R-2822B - Informational Project Update Meeting-20261119_100023-Meeting Recording

November 19, 2026, 3:00PM

53m 29s

Headrick, Hannah S started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:12

Again, good morning everybody. We're here for the R28-22B informational project update meeting. We'll go through and do the introduction. Shouldn't take long here. Hannah Hedrick with the Environmental Policy Unit.

This is Scott Jones with the US Army Corps of Engineers, Word of Transportation Branch. Good morning.

Amy.

YS **Yang, Shiping** 0:49

Is with geo type?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:55

I need.

AA **Annino, Amy** 0:56

Good morning, everyone. This is Amy Nino with Division of Water Resources.

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

Lupish.

BJ **Bhupesh Joshi** 1:05

Hey, this is Bhupesh Joshi, STV Roadway Design.

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

Thank you, Jared.

BM **Bond (RS&H), Jared M** 1:14

Jared Bond, Division Fourteen, Project Development.

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

BJ **Breedlove, Patrick J** 1:20
A Division Fourteen Padilla Engineer.

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

CT **Cao, Luan T** 1:25
Lungow State Historic Preservation Office.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:28
K.

DB **Day, Jake B** 1:33
Jake Day, NCDOT, right of way.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:37
Shane Clark.

CC **Clark, Shane C** 1:40
NCDOT geotech unit.

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

CH **Clements, Hannah** 1:45
Hey, this is Hannah Clements with Stantec.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:48
Allison.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 1:51
Good morning, this is Allison Connor with the US Forest Service.

Headrick, Hannah S 1:56
Marissa.

Cox, Marissa R 1:59
Hey, good morning, Marissa Cox, Environmental Policy Unit.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:03
Crystal.

Crystal Amschler 2:06
Good morning, this is Crystal Amstler with the Corps of Engineers.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:10
Mark.

Endries, Mark 2:13
Mark Andres, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:16
Eric.

Eric Leonhart 2:18
Eric Leinhard, STV Hydraulics.

Headrick, Hannah S 2:19
Okay.
Very thought.

Furr, Mary P. 2:24
Mary Popper, NCDOT, Historic Architecture.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:28
Daniel.
Daniel Gallard.

GP **Gallo, Daniel P** 2:36
Not me, Daniel Gallow went to dot Geotech.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:39
Alright, thank you, Chris Glover.

GC **Glover, Chris** 2:43
Chris Glover, Brookfield Renewable Land You Specialist.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:47
John Terron.

HE **Herrin (RK & K Civil Engineering), John E** 2:50
Constructability Division 14.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:53
Thank you, John Jameson.

JJ **Jamison, John** 2:59
Hey, good morning, Jon Jameson, Environmental Policy Unit.

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

JS **Joy Saddler** 3:05
Good morning, STV Hydraulics.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:08
Bob.

Lepsic (GFT Inc.), Robert S 3:12
Division 14, Padilla.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:15
Thank you, Dave.

McHenry, David G 3:18
Dave McHenry, North Carolina Wildlife Commission, Western dot coordinator.
Thanks.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:25
Yes, sir. Eric.

Seiler, Erik P 3:29
Yep, Eric Seiler, dot Hydraulics.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:33
A banana.

Somerville, Amanetta 3:35
I'm Aneta Somerville with EPA Region 4.

Headrick, Hannah S 3:39
Trevor.
Trevor Reeves.
Um, Brian White.

White, Ryan 4:04
Here.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:05
Thank you. Robert Wilcox.

Willcox, Robert P 4:09
Robert Wilcox, Division Fourteen, Utilities.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:13
Uh, Shopping.

Yang, Shiping 4:17
Yeah, with the geotech unit.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:22
Holland.

Youngman, Holland J 4:24
Good morning, Holland Youngman with Fish and Wildlife Service in Asheville.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:29
Uh, Wesley.

Grindstaff, Wesley T 4:33
Good morning, this is Wesley Jamison, Project Development Engineer, along with Wesley Grindstaff, Division Engineer Chris Lee, Deputy Division Engineer and Jeanette White, Project Team Leader.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:43
Thank you. All right. I think that's everyone online. Did anyone join late to the meeting?

Russell, Jesse A 4:54
I did Andy Russell, District Engineer, NCBOT, and Andrew.

Headrick, Hannah S 4:59
Thank you.

Asher B. Blackmore, P.G. 5:00
Yeah, I did as well. Ashley Blackmore with ECS Geotechnical.

Headrick, Hannah S 5:05
Okay, I'll turn it over to the consultants now.

Clements, Hannah 5:14
Hey, good morning. Ryan is on his phone just calling in. So I'm going to present the presentation that we have. But Jared and Patrick, I don't know if you want to go through the whole presentation or if you just kind of want to hit highlights.
But just kind of let me know what would be best for this group.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 5:47
Good morning, Hannah. Yeah, I don't think we necessarily need to go. We, you know, we went through the presentation last time. I think everyone, with the exception of US Forest Service, is up to date. I think Allison, your folks were on fire duty during our last major. So I think we just want to kind of touch on the high points.

White, Ryan 6:00
Oh.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 6:06
as they pertain to the Forest Service, make sure there's nothing, you know, we need the any
Issues or concerns we need to identify as we kind of try then to get into CP4A.
So I think the main thing we want to bring up.
From a US Forest Service.
perspective would be our wall. So I think if you could go to...
keep going down to six, that one right there. And Allison, I do believe your folks are aware of this. Our, you know, as this project has progressed, particularly with the geotech,

Clements, Hannah 6:48
Thank you.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 7:00
As the geotech has progressed under design, the walls have increased. I think, you know, at the beginning of this project, we were thinking we're going to have a lot of 1 1/2, a lot of 1 to 1 rock slope walls.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 7:13
Mhm.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 7:14
That has not been the case. You know, I think we're up to a significant portion of the project. And I know we've had the aesthetics and we'll match those aesthetics. I think we had a meeting a little while ago, but so I don't know if there's any concerns that you have. I think, you know, I think the main
portion of the wall as it pertains really to our wall discussion is going to be those walls in the snowbird picnic area. I think originally part of our section 106 commitments was going to be no walls in that kind of view shed to kind of preserve the pristineness of the picnic area.
That's really not going to be feasible just because the soil is just not going to support anything above a two to one. And then as we know, there's existing slopes out there. This is a mountainous area, greater than two to one in some cases. So we're just chasing those, you know, particularly in that area, we would just be
chasing that slope to the other side of the mountain and clear cutting, you know, basically a large portion of that. So I do believe it might not be in this presentation. I do have a visual. I think we did prepare a while ago.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 8:25
Right.
K.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 8:37
Or I previously had done, I don't believe it's in this.
presentation, Hannah, showing that wall from the picnic area. So

Headrick, Hannah S 8:42

Two.
It's twenty-three, it's not twenty-three.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 8:48
Okay, thank you.

Clements, Hannah 8:50
Yeah, there it is.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 8:51
Oh yeah, it is okay, we did touch on it. So it is kind of small, but you know, we're trying to reduce the height of that wall as much as possible.

Clements, Hannah 8:52
Yeah.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 9:01
Just so it is and just a big, you know, rock facade, but...
And then this area, we are kind of showing, yeah, that slide I believe is showing kind of the existing gravel, which I think part of our reopening section 106 was to go back and pave that area. So I don't know, Allison, if there's anything.
I guess with the walls, with the lengths, with the aesthetics, you know, if there's any information that you would require for us to kind of, you know, just to make sure that...
We're not throwing yet, you know, any surprises here once when when we get in the 4B and 4C with the drainage and permitting.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 9:38
Yeah.
No, I think that the aesthetic treatment that we've already talked about, you know, matching the A9, like that's going to be our best way to handle that to make it look, you know, somewhat of a natural look. It does here look like there's a little bit of that two to one slope.
And then the rock wall, is that kind of a new change because originally it would have

been a whole just slope all the way up. And so is this kind of the middle ground essentially?

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 10:17
Yeah, I'll have to go back and look at the, and we may need to do a, I may need to get the visualization updated. I think this is a very tricky area because we're coming right at the IU gap. And so

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 10:27
Yeah.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 10:31
to get all those slopes and to get that wall, I believe they were, you know, yeah, we're really, yes, running that.
You know, in an effort to reduce the cost of the walls, you are correct. Yeah, it's putting a two-to-one slope and then...
kind of where it makes sense from a cost perspective than to put a wall. So I don't know if you have any preference if you if you would just rather see a taller wall and preserve and have more of the, you know, forest and the trees behind the wall or if you kind of like what that is. And then also it might just be a
constructability. These are just how these walls need to be, but we'd certainly look at anything you'd like.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 11:11
Yeah.
Yeah, I sort of imagine like a be situation dependent or location dependent. I don't mind that. I would love to show this to the ranger. So when you do have updated visualizations, that would definitely be helpful so that I can explain as well as like maybe a number or.
I guess a length slash amount of retaining walls that we're expecting with this treatment, I would say, like if there is a two to one slope and a wall, but then also what locations would need just a straight wall just because of the soil.
I mean, we're of course gonna...
give dot deference as far as like what needs to be there. I think we would prefer less wall and probably this kind of mixture where you have a bit of a slope, a bit of a wall

and trees as opposed to just a straight up wall and the trees being, you know, almost not probably not visible where you're actually down on the road.
But again, I do want to connect with the Rangers. So any visuals, once you have those, I can give that confirmation 100%. But I personally feel pretty good about just this visual right here. I think that's pretty nice.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 12:36
OK, and that is, and that is representative of what our design still shows, and this is kind of situational dependent, you know, I think where that 2 1/2 to one, or I'm sorry, that two to one slope goes up to the wall, just because we kind of are, it's kind of curling around getting into IU gap, otherwise we'd have.
Kind of like a 90 degree angle with two of the, you know, with two walls, you know, because we're right at the bridge, right? There's just a confluence of a lot of topography changes to kind of, you know, show that. And so, yeah, so what I'll do is, yeah, we'll provide a set of plans. I'll highlight those walls. We'll have

Clements, Hannah 13:02
Yeah.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 13:09
Sure.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 13:16
You know, try to...
you know, have, yeah, I can give you a linear foot, a square footage. It is a lot, I think, and then kind of as that is, you know, relates to the whole project. We're just, yeah. Obviously, we would, from a cost perspective, would have liked to have had zero walls in this project, but it's just this for being a mountain, there's just not a lot of rock.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 13:39
Yeah.
Right.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 13:45

Out there.
Um...

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 13:48
That's probably surprising, I'm sure, to everyone.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 13:51
Yes.

Clements, Hannah 13:52
The.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 13:52
Like, what happened here?
But yeah, no, I think that's actually, it almost kind of feels like a great middle ground as opposed to like just big slopes or just big walls. I think it's actually a nice variation.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 14:11
Okay, and Patrick, was there anything you needed you wanted to discuss? We'll try to run through these, you know, as quick as possible in the...
An effort to save people's time.

Breedlove, Patrick J 14:25
Yeah, not on not on IU Gap. You know, we'll just when we go through the effects again, we'll just make those commitments or update those commitments for the picnic site and then as well as the Chicolilly Cemetery. And then there's no changes on the one archaeological site.
Um, but yeah, no, nothing to add on this side.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 14:51
Okay.
I think, you know, I think as far as the US Forest Service as it pertains, I think the other major thing was in, we are doing an AOP design, which is aquatic organism passage. And that might be at the very end. I know this is something that's kind of come in later.

Clements, Hannah 15:10
Okay.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 15:12
into the project. So, and I think everyone, if you're not aware, this is a newer policy that I think the Forest Service is instituting, and it's really just trying to
rather than have, you know, because particularly in this instance where we're kind of constrained by, you know, the geology of the area and having to put a box culvert, a wide box culvert is to incorporate an aquatic organism passage design. So it's meant to
mimic the stream area. So it's just not, I think Alison could probably explain it better, but I think it's, you know, in an effort for, so the wildlife in the area is not aware that they're going through a giant piece of concrete, that they are going through their natural environment.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 16:08
That's perfect.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 16:09
Um...

Clements, Hannah 16:10
Yeah.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 16:12
Those designs, so we are we are a 90% design, and I do appreciate you pushing that review through if at all possible. And so we should have that kind of wrapping up probably beginning of next year, hopefully, and we'll get that and get all of our hydraulic models updated, get our plans and kind of figure out, you know, go from there as far as from a contractual
perspective how we incorporate all of these and from a construction perspective.
I don't know, Ali, and is there anything?
Now, you know, since we have US Fish and Wildlife and Dave McHenry and those folks, if there's anything we need to discuss.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 16:48

No, with.

I've sent it to our experts to have them review the 90%. And then I had mentioned, I think it would be really good to have a Teams call just to talk about next steps, but also if there was anything specific in the design. But I think from the first round of comments,

there was some good feedback and I'll rely on Brady and Jason to see if things that they had requested, you know, came through in the second round. And I think we're all just thrilled to see it happening and to see it working in this spot. And it's

Yeah, it's definitely something that we do on all forest service projects that are being, as we're replacing culverts or bridges, is mimicking the stream underneath the roadway, looking at the upstream and downstream reaches and making sure that it's essentially

a continuous, seamless stream. So exactly that there's no hindrances, like it's in that bottom one where not all critters can get up and down that drop. And so it's been a positive

thing for our folks to see dot doing that. And we're just super thrilled that that has, especially in Division 14, y'all are kind of the guinea pigs. And so once we see how that proves itself, you know, hoping to get that into other divisions that we also have Forest on. But

We'll be reviewing that. And I asked for, with the holiday coming up, I wasn't sure what their leave schedules were. I did ask for potentially feedback by next Wednesday. But if Jason and Brady happened to be out all next week, then I asked for it for the following week. So yeah, working to get that. And

I think that's all I have for AOP stuff, yeah.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 19:00

Thank you. And then as far as meeting attendees, I'm assuming, so you want, you would like division staff, the designers, all of that, just so we can all kind of, if there are any.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 19:12

Yes, exactly. Yeah, just talking through the, you know, like minor details or finishing details, I should say, not minor, but finishing things. And then just like on the

groundwork and when that happens and how that happens, making sure that our folks are out there on site. You know, that's part of it. It's kind of a finesse thing, you know, when you're out there, there's you have your design, of course.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 19:12
Okay, okay, yeah.

Conner, Allyson - FS, NC 19:35
course, but sometimes conditions are a little bit different on the ground. So, yeah.

Headrick, Hannah S 19:40
Thank you.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 19:43
Okay. Excellent. All right. And so I think now we'll kind of want to just move on. And I think the, unless there's anything from the Forest Service, Alison, I'm going to follow up with one item with you. But I think we want to kind of keep this moving since we do have one, I think, one
item we'd like to discuss. And that's really, I think, how we can, you know, we've had our merger pre-meetings. And so now I think it's, you know, how we get into the actual merger process back in the foray. So, you know, back in the reopening section 106. So
Um...
Patrick, was there anything that you wanted to start off with? You know, this is particularly the new TCP.

Breedlove, Patrick J 20:35
Yeah, is there any way we could pull up the slide or do we have the slide of the original effects signature page?
We might, we may not have it on this, and I apologize if we don't.

Clements, Hannah 20:46
I don't think it's in the presentation, but I can try to look it up while you guys are chatting.

Breedlove, Patrick J 20:52
Okay, so in the original effects,

Clements, Hannah 20:55
Thank you.

Breedlove, Patrick J 20:59
signature that we had. We had the picnic area and we had some commitments there. We had the Chickalilly Cemetery. We had some commitments there. The commitments only it were wall height and wall length. We had another archaeological site and we avoided it from what I remember in our current design still do that. And so, and then we have a new, well, I'll say, I'll not say a new TCP because we don't know if it's been determined eligible, but yeah, yeah, so what you see there is
were having no effect on the first archaeological site. The Chicolilly Cemetery based on geotech wrecks, we had to change the height just a little bit. And I think in the last meeting, the height is actually increasing the height on the bottom, not the top. So I think it was what, 30 feet, Jared? And then the link changed a little bit. So of course, we'll have to revisit that. There has been some tribal
meetings and input and from what we gathered is they were fine with the changes on the wall height because it was just adding height on the bottom part of the wall where the foundation is. And then the last one, we call it the Indian Springs Cultural Washing site, but it's also the Snowbird picnic area.
Um...
There were, as Jared mentioned, due to geotech, there's a need for a wall on the other side. And then I think Forest Service, Ali, please correct me if I'm wrong, there's some few minor improvements y'all wanted, which was, I think, paving the parking lot. And then, of course, the AOP design there.
So kind of where we're at with merger is for us to go to the 4A4B, the next section is, you know, we need to proceed forward with Section 106. And so the Corps is a federal lead on this one. There's no federal monies at this point.
And I think it was a few years ago, I believe it was before Helene. The tribes had never approached us, letting us know that there was a TCP in the original effects determination that was done. And sometime after 2021, and Jared, you may have the

date. I apologize if I...
I can't remember. But the Eastern Band had let, I believe it was either the Corps or the dot know that there is a potential TCP. And I think we're
Again, Jared, please, I cannot remember the dates off hand, but we had submitted some.
plan sheets and everything. And I think there's some discussions on whether it was on tribal lands or whether it was on forest service lands. And of course, our land folks are on here. It was determined by infield surveys that the, I say potential TCP because We don't know yet for eligibility. It is on US Forest Service lands, not tribal lands. And so I guess at this point, before we can really proceed on to 4A, 4B, you know, we're at the point where we've completed all the T&E surveys for Section 7.
And so US Fish and Wildlife, we're at that point where we're about to submit the informal consultation to y'all for the project. But for Section 106, we've got this outstanding TCP. And for us to kind of proceed any further,
4A4B, because Jared, we're pretty close on red line drainage permit plans, right? Or we're getting close.

BM **Bond (RS&H), Jared M** 25:09
Yeah, we have, we should have the red line drainage approved. I would say end of this month. I think we've on our, it's been reviewed by NCDOT Hydraulics a couple of times. So we've worked through those. And then our permit plans would be the next thing we would be.
Moving forward, I would imagine that those will be done pretty early Q1 2027.

BJ **Breedlove, Patrick J** 25:36
Okay. And so with the potential TCP that we were notified of, Hurricane Helene came up and y'all know how it kind of spread everybody thin and everything. But I guess in the informational meeting today, we're dot, not to speak for all dot, but we're just trying to figure out
where we're at with that TCP determination, because I know we've been waiting some time on that. And that's kind of our hinge point for moving on to schedule when 4A4B will happen. And then, you know, I think it was about
five or six months ago, maybe a little farther than that, we had to request a schedule change request for this project and I, as well as the design firm, we sat down and, you know, looking at all the agencies involved and we tried to come up with average

approval times and things like that and tried to come up with a
Realistic let date for construction, and...
If we're wanting to see where we're at with the TCP, because if we proceed on maybe another month, maybe a couple more months,
without a TCP determination if it's eligible. If you know if it's eligible, then we'll go back through the effects meeting. If it's not eligible, we'll still go back through the effects determination because there were changes at two of those sites, some minor changes. But I think we're just trying to keep this project on schedule.

Headrick, Hannah S 27:08
Yeah.

Breedlove, Patrick J 27:14
And we still, I know Brookfield's on here, we still have to work with Brookfield. Still have to work with Ali, with US Forest Service, with the special use permit. Still have to work for the tribe because there's tribal properties on this one.
But I think that's where we're at. We're just kind of needing to know where we're at with the TCP determination. And Jared, do you have anything to add? Because that's kind of our critical point, our hinge point of us moving forward. And if it is determined eligible, then we'll
We'll proceed with the next steps, and Mary, Mary Pope, I see you got your hand raised.

Furr, Mary P. 28:03
Yeah, I do if you want me to go ahead and talk. So pretty much, you know, we knew about this potential TCP site back in 2008 when we met with the Snowbird community on site. In our 2012 report, we talk a little bit about the site, but we were never able to.
define boundaries or evaluate the criteria. TCPs are a little difficult to do, especially if you don't get a lot of input from the cultural, the people who practice the cultural practice there. Let's put it that way. So I know I just talked to Scott earlier. They've sent a letter.

Headrick, Hannah S 28:33
Sure.

Furr, Mary P. 28:44
to the Snowbird community. We would certainly consider this a TCP as for the boundaries, but we've not been asked to do anything more. So I just want to be clear. This is kind of the first I know that you want us to do some more with this. So we're happy to, you know, try to establish some boundaries for this TCP and do some further coordination on it.
But I'm gonna let Scott talk about what they've been doing.

Headrick, Hannah S 29:12
Thanks, Mary Poe. And Crystal, please, please chime in if I miss something here. But we did provide the tribe a letter requesting information on the TCP site at the end of October. They have until the 27th next week to respond to us. I know that they are going through some manpower shortages in that Tippo office right now, and I'm not sure if we'll hear back from them.
But as Mary Pope and Paul and I discussed this morning, I mean, I think it's the core's position that we would just move out and consider this site eligible. And so Mary Pope, if there's work you want to do to try and establish those boundaries, and then we can bring this back to the historic effects meeting next go round.
Over.

Furr, Mary P. 29:58
Yeah, we're happy to do some of that and evaluate it as a TCP, especially, you know, after the 27th, we can take whatever information if we do get any from them and establish some boundaries. You know, we have a pretty good idea about this site, so.

Headrick, Hannah S 30:18
Backs.
Yeah.
Yeah.

Furr, Mary P. 30:25
And then we can hear back from the Chapeau on that and possibly hear back from the tribe on that.

Headrick, Hannah S 30:33
Patrick, does that does that help answer the mail for you today?

Breedlove, Patrick J 30:37
Yeah, absolutely. What was that date? Did you say again? I heard it, but I was going to write it down.

Headrick, Hannah S 30:44
The 27th.

Breedlove, Patrick J 30:46
Of this month.

Headrick, Hannah S 30:47
Yeah, like, like 8 days from now.

Breedlove, Patrick J 30:51
Okay.
Yes, sounds good. I think if, you know, if that will help us a bunch. Again, I know we got Thanksgiving. I know we got Christmas coming up. But yeah, thank you so much, Scott. And I think, Jared, that will help us move forward, I believe, right?

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 31:08
Yes, Sir.

Breedlove, Patrick J 31:10
And Mary Pope, once we once we get Scott, will there be a letter if the tribes don't respond? Will there be a letter of y'all's coordination and there's just no response?

Headrick, Hannah S 31:23
We can, we can crystal or I can provide that, Patrick, that's fine.

Breedlove, Patrick J 31:28

Okay, and then Mary Pope, once we get that letter, would you just like us to resubmit e-tracks for effects determination?

Furr, Mary P. 31:37
No, because we're going to need to do eligibility first, if that's what you want, to determine this eligible.

Headrick, Hannah S 31:41
The.

Breedlove, Patrick J 31:46
Okay.

Furr, Mary P. 31:49
I mean, that's what I heard that you guys weren't sure if it was eligible and you're not sure because we don't have a formal determination of eligibility. What I'm saying is we would need to do that if that's what you want. I think originally, since we weren't getting a lot of information, we had stopped and just said, okay, can we avoid this general area and provide them the access that they need?
And you guys had said, yes, so that's why we kind of let it lie. Again, this was years ago. And, you know, we were going to move forward, just keep the project moving forward and not do a formal determination of eligibility on this. But if you want that determination, we can do that. But I mean, it's going to take a little bit of time. And then
30 days on the back end for comments.

Breedlove, Patrick J 32:33
Okay, so I've got the timeline pulled up. So back in February of 2025, when we restarted merger, we actually had where we were going to be impacting this site. And I think at that point, from the notes that I have, the Corps was going to draft paperwork to determine eligibility.
with the tribes. So I guess maybe I'm just a little confused. I thought the Corps along with the tribes will determine the eligibility.
I didn't know it had to come back to our folks.

Furr, Mary P. 33:07

Well, I mean, here's the thing. We like to, with TCPs, include the culture or, you know, the people of the culture or the ritual that, you know, that place is marks for them in order to, you know, have a determination of eligibility and in order to have accurate boundaries.

However, if they don't respond and you, you know, then I think it's incumbent upon us to, because many organizations may not respond because they believe that these rituals are sacred and they don't want to tell you things about it. It's, you know, it's incumbent upon us then to at least provide a boundary that I'm going to say this somewhat has a buffer.

so that we feel that we are, you know, at least protecting them and providing the access that they need. You know, I would think that that's what you'd want in order to document it in order to have know where you need to provide your access.

Breedlove, Patrick J 34:02

Yeah, and I guess to follow up, so we actually had, and Crystal led the meeting since she was a federal lead with the tribe sometime back. And Stephen Yurka was on the call. And with our current, for safety and Jeanette, I can't remember the,

The other term we used in our internal meeting we had the other day, there's no, there's literally no way we can avoid the site. There's there.

Grindstaff, Wesley T 34:26

Thank you.

Desk.

Yeah, absolutely. That is correct. We've definitely looked at it and the current design speed is at a 35 mile an hour curve that if we were to tighten it down to a 30 mile an hour design speed, we'd have a posted speed of at least 25. And that just really affects our purpose and need of the project because the purpose and need of the project is

for mobility. And so providing any access to the site would be extremely difficult. So we're kind of anticipating, you know, what else can we possibly do? And we like where we're going with this, where

It is an eligible site. We kind of anticipate, unfortunately, an adverse effect. But we've

really looked at it quite a bit, and we just do not see the ability to totally provide access in the future.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:34
What about providing access from the upslope side, not the roadside?

GT **Grindstaff, Wesley T** 35:40
I think it's just so steep in that area. Looking at the contours, I don't think it's very easy accessible unless there's some sort of walking path that could be provided up there. But it's just that area is so steep and it's so clenched up into the edge of the the local lake or pond that's out there. It's just, it's just very, very difficult terrain.

BJ **Breedlove, Patrick J** 36:09
And when we met with the tribes, and Stephen was on that call, they had requested like a pull off and maybe some parking. But Jared, again, I don't know the engineering lingo, but safety, it would be a major safety issue.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 36:20
Yeah.

BJ **Breedlove, Patrick J** 36:30
to provide a pull-off with parking.
with line of sight and everything.
So I guess we, again, we've just kind of been in this holding pattern because we thought the determination was still up in the air between the Corps and the tribes.
And I know the tribes have not been very responsive.
And we'll do whatever we need to do, but for sure we'll need to request to get some boundaries on this and if it is going to be eligible. And, but I just wanted to let the team know that there are.
With current design plans, there's going to be significant impacts to this. But basically with current design plans for safety and mobility, there'll be no way they can access this as it is now.

FP **Furr, Mary P.** 37:29

Then, I mean, I hate to be crass, but what's your plan if you have to do an MOA with the tribe? What's going to be your stipulations to minimize your impacts?

Breedlove, Patrick J 37:41
That's kind of why we're waiting to determine to see if it was eligible, because I think it's critical to see if it's eligible first. If it's eligible, then we would go through our next steps. If it's not eligible, then, you know, we don't really have to add it to another site to go back and update the effects.

Furr, Mary P. 38:01
Well, I mean, I went to some TCP training this past May, sponsored up in Virginia about, you know, sites like this, and it ticks all the boxes.

Breedlove, Patrick J 38:16
Okay, so what is our guidance, I guess, moving forward now? I know, Scott, thank you for letting us know that that coordination will be done the 27th and we'll be waiting for a letter. So what will be our next steps?

Furr, Mary P. 38:31
I mean, I think we need to evaluate the eligibility as a TCP and then submit that to the Chapot and the tribe. And I mean, I have to caution in meeting with these folks back in 2008, we were there, it was made very clear to us that the overall Eastern Band does not necessarily speak for the Snowbird community.

Headrick, Hannah S 38:55
In.

Furr, Mary P. 38:55
And they are, they consider themselves a very separate kind of entity within the overarching tribe. It's kind of like saying North Carolina and the United States, you know. And so, I mean, I really want to make sure that we get this back to not just the tribe, but the Snowbird community.
there that has a community center there and get their comments back on what we would ascribe as good boundaries for this. And then, you know, if you can provide some kind of pull off similar to what you do on a 35 mile an hour facility like on the

Blue Ridge Parkway and be able to provide them some access.
even if it's farther down the road and they have to walk, you know, a 10th of a mile up there, you know, if that would get you on the same side of the road where they wouldn't have to be crossing the road, would that reduce your safety concerns? Because I think we want to avoid trying to do an MOA with these folks because that's going to drag out.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:41
Mmh.

FP **Furr, Mary P.** 39:55
And, you know, not only that, I'm sure the MOA would also be with the Forest Service because part of this is on their property. So, you know, I think if we can get to a no adverse effect with some design commitments, maybe they're not right across the road from it, maybe they're just a little bit down and they're good with that, then that would be the best outcome.

GT **Grindstaff, Wesley T** 40:18
Jared, if you would, can you please pull up the plan sheet in this area, the one that we are with the drainage?
Yeah, do you have the one with the contours, please? The one with the red line drainage.

BM **Bond (RS&H), Jared M** 40:39
Well, I was just want to start this one. It gets a little busy, so I know I just wanted to kind of, you know, show where we're at. So our site, our spring site is kind of, if we pull in, it's kind of right in this area. So that's where that water is kind of coming down. And you can kind of see that old,
the pool off area is this kind of gray line. You know, unfortunately, this, you know, this is a this is a low spot on our project. We've got water coming in from this side. We've got water coming here. We've got a, you know, I think it's 48 inch pipe. So, and then also the water coming in from the, you know, behind the wall. So
Um...
We do have a visualization, actually. Hannah, if you could, and I'll pull up the one

with the contours. Hannah, if you could bring up the, well actually I might have it up here.

Clements, Hannah 41:39
In the presentation or something separate?

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 41:41
I've got it. So this is kind of our area right here. So here's the, you know, here's where the spring is. It's going to be, it's kind of behind this wall.
And so this is kind of what we would be looking at as far as, you know, from a visualization. So we'd have a, you know, the pipe coming out, discharging water into this kind of riprap, you know, to keep erosion. And then the water is going to get piped through here.
And so, and we did, and I understand now that, yes, that Steve New Yorker does not speak for the Snowbird community, and I think he was, you know, I think at least understanding that we were kind of stuck in a between a mountain, a hard place here, as far as preserving the...
The press, you know, the current, how it sits there currently.
So, Mary Pope, so you think, I mean, you know, obviously it wouldn't be preferred, but I think, you know, so you think something similar, so maybe, you know, it does, you know, there's a ditch coming through here and I was looking at the cross sections, it kind of does flatten out. So we might be able to look at something where, you know, some sort of...

Grindstaff, Wesley T 42:55
We had some damn.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 42:59
Pardon me?
Um...
Is, is we can have this for, and like I said, we can we can kind of look and seeing if there's any other, you know, safety mitigation, you know, we can do to to kind of... do what we can. And so I don't know if is this how you see this like an adverse effect, because it's not going to be water, you know, necessarily trickling out of a spring. It'll be water trickling out of.

A pipe.
That is connected to that would be getting that that spring-fed pipe.

Furr, Mary P. 43:43
Yeah, I mean, I think that for them, and again, I don't practice this, but, you know, that change in how that comes out of the ground might be a big impact to them.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 43:54
OK, and I don't think we can get out of that.

Joy Saddler 43:55
So, also, just...
I also just want to add that the drainage plans currently actually have a different configuration there because that berm ditch outlet was not having the capacity for, I guess, that spring that's coming in. If you give me like 5 minutes, or if you have the red line drainage plans, we can look at it, but they're converted to open throat catch basins. There's two of them now in that area.
just to be able to handle that flow behind the wall.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 44:51
So, Joy, these are the R8 plans, so it does look like it's fairly similar.

Joy Saddler 44:59
Yeah, those look, those are all. Let me pull up the ones that I have.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 45:04
But he's not the one. Oh, sorry.
Where is?

Joy Saddler 45:09
Ohh, sorry, yeah, you, I'm in a different folder for the most recent submission, just in case.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 45:14
Oh, there it is, okay.

Furr, Mary P. 45:14
While you guys are looking for these, can I ask a quick question? Is there not a way, I mean, we're already building a wall there. Is there not a way to push that wall back a little bit more and provide like pull off for like maybe two, three cars?

Headrick, Hannah S 45:21
Mhm.

Grindstaff, Wesley T 45:29
Yeah, Mary Pope, this is Wesley Grindstaff. I think you're right where we need to be. I think we need to look at now that at least myself understand.
what the adverse impacts might be and what might get us out of that. I think we're obligated and we want to look at options to mitigate that, minimize that. And I think that's the obvious step we need to do here. We need to definitely show that we are doing that. And I think we have options at least to look at that.
That show that, if you're if that's what you're asking.

Furr, Mary P. 46:05
That's what I'm asking.

Grindstaff, Wesley T 46:06
Nope, I, we, yeah.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 46:06
Yep, and I...
And I think we've got this area right here that we can work with.
Maybe even presently designed.
Because that is going to be, you know, 20, 30 feet to the face of the wall. I think it's 30 feet for, you know, for a clear recoverable. So we may just, yeah.
As Wesley said, I think that I think this is something we would be happy to explore.

Furr, Mary P. 46:38
And if you need to put some guardrail up along there that protects the people from, you know, the people that get out of their cars and walk over to that side, if you

need to put up some guardrail, I think that's probably, you know, a good idea. I mean, you know, that that helps. We've done that in other places where people are getting off to go access trails for the Forest Service. So
You know, I think some of this can be done and maybe we can get ourselves out of the way in MOA. I mean, that would be great, wouldn't it?

GT **Grindstaff, Wesley T** 47:10
Absolutely would be great, and I think that...
I think we have a better understanding now of what those, what can be done to mitigate this. And I think we've got options. We want to take that route and we want to minimize these.

FP **Furr, Mary P.** 47:26
Yeah, and as for how the water's coming out, you know, into a pipe, you know, the other thing I would be saying is, is there a way to maybe disguise the pipe?
that maybe it looks a little more natural how it's coming out, but we all know back in there, maybe about a foot or two, it's a pipe, but maybe up the front facing user interface is, you know, some nice natural looking rocks that look right there, maybe with some moss put around it. I don't know, whatever, you know, something that looks like that.

BM **Bond (RS&H), Jared M** 48:03
Certainly, yeah, we'll have, after this meeting, we'll talk, have further discussions with STV to see if there's anything we can do to
minor modifications or modifications to this drainage to make it more, you know, aesthetically conducive to what, you know, they would, you know, whoever would like to access this water. So, so it's not a roadside ditch.

FP **Furr, Mary P.** 48:29
Yeah.
Right.
But I have to say this too, it was our understanding in the 2008 meeting, and again, this was a while ago, that they also had some things possibly in the river there on the, you know, the downslope side to this. So I don't know if this whole thing, you know, it might cross the road, the TCP.

Headrick, Hannah S 48:50
That's a big Sunday.

Furr, Mary P. 48:58
But, you know, we're going to have to go back and open this file up a little bit and figure out what notes we took in that meeting.

Grindstaff, Wesley T 49:11
Yeah, thank you for that, Mary. But what that that information will be will be helpful as well, because don't know that we considered that just considering how steep that that terrain is that falls straight off into the lake at that point.

Furr, Mary P. 49:27
Yeah, they had, they intimated that, you know, there was, it was also a cultural washing site and that maybe there were some activities that happened in the river. And again, you know, this, when we went to meet with them, it was years before we were going to construct this. And a lot of people, you know how they are, they don't really see that
the end that is coming. Well, now, you know, the bulldozers are almost here and they might be a little more amenable to kind of describing where they would like to perform these rituals.

Grindstaff, Wesley T 49:59
Sure, yeah. And if you could check that, because that, I'm not sure if it's considered river there, but it's definitely lake at that point. Now, as you get upstream from here, it turns into more river, but be interested to see those notes.

Furr, Mary P. 50:08
Sure, yeah.

Headrick, Hannah S 50:09
Stable.

Furr, Mary P. 50:16

Okay, well, we might have to go back and, you know, go talk to them again. I think that's probably would be first on my agenda to go back and set up a meeting with some folks in the Snowbird community.
If they'll meet with me.
Could I also get some of these, just know which plans to look at on SharePoint for this, since there seem to be a lot of plans on the SharePoint side? If somebody could just send me an e-mail that shows the correct link that I should be looking for here, which ones are the most up to date, that would help.
And if you want to go ahead, Patrick can send us a request for a comprehensive survey eligibility, then we can go ahead and get started on this.

Joy Saddler 51:09
I can send you a link. FYI that the red line drainage plans have not been approved for this round. So I can send you a link and let you know, you know, after they've been approved, I can resend that link, but I can send you a link to the most recent ones.

Furr, Mary P. 51:24
I'm just good with the most recent ones. I'm not going to hold you in anything. It's just kind of getting getting an understanding of the area and where we are.

Breedlove, Patrick J 51:37
Hey, this is Patrick. Mary Pope again, thank you so much for the guidance. And I'm going to be very honest, this is the first time I've ever dealt with a TCP eligibility kind of determination working through that. So apologies if on my end, if I've missed anything, but Mary Pope, thank you for that. Scott, thank you so much for the updates.
on that. And I think we've got a path moving forward. I did want to mention one thing, and I think I mentioned it a month before last when we had our information meeting. Holland, we plan on after the 1st of the year working on the Section 7. Good news, we've got all the surveys complete except for the winter surveys of the culverts. So we're at a good spot to work through the section 7 coordination on that. So we'll plan on doing that the first of the year. But again, Mary Pope, thank you so much. And Scott, thank you again.

Furr, Mary P. 52:37
Sure.

Youngman, Holland J 52:40
Thanks, Patrick. That sounds great. And if any section 7 questions come up, just reach out to us and we'll work with you all on those.

Breedlove, Patrick J 52:50
Sounds great. Thank you, and Jared, that's all I had.

Bond (RS&H), Jared M 52:59
I believe we had all the all the points we wanted to get, so...
I think we can go ahead and conclude this. I appreciate everyone's time. I appreciate everyone's input and happy and I'm glad we've
got some forward momentum to take with this project. So everyone have a happy Thanksgiving.

Breedlove, Patrick J 53:22
Thank you all.

Clements, Hannah 53:22
Yeah, thanks, guys.

Glover, Chris 53:23
Thank you.

Youngman, Holland J 53:24
Thank you.

Bhupesh Joshi 53:25
Yeah, thank you.

Annino, Amy 53:25
Thank you.

EM **Endries, Mark** 53:26
Thanks, everyone.

CA **Crystal Amschler** 53:27
Thanks, everybody.

◉ **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription