic property.

So, um...

heard going forward and what needs to be done is we need to have a fairly good meeting minutes with us. That's very descriptive. Do estimates on what the wide lines are and add those quantities to the other two alternatives.

so that we're looking at apples and apples. Frank is going to talk to me and work me through, make sure that I have captured all of the constructability issues with site 2.

What else? What am I missing?

Just everything that I thought. Okay. I heard. And so then going forward from here for the team, the next steps on our schedule is we know that we need a public meeting for the merger process that's currently scheduled for mid.

December 2026. We're working on that now, trying to work with the public involvement group.

to make sure that we can find a different location. As opposed to Brushy Fork Creek, we've tentatively scheduled the CP3 meeting, the lead pup, after the public meeting so that we have a minimum of a 30 day comment period. That's tentatively scheduled for January 2027.

And so I guess my question today is, can we sign the concurrence form for 2A? I see nods. Yes. I got one nod. OK.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:20:38

Yeah, the coral sign it. The coral sign.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:20:45

This is Aminetta. I have a quick question. Are we going to get the revised information before we sign it or?

What's the timing for that?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:20:55

Um, that that's your comfort level, the the.

We can we can do the revised information and then send out for signatures, or we can send out for signatures.

Your preference.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:21:10

You, you can you put something, let me to address this. I wonder, could you put something on the concurrence form that basically says.

The numbers are being revised to reflect why lines on the blank and blank alternatives, and if...

If it shows that the best fit.

Uh, here's what I'm trying to get to: if it shows that the best fit.

is, oh, Marissa, I need help. Basic, basically.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:21:47

I'm sorry. What if we just get the numbers and then sign? That's what I was just going to. Yeah. Is that just easier? It doesn't feel like we're in a race here. So that feels cleaner. I think it'd be more clean to get the numbers inside. Yeah, that shouldn't take that long then.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:21:53
Okay, you can do that.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:21:53
Yeah.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:21:59
Okay.
Okay, I just wasn't sure. Okay, good.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:06
Yeah, we can two weeks, and then that removes any, you know, small chance that you may have changed opinions based on those numbers. So, sure. When are you retiring, Lori?

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:22:19
October 31st.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:21
Okay, we got time. I do appreciate you. I do appreciate you trying to come up with language so you could sign sooner, but I agree with Seth. I think it's just cleaner if we just get the updated tables. It sounds like it would make Amanetta more comfortable too and just have the updated tables, send it out with the concurrence and the minutes.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:22:34
Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:40
That, that, that perfectly, that's perfectly doable, not a problem.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:22:42
Make a deal.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:22:50

Thank you. We're done. I'm done. Does anybody else have anything else that needs to be discussed? Yes. So we don't need to respond. And we do not need to think about that. Go ahead, Laura.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:23:02

Hey.

This is, can I say something, this, I appreciate the hour we spent going over that and I apologize to any emerging team members who weren't, who that wasn't the focus of their interest, but thank you for listening and hanging on. It was important for us. So thanks.

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

No problem, Lori. Thank you for your input. Thank you very much. That's really good use of time. I will just say real quickly, Holland, you've been on the meeting, but you haven't said anything. Do you have anything you want to say regarding species? Without.

YJ **Youngman, Holland J** 1:23:36

Nope. It sounds like that's something like habitat's going to be looked at in the future. So I just have more interest in, you know, any suitable habitat present for listed proposed species. But at this point, no questions. Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:23:49

Alright, yeah, of course. Thank you.

Mr. Daniel, Division Mr. Daniel, do you have anything to add?

I give it a shot. Thank you, sir. Gotta get him to say something.

AR **Adams, Daniel R** 1:24:01

No, I don't have anything.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:24:09

Well, thank you everyone for joining us today.

Thank you, thank you. Talking to you soon.

YJ **Youngman, Holland J** 1:24:13
Thank you.

LB **Lori Beckwith** 1:24:16
Thanks.

MG **McHenry, David G** 1:24:18
Thank you.

TH **Trent Huffman** 1:24:18
Thanks.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription