

R-3410 - CP1, 2, 2A-20260415_100037-Meeting Recording

April 15, 2026, 2:00PM

1h 33m 39s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:30

Hey, everybody. Thank you for joining us. We just went through introductions here in the room, but we were muted on the mic, so we'll go through them one more time. Morgan Weatherford from the Environmental Policy Unit. Matt Martin from the Army Corps.

I'm sorry, Martha Register with WGI. I'm doing planning as I'm trying to find my volume on my computer. There we go. I am Gary Jordan, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Faith Harden, Division of Water Resources.

Rob Ruddings, Division of Water Resources. Seth Fulcher from Federal Highway. Katie Harville, Environmental Policy Unit. Art Campbell, WGI.

Brandon Baron, PHP, Edison Gainey, Division 4, Mark Picher, Marvin Gold, Russell Broadwell, Division 4, Chad Hawkins, Division 4, Emma Hendrick, Environmental Policy. Yeah, so much better. Second down. We have practice one online.

I.

CT **Cao, Luan T** 2:46

My Gal State Historic Preservation Office.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:52

Uh, Daniel.

DS **Daniel Spruill** 2:53

Good morning, everyone. Daniel Spruill from Campo, the capital area of NPL.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:59

Christine.

- FE Farrell, Christine E** 3:02
Hey, Christine Farrell, Environmental Policy Unit.
- HS Headrick, Hannah S** 3:06
Megan.
- GE Gracey, Meghan E** 3:08
Megan Gracey, trainee with the dot.
- HS Headrick, Hannah S** 3:12
John Allison.
- JT John Townsend** 3:15
John Townsend Roadway Design Traffic Control with VHB.
- HS Headrick, Hannah S** 3:20
Within the room, Marisa.
- SP Sarzaeim, Parisa** 3:25
Paris of Sarzane, Division of Water Resources.
- HS Headrick, Hannah S** 3:30
Scott.
- SJ Scott Jones** 3:30
Good morning. Scott Jones, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- SA Somerville, Amanetta** 3:36
I'm out of Somerville, EPA Region 4.
- HS Headrick, Hannah S** 3:40
Tripped.

TC Trent Cormier 3:42

Trent Cormier, Tomo Engineering, Hydraulics and Erosion Control Design.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 3:48

Victoria.

VR Victoria Riege 3:51

I'm Victoria Rigge with Mott MacDonald.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 3:55

Did I miss anybody?

All right, before we start off, does anybody have any? I can kind of maybe starting with maybe somebody else filling the gaps better than I can. This project I've learned like worked its way through.

My office like almost a decade ago to get to see. Correct me if I'm wrong, that was because it's before. I've been here for 6 1/2 years and it predates me. So it's been around for a while and it's not a merger.

And now here we are kind of pulling it into merger at this point. So Chad, I don't know maybe you can. Yeah, we we agreed to keep this on the merger and bring it back in and get all the terms right before we'll be kind of talking through hydro and and permit drawings.

And the Vision 4 had had kind of brought this project up in sessions for design, not for construction, but for design when I came back to the core to kind of start one of those 4B or 4A meetings.

We have the new GP now and being the core guy talking about the possibility of bringing this through as simply and as painlessly as we could through merger to use that GP, which will help us out on the back end. You know, let's let's do all the upfront work and not have to do an IP.

We'll see if we can get there. We're we're open to doing doing a little bit of legwork to try to answer some of these questions, but we really are really likely to use that that GP and get through merger as soon as possible and certainly can and certainly do plan on sitting down and do a true for a.

We'll be looking at drawings at that point. We have broken it up just because there's some some easy breaks in the project with 40 and 70 where we're not not actually

touching some of the those designs and there's.

There's one section that's really close to being that right away phase and the other two sections are all right, whatever you call it, 20% plans. So I just want everybody to kind of get back story on the property yesterday since this one's not not your normal merger projects.

Those are my comments. Thanks for filling in the gaps. I I said the murder team, do you have anything you want to add or I I sent some comments in advance. You have to to chat some before.

What I think might make sense is it looks like you'll have a presentation prepare if you want to get through that and maybe we can talk through the comments. If he has that's helpful to you after that. Yeah, no doubt. And and it's gonna, there's gonna be places in the in the presentation that will just stop and have whatever conversation.

that we need and decide what the step forward is. So yeah this is this is our 3410 improvements to Veterans Parkway which was previously NC-42 in Clayton and Johnson County. A lot of an agenda. Hopefully we can get through maybe 2A today. That's ambitious. We're going to try. So as as Chad was talking and a few others, there's several portions to this project. I've been working on it since 2017 when it originally started and and several of.

People in the room have been also, so there's some history with this project. As I said, we would like to do concurrent .1 purpose and need and study area to what the detailed study alternative to carry forward with and three.

What the bridging is? Um.

So the project location, if people are not familiar with this, is in Johnson County. It's West of Clayton. It goes from on the West side of the project NC 50, which is over here through the I-40 interchange, but we did not look at the I-40 interchange and then it goes through the.

70 bypass, which is now I-42. And again, we didn't modify the interchange, but our study area runs through it and it goes to US 70 business in the town of Clayton.

So the existing project is roughly 8 miles long. It's two mile. It's excuse me, two travel lanes with shoulder. There's no pedestrian and bicycle facilities and we have a variable right of way we're proposing to go.

To four travel lanes, 2 lanes in each direction with a 23 foot median. As the project has evolved from 2017, we have at the request of the division been converting this into a full RCI corridor with limited left turn movements.

Roundabouts, those kind of things. We have a couple of different typical sections. There's a curb and gutter section on the West area of the project and the east, the very east area of the project. So NC 50, the old drugstore and Guy Rd.

To US 70 business, there's a shoulder section in the center of the project. We're working on a multi-use path from NC42 to US 70 business and in an evolving process.

We're looking to put a sidewalk on the other side for that section and that's still under discussion. Am I correct? OK, the town is still the the agreement. We got to get the agreement as long as town groups.

So there definitely will be some kind of pedestrian bike and ped facility on one side working towards getting it on both sides from I-42 into Clayton. As Chad mentioned, there's three segments sections.

They're not formal, so we're calling them the West area and that project is currently that is currently under VHB is working on that and they're they're moving towards. A preliminary plan set. The central area is worked is managed by Mott McDonald and they're currently approaching right away plans and the east area is also managed by Mott McDonald and they're moving forward from preliminary design.

So as Chad had mentioned, there's a whole bunch of history with this project. The categorical exclusion was signed in July 2018 and a whole bunch of surveys and studies were done, as you would expect for that categorical exclusion.

A Geo Geo environmental report, public involvement plan, several historic coordination. We do have a couple of historic properties on the project. I can show those to you traffic memos.

And our TRS, memorandums, etcetera, community impact went through ICI and an indirect land use effects report and then traffic noise and that original traffic noise was completed in 2018.

Currently they're doing another traffic noise analysis. ACTS is working on that and the traffic studies have been updated. The last one was done in April of 2025. I believe that was on the eastern section.

And they were looking at the roundabouts.

If that's correct, Mike, yeah, well that they are new. They did the central and the east section. OK, we have had three public workshops for this project, the original one for the CE in May of 2018.

When we started looking at the central area to look at what an RCI corridor and what kind of intersections we could look at there, we went back out in 2023 and then

moving forward when the division thought that they wanted to take the whole thing to an RCI.

We went back out again last spring, so there have been three full-blown public workshops for this. There's several adjacent projects. For me, the easiest way to look at them is this way on a map. So our project is the green one in the center.

There are several windings to the South. Those are improvement projects, of course, the I-40 and the interchange improvement, and I believe that's fully constructed now. And then as you go into town, they there are some sidewalk improvements down here and I can't remember what this little one is. Signal systems upgrade, excuse me. So Cleveland Rd. There's a couple Cleveland Rd. widenings.

Sidewalks, infrastructure, and those are mostly those projects in here are the sidewalks and the infrastructure.

Currently we are planning a couple merger meetings. This is the first one, so we're off schedule a little bit. Well, hopefully we can get to a second one sometime this summer that they're moving forward with the central area.

I would like to start maybe some right away acquisition. So we'll be moving forward with the consultation this summer. They've begun priority parcels. There were some people who were moving and shifting around and then.

Construction consultation 2030, but January 2031. That's the current schedule.

Project cost estimate as of last summer 229 million plus change.

There's a lot of things going on in this corridor. We have several protected species, including a bunch of mussels that are in Swift Creek, which the project corridor crosses. The 2018 NRTR came up with 15 acres of wetlands in the study.

The area, not that we're going to hit all of those. We're in the Neuse River basin with four named streams going from the West. Buffalo Creek, Swift Creek, White Oak Creek and Little Creek, plus a whole bunch of tributaries. And yes, we have Neuse River buffer rules.

There's a county hospital in the middle area. There's six or more churches. There's an elementary school in the east area. There's over 15 neighborhoods and apartments, 30 shopping centers, and two historic resources. The Sanders Hare House is South of the corridor.

Just off of Cornwallis Rd. We won't be impacting that. And then the keeper of the records and seals house is in the east area near Barber Mill Rd. It does have a rock wall adjoining the project corridor, so we shifted to the other side to avoid that and there is a.

No adverse effect document on that one. So and then obviously this is where we get to the points of discussion. The purpose and need from the CE is the primary need is for proposed improvements.

Due to the increasing traffic congestion along NC42, Northwestern Johnson County has developed from a rural area to more characteristically suburban, with traffic volumes steadily increasing. Rapid development around the two-lane NC42 will soon overburden its capacity.

Primary purpose is to provide additional capacity to accommodate growth in traffic tied to suburban development occurring in the area. The secondary desirable outcome is for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

And that will be in the central and the eastern area. So my understanding is that this is probably the 1st place we should stop and talk.

I understand there were some conversations going on behind the scenes. Chad mentioned that you talked to Seth and then talked to you and then talked to Morgan. So yeah, and I think you guys proposed a new one after that. Do you have a slide with that one on it by chance? The I think you'll let's kind of like that.

Sex purpose needed.

So I think what I did unfortunately is I went back to what was originally proposed, what was originally there because you had objected to the acceptable level of service comment and originally there was a comment.

That level of service D for capacity was too tight. Acceptable level of service was too vague. So that's where I don't know where the discussions have gone. OK. And I think that that might be where it's and it is is you know and that that was my.

Comment on the measure reset package was just that it felt hard for us to to measure acceptable level of service. I I just don't know what that means. It's what is it currently acceptable? It's like the obvious question we're going from 1/2 to 1/2.

It's the no build about, so I don't want to leave us open to that. Yeah, I agree completely. I'm a fan of not including level of service unless we absolutely have to, because sometimes there's unintended consequences like you're talking about. Yeah, I'm open to.

SA Somerville, Amanetta 18:44

It it this this is almond.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:47

Oh.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 18:48

I'm sorry, this is Aminetta with EPA. Is there any way we could just say an improved level of service?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:54

Does that you hear me?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 18:54

And as long as it's better than what it would be under the no build, it shows improvement.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:59

Again, like some of those things are out of our control with traffic volumes and you know, projections into the future. So, so sometimes we get into scenarios where we we set a bar, we can't meet and then we get our we kind of paint ourselves in the corners.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 19:04

Uh huh.

OK.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 19:17

By accident. And so that's why to me it's kind of a slippery slope when you start putting that in there. So I prefer that we be as kind of general as possible, OK. Yeah, maybe what would be good is if we could, do you have the ability to pull up what that 2026 one was and we can just look at it as a group really quick. It would be in that most recent merger packet.

Oh, I should have printed it out. No worries. I I think one of my suggestions was.

I'll say it before reading that and then we'll we'll back it up 5 minutes on there. But I think one of my suggestions was gonna be maybe even we just lose that part of the sentence about acceptable LOS and then I think we might be at a a reasonable

purpose in the.

That was the only thing in there that I drew out as like potentially problematic for kind of the same reasons we just talked about.

Oh, I didn't say that the next one. OK, OK, yeah, so either either pick an LOS or maybe remove the reference was kind of what I was saying.

OK.

Actually, when you consider Johnson County, you could pick another one epic one. Well, it's yeah, that kind of just exploded, especially in this area. So I'm gonna hopefully if you didn't follow me before because I don't want to feel like I or you to feel like I'm dismissing your comment, so.

To elaborate a little more fully, let's say so we could set this goal to improve level of service and we may find that even by adding a lane through there or two lanes through there with the growth happening in that county, even in our design year, I don't know if it's 2045 or 2015.

We may still wind up with worse level of service even with adding these lanes. And so then all of a sudden even our improvement to a really congested highway that's needed, it no longer meets purpose and need. So we that's what I'm trying to avoid here.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 21:35

OK, that that makes sense.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 21:44

OK, and this is the the updated one since this is this is what the updated one was cause this has got the the March date on it that you commented and I I've changed it since then. So we went to a.

Can you maybe increase that size a little bit?

So I'm not the answer. Yeah, I was thinking that too. Yeah, great. That work? Yep. OK.

I'm just thinking about the the copper district. I am too. Yeah, that's huge. If they build it, yeah. Is that under here?

Always.

Once. So we just take out level service there and just talk about increasing capacity of the roadway, I think, yeah, that. I mean, it's a little awkward to remove your primary objective, but can I? Yes, ma'am.

Maybe I'm missing something, but why is it NC 36 instead of. That's a whole nother

all conversation. It's again, we're going to have to have a lot of that. That cut me off the first time I read it. I had a whole thing typed up about, you know, is this the right project?

So it's gonna be, it's gonna have multiple and and does it is it truly a section of it is but is truly just veterans Parkway. Each section is an Sr. called veterans Parkway. OK, but the whole thing is named veterans Parkway. It is and then it's 542 just keeping. Yes, we just tried.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 23:35
Uh.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:42
Everybody on their toes.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 23:43
So, so this is Aminetta. I just want to make sure that the the road has several different names and that's what was going on. I'm sorry if I talked over someone.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:53
Sorry, could you say that again?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 23:55
I said so NC 36 is Veteran Parkway because I was also confused a little bit on the naming of the roadway as well.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 24:03
Yes, so it's a it's a dual. It has a name, a road name, Veterans Parkway and a primary route number. The primary route number runs from NC 50 to I-42, then runs concurrent with I-42 and NC 36 down to Ranch Rd. exit on I-42.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 24:03
Oh.
Up.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 24:23

Which is also NC 36, which gets you back to what was 70 business in Clayton, but it's now 70 slash Clayton Blvd. OK, so nobody knows where they're at now. I understand and I may be causing confusing too. I guess when I've been saying 42, I mean what?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 24:33

Oh, that's not confusing at all. OK.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 24:43

And it's it's yes that's that's what we that's what in the previous language is correct. Yeah that was we can provide a map. We have a map detailing what those road name changes were so that we can always include that in any updated. I think we need to include that in a packet.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 25:01

I think we should include it just.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 25:02

If we could get that, absolutely. Now I got the map. Yes, Miss Amanetta.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 25:06

Yeah.

I was saying I think we definitely should include the map just because it's it's confusing.

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

Yes, it is.

And old and people still call it the old name regardless what the new name is. So it's just going to take a while for people, the community and everybody at large to get on board. So are you improving traffic operations on NC42 or are you improving?

36 There is no NC 42 within the limits of this project. Well, then it needs to be changed. Let's take a paragraph. We just that that's new. Yeah, so.

Yes, please. So I guess the only spot I see the LOS mentioned is that's the primary objective of the project. Are you guys comfortable if we just lost that part of the sentence?

And or change the primary objective to reduce condition and improve traffic. Is that Seth? Does that give you a heartburn or no? I think maybe if we move the sentence, turn the sentence around the probably.

Project's primary objective is roadway improvements to support forecasted traffic growth through the project design year.

Just real straightforward. Not no, no clauses or anything along those lines.

Somebody write that down because I said it.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 26:49

Can you re? Can you repeat that again please?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 26:52

The primary The project's primary objective is roadway improvements to support forecasted traffic growth in the corridor for the designer.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 27:06

OK.

This is Aminetta. My only concern is, is that if you say you're doing, you're improving the roadway to deal with traffic growth.

No, no, never mind. That sounds good. Never mind. I'm sorry.

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

OK.

Support current and forecast. Do we want current and forecasted or just forecasted?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 27:42

Current is also showing problems, right?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:43

I think current and forecast makes sense to be there's currently a need, right? They're currently it's in need. We have local service at intersections currently. OK, current forecast that that that makes sense. I think there's mainly getting rid of the LOS thing at all.

And then we'll leave the secondary benefits include improved safety and bicycle and pedestrian accommodations east of I-42. So it's the bicycle and pedestrian east of

what is US 70 bypass.

And then just generally improved safety, which bringing it to current standards will do that presumably. I thought Seth, I thought we did want safety in there as part of secondary, secondary, secondary.

And yeah, and I was, I was gonna ask you if the bike had stuff was in there, which it is. So that's that's good 'cause we had you opened with talking about the the sidewalk, which I assume there's not a sidewalk there. There is not a sidewalk along it at all.

OK. OK. So let me see if I can get back to Google. There may be a few partial segments where they made a new development, put it in just on their property. There's zero connectivity. Sure.

OK, so we we've talked about traffic and and to get to your current to your comment about current traffic and to get Addison's traffic is is minimum 16 to 17,000.

And then if you get into close to the I what is currently I-42, you get into twenty-nine, almost 30,000 vehicles per day. So it's a two green highway that's got a lot of traffic on it. It's a village.

So I'm not going to go through the level of service discussion that's here. We do have logical termini if y'all want to talk about that.

So this was this was is the project long enough to accommodate alternatives and since we were generally adding capacity and widening, we went from I-50 on the one end.

To where it goes into US 70 business in Clayton and that was the segment that generally has the the excess traffic and there is.

70 business I-42 I-40 and NC 50 to move cars on and off the project.

Which would would allow for logical termini and and flow.

Comments. So you're simply everybody agree on that point.

So this is the study area and this study area has some hashed red spots on it. So that came out of the pre-merger meeting where we were looking at the cut and fill slopes and noted that they were outside of the previously designed study area.

Area which was the L line plus or minus 200 feet from the center line and then Y lines were plus and minus 50 feet and 50 feet from the the intersection. So we've added some additional little bump outs. There's a bump out here in Drugstore Rd.

There's a bump out here and I can't remember. I think that's Walmart. It's next to the Walmart I believe. And then the I-42 interchange, we added some area.

For the most part, we actually went through it, but added some area. This is Barber

Mill Rd. the tie in at Barber Mill Road and then the tie in at US 70 business. So Chad and Addison, Russell and I have all talked about that. That's going to be looked at. Bye. Yeah, three years engineering. I did the updated in RTR for my my video. It's been all the sites and kind of spot check them, but we just didn't put the paper in updated in RTRS. OK, but you know we we designed for love impacts or love impacts that they're.

But plus as possible, understood nothing there, but we we have not cleaned up the RTR for full yet. OK, so yeah, there will be a memo to file later prior to the consultation, which is for the middle of this summer.

So that's what the hashtag study areas are. Any comments on the study area?

OK, so this is the study area per the April 26 map. So we will adjust the purpose of need. We will the study area is the April 2026 map. So we'll do that and then send around the the CP1.

Document for signatures. Yes, Sir. Could you do me a favor? Could you read that one time and let me canvas and make sure everybody's verbal occurrence with that before we read what, Sir?

Let's send out a draft first. Send out a draft and then we'll ask for concurrency comments, comments first and the concurrency. OK, that sounds good. Yeah, that's fine. All right. Yeah, sometimes those things are just better to to read. No, you're in doubt.

So.

But nobody has an objection.

What we're talking about so far and everyone thinks they can.

It's not. Yeah, it sounds, it sounds better. I think, you know, like we're saying just, you know, it sounds good. I think just laying our eyes on it when we're reading would be handy, but it might not be a long back and forth, you might say. That's great. Yeah. No doubt what, Morgan and Katie, I'll work with you to get this updated.

Run it through a couple drafts, I'll send it out for everybody's comments and then we'll we'll get signature. This map that you're looking at is the map that's like I said is the April 2026 and I do have that printed so that'll be attached to the concurrence point when we sign it, OK.

So, yeah, we'll update that. All right, alternatives. This is, this is another question. So when we originally went through this project in fall of 2027 or not, excuse me, fall of 2017, let me, let me get ahead of myself. I'll go back to the future.

So when we we sat down with FHWA, we sat down with the division and then we sat

down with Eric and Rob and went through what it was that they thought at the time we thought the project would look like and so generally got agreement that logically a best fit alignment.

Made sense that it would allow us to wiggle and squiggle and move around and avoid things that we needed. So we had looked at potentially just winding all the way to the north, winding all the way to the South and then the hybrid which is north-south and some of it is symmetrical to minimize impact.

What we carried through the CE was the best fit.

And so then just looking at this, these are the maps that I put in the packet. What is in green is cut and fill slope. The design is in slightly different stages. So when we had.

Roughly around 25% design preliminary, we put in a 40 foot buffer and so that's the light yellow around the the bright green. And when we were in the central area that was close to 65% design right away, we put a 25 foot buffer on that.

So the buffers are slightly different and you'll see different colors in here just to allow us to indicate the different stages of the project development and what the buffer widths were. So I flipped off the legends and everything on these images just so I could get more more of the image.

Into the PowerPoint presentation, but these are the images and the maps from the packet. So if we want to discuss any of these locations, we can do that. So this is starting in NC 50 and going.

To the east.

So at this particular location and let me see which set of notes I want to go for. So we started with symmetrical widening along the roadway and then shift to the north.

To minimize impacts to these two creeks in this wetland here. So this is Buffalo Creek and it's and it's UT. So Buffalo Creek is this one. This is the UT to Buffalo Creek. And of course right in between the two of them, their their confluence point is down here. There's this.

Big wetlands. So we shifted to the North side of the roadway at this location for the best fit to try and avoid wetland impacts there. And Matt, just just go back more.

Yeah, just for information. I'm sure you probably on the top side. So yeah, what pumices built those?

Animals are in and they're big and they're big. I think we're tons or slightly will be. I can't remember what we're going to try. We tried to work with them to have them set back far enough where we can tie in to what they have, OK.

You know, a lot of that is we'll see how that actually works out as we get further along in design, but that because we were had preliminary stuff that we were sharing back and forth. But they have a permitted crossing that they ended up doing that. They did 2 culverts, big crossing.

We won't have to touch such crosses, correct. Our our retainer wall may slip beyond their retainer wall, but we'll still be well outside that. Yeah, in a few locations, there's potential we build another wall behind there and end up covering there. So OK. Which is not not a environmental concern. I'll be some additional closer patch, but not we won't be touching that, OK.

Which is a lot of linear footage that was in the original. That's great. OK, so going to the east.

And this is it says connect to existing. This is where the I40 interchange picks up so continuing this way.

And by the way, what I'm reading is the January, what I'm going and referring to is the January 25th, 2018 meeting minutes that we had with the Corps of Engineers and and water quality where we discuss what we were trying to avoid for the best fit.

So those meeting minutes and those notes are also in your avoidance and minimization measures discussion.

Um.

So there are businesses in this vicinity that we were trying to avoid at this time. So the widening going through here I believe was to the north and yeah, winding shifts from the north becoming symmetrical to avoid impact.

Hacks to like this wetland here and to the to the.

But veterinarians hospitals that are here as you go into old drugstore and this is where we expanded the study area so that we can tie in better to old drugstore that was outside of our study area.

So then we skip the I-40 interchange, which I did completely. And so coming out of the I-40 interchange, continuing to the east, it's symmetrical.

The winding shifts to the South to avoid the large wetland complex at Swift Creek. So this is Swift Creek right up the middle, this big drainage in here and so we so we come into it symmetrically and we go to the South.

To avoid to try to minimize impacts to these larger wetlands that are north of the roadway. These two wetlands, particularly this big one, and I don't have the names on them here. This one comes right to the top slope.

So there's not a whole lot we can do in that particular regard. That shift also helps us

construct ability wise because that's a dual structure and in the future it'll be two bridges. We can use the existing bridge to maintain traffic, build a new one.

So as you mentioned earlier, yes, there is a bump out here at Walmart for the study area and then there is one here. I can't remember what this is Meadow Drive. This is a utilities bump out, yes.

Thank you.

OK, going towards Cornwallis Rd. We're still on the South, we're still on the South and through through all of this and this is White Oak Creek and this all stays to the South through here.

There was a lot of, you can see residential up in here and there was more development on this side of the road. So we stayed to the South for the widening. The Sanders Harehouse is down here. This is Cornwallis Rd. That National Register house is down here and so we're.

Staying all of our turn lanes and everything are staying north of that property, so we don't touch that property. And so that's not the environmental features maps that are in your packet show where the Sanders hair houses.

OK, as we tie back into the US 70 bypass I-142, excuse me, I-42, it it stays symmetrical so that we can use the existing bridges and structures over.

The Interstate. So the project, this project you can see we stopped it here and I we might have the term lane improvement here. We didn't want to touch these bridges in the center talking with Mott McDonald and looking at this.

They need to work on the tie-ins, so they're they're we're going to extend the study area just to make sure that they have enough room for any any work that you may do on the I'm going to change how we're doing so.

Resurfacing between the terminals and then adding a little bit of lane winding along the ramps, but it stays out of the corner.

OK. So we're not going to go on to yet just type up the studies to really much you can very much need for us to go out there if you're wholesale top the so like the ramp, like the on ramp, the off ramp, I think you know how maintenance was.

We'll sometimes add a right turn lace, so we're at the right turn lane right for the hall and then between the terminals of the bridge, all of this is all the asphalt is the same age, the whole corridor that way.

We don't have any from a study area environmental standpoint. It's just a lot of the woods anyway, so no, no big deal, but I was just right. No, that's the whole reason is, you know, since we're touching it, if there's some stores that y'all would do, I guess

we were grabbing it so that it's one hit rather than.

Yes, ma'am.

No, I don't believe there were any design documents provided recently. They they're right, they're not in the merger packet and I don't think that I linked any design documents in the merger packet. Typically at this point we wouldn't have that information.

So we can just state it included because it's not pertinent to be specific. Agreed.

Yeah, we we don't need to see that at this point. OK, Chris, does that answer your question? You comfortable with that?

CL **Chris Lukasina** 46:08

Yeah, you answered my question. I appreciate it. But I mean, I've been through a lot of merger processes over the years and by the time we're getting through to, we we've got some level of functional designs to be looking at. So if there's anything, it sounds like you have them. If you could provide them, that'd be great. Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 46:27

Right.

OK, so we'll make a note of that and we'll figure out how to work with Chris. We can make sure Chris has current information outside of this meeting.

OK.

OK. So going east of the I-42 interchange and up here before you change pages, so we are including the the bulb house for for for.

I need I40I42I36. Do we want to?

So Chad, Russell, Addison, Mike, when I worked with study areas, yeah, this is a study area. When I worked with the GIS guy and just being a biologist, I wanted to make sure there was enough room for everything. They didn't have to go out there again. I did a week, worked with the GIS guy.

Make sure that we were behind the gores on the Interstate so we didn't have to do an Interstate modification. Are you comfortable Division four with where the study area is on this interchange? Do you want it modified?

If we modify it, then I can change it for the the concurrence point.

I mean, I don't, I don't. Yeah, unless it poses an issue for some like that, I I don't see a problem going ahead and doing down to the core areas, you know, as long as as time progresses, reopen the head off. Yeah. So, OK, there's still work, right? Yeah, I

mean, but the worst would happen.

That should happen since the lesson 20-30. Well, that's what I'm saying as it goes on, another right slip from onto the onto the home ramp. At least we're covered study area wise.

It would have a personal impact. So yeah, that was my logic. That's fine. It's fine. I just want to make sure that we was closed, 'cause that looked like the biggest area that got added.

And then it's just if we were touching it, might as well just make sure we're setting it up for the ultimate check worries. Yeah, I don't want to send somebody out there again, just be conservative about it. We got to go out. It takes 5 minutes to walk that way. It takes a couple days to set up, go out and do it again. So that's where my life. OK.

Um, is everybody online? Does anybody have a question about that?

OK. Thank you. Continuing to go east. So this big complex that you're starting to see here, this is the the hospital. So did a lot of coordination with the hospital to try and make sure that they had the access in the driveways and.

Things that they wanted so.

And there also is a medical office complex building down here. So it tends, it comes out of the interchange symmetrically and then shifts slightly to the north to avoid this medical office complex that's over here and you'll begin to see that a little bit more.

So big hospital complex, smaller hospital complexes and there actually is they're building more here. So you can see that this starts to shift to the other side of the road.

Amelia Church is the next intersection that we come to east of Amelia Church. We're going to be symmetrical.

And again, that's to avoid displacements of residences and businesses. And as you can see, this particular section here is where you start really getting into a lot of urban setting new developments.

Those kind of things. There's businesses along the roadway and what I'm not talking about in this particular is we change typical sections as we go east of I-42 and I can show you the typical sections are on this next.

So then continuing along, this is Barbara Mill going right into town. We and this is the very skewed intersection that we had talked about originally.

This is the school. This is West Clayton Elementary School. This is Guy Road. And all

of this right in here created a lot of backup and heartburn going into the school and having the buses come out, having this very

Skewed intersection having Guy Rd. come in. So we talked about this in the pre-meeting. There were there were quite a lot of reasons to realign Barbara Mill Road and make it 1 intersection to align with Guy Rd.

And so we we did bump out the study area down here to to better get the tie in. This is the Clayton Town Maintenance Center. So it'll run up the one side of the maintenance center and then going into US 70 business.

Um.

I believe we are.

So east of the elementary school, it shifts to the South to avoid impacts to the church, which is here.

And then become symmetrical again to cross Little Creek and this is Little Creek and its bridge and it has several wetlands on either side of it. They will not currently.

There's a proposed walking trail here. We're going to accommodate that also.

So how are you accommodating it? Just allow for access. I'm not specifically familiar.

So at at the river crossing we are widening to the South. We will build just like.

Edison described one side and the other, there is a pedestrian bridge on the north side and so during during construction we'll be able to build the South side while the north side is open and then move traffic over to the South and then we will remove the pedestrian and.

And rebuild the the road and it'll all become one bridge. So there'll be a 320 on the play pair. We have splitting them up and keeping them all on. So the pedestrian travel would be on this side of the neighborhood on the north side. OK, that'll be where it is today.

There was a 12 year old.

There was there. There had been a fatal pedestrian accident on that section of Rd. there between the school and the park and so division is has been great. They have done a lot of coordination with the school and actually have through a separate program some improvements to the.

Facility to get vehicles off the off the road and into the school and that's complete and part of the bar mill actually shifting it away from the school. That angle intersection has caused a lot of.

Conflicts during pick up and and drop off, so pulling it away from the school removes those and so the dot division has been working with them and the county school

system.

To make sure that everybody is open to some improvements, however, exactly how we cross them right at the school, kind of. Once we get there, there are ideas about, you know, the crossing and one side versus the other. Yeah, will the Barbara Mill crossing build or intersection go away?

There, that intersection, the bar mill is existing. It goes away. Yes. OK. They say it's something the rim middle, the rim middle of the road will stay there and just be severed at at there as part of way that that was kind of what I was going to ask the the the store wall that was the other second parcel.

The second historic parcel is actually the contributing element or one of the contributing elements is inside the right of way and is a hole across from the school Canyon along Barbara Bell. And so it cleans up safety.

Makes traffic flow better and reduces impacts and as a mitigation division has been working with the school system to make sure they're whole as we go towards them.

The whole parcel with the keeper of the records and seals house is much easier.

Easier to see and where that property is on figure E3 of the environmental features map. So you can see where that house is and where the school is and the the house is on a small parcel and then the the rock wall just follows along the curve.

Above I-42 or excuse me, NC 42 and Barbara Mill Rd. But it's inside the right away division. It's already been clear to me that all the plans get to show do not touch the wall. Makes sense.

Yeah. Is that on this plan you're showing here, Mark, on the screen? It is not. It's on the screen. This is the aerial. Let me see. This is the house. I believe this is the house. Yes, right up against this little driveway here and the wall, the wall runs along this corner.

And it comes down to move out right here and because of the angle and sight distance and everything, it's it's not historically done. It's eligible safest thing to drive apart. So that's part of.

Yeah.

So that whole area has a lot of history that the divisions got a lot of talking about and coordination.

OK.

So as I mentioned, we have typical sections, curb and gutter from NC 50 to old drugstore in the West area. Portion of that is also going to have a shoulder section. I'm not.

Familiar where the brakes are with curb and gutter and shoulder in the West area. So we're we're best to go on from 50 to the back of public with curb and gutter now. OK, just because it's becoming more urban as it goes and we're changing our typical time to keep up.

Bagger truck or something. Please talk about on the on the more front cross. Yeah, sure. So the majority of the West area is going to have shoulder section.

Then going into the central area coming from Sunlon Parkway is going to be curb and gutter to past the Walmart past.

Board Meadows, it's just to where the construction and the the development just has gone. Oh, there's a food line. There's a food line. There's a new food line. It's before that, so it's before.

Bridge. So before we get to the bridge, so that it goes to the grass inside the Walmart is auto parts store, as he thinks, parcels in front of the Walmart and then it goes to the shoulder as it goes to the bridge until it gets to.

542 Yeah, so we'll have a shoulder section with a wide shoulder on it through the I and I-42 interchange past the I-42 interchange we're going to start adding.

Either a sidewalk or a multi-use path. And as we've just discussed, originally we were thinking that was just going to be one-sided and now they're talking about it being 2 sided from the whole segment from NC42 into town.

So both multi-use path on one side and sidewalk on the other. Thanks. Well, the most recent discussion has been, yes.

So ultimately when we get that decision, we'll we'll update these typicals tomorrow, the barms are there. So it's just build it or not build that. OK, they don't want the town walls. Sure. No. Yeah, when we get further, probably a concurrent going forward to get for us to see.

Where we have multi-use trail or pedestrian impacts for for core permitting.

Yeah, there's nothing there now on any side of the highway in front of the hospital, the hospital and some of those out parcels. They recently made developers build it there. So we're going to start tying, tying all that together.

Cool.

Preliminarily, so I updated this from the 2018 documentation. So for instance, we're doing a noise, a new noise analysis. So the number of of receptors has changed.

What I did for residential and business impacts was I looked at the 2025.

Public involvement maps and counted so added added my buffer and and counted how many we were hitting. So update updated those numbers.

I believe the stream and wetland impacts, you'll have to excuse me. Those are current numbers and they say slope stakes plus 25 feet, but that should be consistent with what was on the map. So that should be slope stakes plus 4025 feet or slope stakes plus 40 feet depending on the section.

My apologies, there's an error in that table.

And we added square footage for riparian buffers.

Same kind of assumptions for the buffers. Yes, we will be using the part about it. OK, what? Yeah, if you could go back surely to the slide before that. So for the muscled.

Of your biological conclusions are correct there. We've got critical habitat in Swift Creek for the Atlantic pig toe and the yellow plants, which automatically throws you into a form of consultation, but we have the programmatic.

The and I think it's safe to assume may affect likely to adversely affect for all of the other mussel species as well because we do have records in the vicinity. The one question I had though, or I guess a couple.

Deuce River Water Dog. We don't have any occurrences right there at the Cracksley and Swift Creek, but we do within less than a mile. So are y'all just assuming presence? OK, it would probably be the easiest thing to pay.

OK, that makes sense. And then Carolina, Matt, Tom, we don't have any records anywhere near, but that's tied in with. So yeah, so you might as well say, OK, but that's the way I ran out if you disagree with us all. But no, I think that's probably the best way to do it. Of course you've got a crossing of.

What is it? White Oak Creek. So that's a that's another crossing. We'll have to talk about that as far as in lieu fee pavements. I think worth wedge muscle has been found in White Oak Creek, so.

Yeah, we we can talk about Swift Creek. I assume both programmatic. Why they got some mussels and probably going to assume the other one as well. Yeah. And is there another bridge as well? What's the other? Those are the two bridges.

And then it's a little, right? Why? Why is that culvert? There's two in the center section, two sets of ridges in the center section, one set of eight. So why don't some of them culverts? OK, but still they're big culverts, so.

Culvert. Culvert. Part of about it. Steel probably holds. OK, so it's going to be a culvert. That's the stitches bridge. Swift Creek, White Oak.

OK. So we may need to talk about White Oak. OK, I think that's a bridge. I think for mussels probably best to the same presence. The other, the Neutral Water Dog, Caroline Matt Tom, maybe not, maybe not. And then the third bridge, that's a little

little. That's the one back by 70 in.

OK. That one's probably not, but like I said, we're we were going, we left it in there and on from the in off we are and when we get around them get ready to permit the thing, we were going to look at the latest I pack and reach out to you and kind of discuss it.

Make a determination of just pay for everything or do some studies. Yeah, I just. I don't want you to pay for things that you don't necessarily have to. We can talk about it. But yeah, we we.

Push that off just as far as permit as we can so we don't have to reopen surveys and stuff like that.

OK. So again, those are preliminary impacts. This is probably what I'm going to run with with the consultation when we do that this summer, although obviously some as as we shift study areas, if we find new things or anything along those lines will.

And I'll recheck IPAC again. I want to say I checked IPAC just.

Last week or just before I submitted this. So this is current, but we'll do it again in the summer. Yeah, we are narrowing down the the ranges quite a bit. Yeah, I want to say I've red cognated woodpecker and something else. Oh.

Southern hognose. As a biologist, I'm I keep up with, yeah, we just changed the southern hognose snake range drastically. I mean, we cut it down a lot smaller than what it was. So yeah, those came off. That's a change, just a real recent change.

So this is what concurrence .2 currently reads as that that will carry the the best fit alternative carried forward. And I know that there's some discussion Seth and Matt and Addison and etcetera, so.

Let me just, I'll ask again, but based on this conversation, do you concur with this or or not? No, but it's still, I hear you. You guys talked about it before the meeting.

Kind of go into the merger processes, the the North and South alternatives still meet your purpose and need. Not saying you have to do them, but we have to at least there's kind of a show your work aspect to to go into this process and and that's not unique to merger if you.

Pulled it out of merger and came out with an IP. I I still need to ask you for alternatives that would make your purpose made. So our division board plan moved forward. I think we've talked to Mike a little bit. So we're we're going to do some 2D work basically going in and move those.

Alignments to the left, right and center and give you whatever offsets you want, which is whatever the loss it is. So slopes say plus 50 or well, there's my image plus in

a certain slope state plus in a certain buffer. Yeah, we we can work with conceptual. Yes, right.

But like you're saying, you have the alternatives you should in public meeting maps and things like that. So the the intent's not for this to be like a giant list, but Mike actually going up some old files where we have a rough layout and so when we when we started building how to build the best way we started off.

With something somewhere, yeah. So we'll just have to have to find the files from 10 years ago and try and clean them up. I guess that I think, I think, I think I understand a little bit. Yeah, we can clean them up, put the put the delineated areas as a reference file kind of.

Get rough numbers for one of those alternatives would be and then maybe have you know the whole table together so we can kind of work towards. And I think you guys, you guys have likely done done what we're asking to do exactly. And that's what NEPA and 40481, a lot of it is us documenting the federal decision.

Making process. So that's that's all we're trying to do is have it. It sounds like y'all did the the pieces at minimum in your mind. You got the best fit somehow and we're just asking you when we understand. I my hope was that memo suffice. Yeah. Call our students OK if that ain't good enough.

We can go back and show our work. Yeah, yeah, true table for them. I appreciate it. I was really sick because I mean we we met downtown and in their in their building to go through and we rolled out the same maps then.

We did the work. We just don't have to basically that's that table. We didn't put it to a table, but you can dig that old, old stuff. It's not a heavy lift. Is that is that the level that you want? And after that do you think we can? That's the level, yeah. So we would, so we would update the concurrence point to show these other.

These other alternatives that we would move them forward and then that would kind of correlate the conference .2 A and that I don't want to steal your Thunder. Do you want to just just to clarify, do you want to say just a north, a South or a north-south and a total symmetrical?

I think it makes you guys have presented so far a best fit and all of them so OK, I just I think that I just make sure it's rather than throwing a new one in the mix. OK, I'll just make sure. I'm sorry Sean, you're just talking a CP2 doesn't look like a CP3.

That's what I'm trying to do. Yeah, we're kind of skipping the answer here.

And Amanetta is is asking to speak as Mark. So go ahead Amanetta.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:10:57

Yeah, in in addition, in addition to the North and South, I noticed that at least for I guess the purpose and need part of the project said that the 2040 population was expected to be 38,000 residents.

But it used 2010 population data. Is there any way we could get more updated just so we can say that yes, we started this project almost a decade ago, but it's still showing that as many or if not more residents are expected to be in the area to help just strengthen the whole argument?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:31

So you're not talking traffic forecast, you're talking population forecast, census data.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:11:36

Well, you you mentioned in your social and economic conditions of the packet, I think it's section 3.1 that that was part of the reason that the congestion was so was expected to to continue to grow. And I'm saying if we're updating the information anyway, can we make it just more up-to-date?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:11:57

So that's that 2018 memo that I inserted. It never got formally finalized, but yeah, we've had another sense. When we did it, we had an internal memo that we were working from, but it never got included as part of the NEPA documentation.

To pull that forward, I just, I just embedded it in here as as a this is a 2018 memo so that that logic was here and I believe that's what Amanetta is asking that that some of that census data can be updated.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:12:18

OK, so the I.

Hmm.

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

And Addison, you were comfortable with that? I mean, I guess you wouldn't change the previous memo from 2018, you would just add another document to supplement saying that since that was done, there's been another census and it's obviously going

to show the county growth as a risk there.

There, we know it's exploded. Um.

Is that memo given adding any value at this? Because we've changed the purpose and need since the memo.

Just going that other slot, I'm not concerned with updating the memo. If we want to pull it out of the packet, we can do that. That would.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:13:17

You could just update the packet and not have to redo the memo. It's just it needs if I understand the packet information was pulled from the memo. If we just update the packet 'cause we're gonna have to update it anyway with the North and South alignments and stuff like that.

Let's just update everything so we're just consistent, because if anyone else was to look back on this project, let's say five years from now, we just want to make sure that it's clear on what our decisions were based off of.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:13:50

OK, So what I'm hearing and and is that put a new packet together, look at the memo. I may pull the memo out and and because a lot of it discusses level of service and interchanges and and travel delay, I may just.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:14:03

Mhm.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:14:08

Insert a section in there that that talks about growth in that portion of the county and and the continued growth rate is that.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:14:15

OK.

Yep, that'd be fantastic. That would be fantastic. And that way it clears up everything and makes a nice, clean, concise document.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:14:20

OK.

OK.

And the said that we're also going to update concurrence point. We're going to get the data, we're going to look at the data and then we'll discuss concurrence point too. Is that what I'm hearing? Yeah.

Seth, you good with that one, Madison? OK.

so it's clear to me so it was one that was going to be like an e-mail with the the new written language that we decided on and potentially concurrency via e-mail but the second one would be an additional meeting I'm hoping not I hope the table will lay it out pretty clearly that the best

Yes.

Basically prefer or whatever we're so an updated packet and then a new concurrence point. So the packet emailed to you guys to review, we're not talking about that, but we're talking about detailed alternatives. But yeah, that were.

They were showing the impacts related to those other alternatives and showing you that we're best taking the best fit forward. OK. I think I was just clarifying that we would be OK with the table. Yeah, I think we, yeah, so they would.

But I I don't want to. Do I have to do another meeting for EPU? Oh, no, no, no. So yeah, my preference will be to not do another meeting and I think if you send us the updated package.

But we can do it similar to the purpose of need statement where you send it and say does this look like what we talked about in the meeting? We can give you comments if there were any, hopefully there's not any and then we you know proceed the the siding portion of this. So the updates for CP2 would be including the North and the South alternative, right?

In the package itself, you would, you know, analyze them like you did that bit. So we would, we would see the table and that would kind of it'll.

When we get to CP3, we'll kind of begin the conversations that I think everybody wants to have now and that's when we'll do the lead bud referrals. Scott, the whole point is we've already gone through pretty deep design. Yeah, but if we can go back and add these alternatives.

And that level of analysis is enough. Yeah, we get there. If it's not enough to, we got. Yeah, I'm thinking we can. Is anybody opposed to conceptual CP2? Yeah, we're fine.

We can easily accommodate that. All right, I'm just, I'm going to ask an apples to apples and and because I'm tend to be a very practical person and I got to deal with these numbers. So the conceptual designs are going to, Mike's going to lay them out

and I'm going to put a 40 foot buffer on them.

The whole length with the best fit is going to stay with 40 foot buffer, a 25 foot buffer and a 40 foot buffer. Just so that you all know there's going to be a little bit of a gap or a change, but that's because that already has some drainage and utilities on it, right? That part already has.

Has drainage and utilities and has those easements already on it. So quite honestly, 25 will actually be more aggressively than the other because.

And you're also going to make slope stakes options, right? Yes, yes. So it'll be language plus the slope stakes option and then the buffer. So yeah, the buffer is currently slope stakes from slope stakes and and since it's, I mean since it's.

NC route or Interstate routes for the break. So where those be I I would I think personally in terms of design being just a designer, I think you should be comfortable with or I feel comfortable with providing that type of breaking for you to pull those numbers from.

Because they're bites that are at that same level. So even though each section is they're not the same, the alternate left, right, best fit, they're all at the same.

So when you are you telling me that for the central area you would do a level that you're comfortable with that I can put a 25 foot buffer on it. Is that what you're saying? No, I think I think you have the 40 and this because there's so many utilities out there we probably added.

OK. I think you could probably even go on the best fit less than the 25 because we've got utilities and drainage already laid out there. It's just, OK, I hear what you're saying, but but I think the real thing that the agencies are after is we want to see left, right.

That you did your homework in picking the correct side for where that right should be done and where the left should be done to build the best fit. I just want to make sure that everybody's comfortable with what the buffers are. We don't want to skew and we don't want to skew to say that one section is near 65% design as Mike keeps saying for the best fit.

It and it has drainage and utilities on it. In fact, as Mike would be making an argument that I could go probably to a 15 foot buffer on it or 10, I mean be well, 10 would allow you construction access. Others are going to have, I'm sorry, they're going to. I thought same thing. It's not apples to apples at that point.

It's going to be, it's still going to be the right answer because it's obvious what we're doing, but I mean, I can back it off and they strip off. I can strip off the drainage and

utilities and you can do the 25 and slip space and right.

Further along with design. That's so weird. But yeah, we could do a pair comparison. You could back it off. All we do is show like this and pretend like you haven't done that. Yeah, I mean, we're kind of back the preferred out. We're kind of reversing. We'll go in reverse lanes plus an assumed slope stay plus a buffer.

But then you're gonna get a true comparison. I'll think, I'll think because we you you guys have likely already done some points, some minimization and whatnot and documented it in there and we wouldn't even have actually do that yet. So just do that.

That'll change. That'll change the maps, which is fine.

We'll change the numbers a little bit. Yeah, we'll change the numbers a little bit. OK. That's why. That's why I brought it up. It's it's the comparison thing, just to make sure that everybody was comfortable with the level. The middle part, she was used to everything you had. So it wasn't understood. Yeah. So when you when I said change, the numbers change, I thought you.

I was misread here. Oh, sorry. Yeah. Oh, OK. So you don't feel like you need. You know what you need for concurrence .2? Yes. Yeah, that's what's called. Yeah. OK. We'll just stay consistent in all the assumptions across all three sections. I think that's fine. Yeah. And then we know where Apple's at. Then we start talking about when some immunization on y'all are gonna look like, you know, we got, yeah, yeah, geniuses. We like that. That's right.

All right, so bridging discussion. Do we even want to go to a bridging discussion? For 2A, for 2A, what do we got? 37 minutes. I hear a yes. Yeah, I mean, if it's safe, let's have to get together later. But can we do it in 37 minutes? Yeah, this this one really long, pretty straightforward.

Bridge to bridge, culvert to culvert. So I think my my only comment was just that you know now now we've agreed that we're bringing some more alternatives into two that you would just at least give me a narrative description for QA for these so.

I don't want to, I don't know the answer, but I'm going to assume that a N winding is the same kind of bridge for Slope Creek, just it's on the north. But if there was something where it's, you know, uniquely different, you know that this would be the time to tell us, but it may just be we're doing the same kind of work.

Work just on that side instead of that side. This might not be a giant wood, but it's more just along the merger process. Given the nature of these creeks, it would be the same either way.

Yeah, but we can, we can write that. OK, let's just pull in Hydro and do a quick, you know, analysis of looking at, yeah, Hydro already explained a report quick. We know they are basically saying I don't think the problem is right there grass because we are bridging everything that's bridges and it will.

Change what we would do when we and I believe, unless I'm completely mistaken, that none of the bats are going to be in the Creek.

So I I I want to say on what the Swift Creek one's pretty big. The the other one's big.

So that kind of comes into play with the use of the problematic. Yeah, well, well, yes.

And I was very aware that when I laid out this bridge four, four or five years ago.

I don't remember what we end up with, but if if we end up with a bit in the water, it will be just three spans, 400 feet. So right, we're probably good or we're trying to get 120, right? Program and always. But yeah, it's just it's a same that that you will span it.

With up to 120 and after that then we we don't assume that you have to do that.

But that was a good point. We'll go back and forth.

OK, so three bridges. If they're currently two line bridges, we're going to have sets of duals, although and so build one, take down the old one.

Put the new one where the old one was, so there'll be a gap in the middle.

Culverts. There's 22 large box culverts on this project. They're on the West area.

They're Buffalo Creek and the UT to Buffalo Creek. So they're right near that NC 50 interchange. And so we've got a a double 9 by 8 currently.

They're recommending a double 9 by 9, so effectively the same size. My understanding it's working hydraulically. So they're they're looking into extensions both to the north and to the South to accommodate everything that needs to happen on Buffalo Creek.

The UT to Buffalo Creek is real similar. They haven't gotten as far with the design on that yet, so I don't have lengths for the extension to North and South. And did somebody? Yeah, so those those bridges do span.

I was talking with VHB and Galen and he told me that if the Buffalo Creek, they're going to look at the hydraulics. If they need to do some extra capacity, they would look at a bore and Jack with a supplemental pipe.

Which is standard stuff there. So we're, I mean, those cars are very well built. We'll be doing extensions on. If we can't beat the hydraulic leave there, we'll do, we'll do a jack and bore upside of the title.

Just standard stuff. We don't want to open cut that road ever. Would that be a

double culvert or is that like a flood plain over? So whatever is there now and yeah, we've ran into that too, but I I think they're probably both and they were built.

Or what? What are you the jack and bore? I guess the jack and bore would be just the overflow. OK, so I I like a floodplain pipe, right? The ties in and making all that works. Yes, so nuance there, but that's the only way to do it, OK?

Trying to stage construct the triple barrel box go would be nightmare. So we're I think we can get away with the extensions under the objective more if needed. I'm hoping I'll probably form it still be analyzed. So do I have the data?

For the UT to Buffalo Creek, I noticed that existing as a single and then I had written the the recommended as a double barrel.

And I may have gotten that off of. There was also a report out there. Yeah, yeah, we're looking at it. You think it's going to be extended, but like you said, like I'm saying, so my my bad that I'm looking at an older report.

They're going to redo the hydraulics, so chances are you're just going to extend the the seven by seven single barrel that's.

So do we want to sign this? Do we want to wait and just pass it all around when we get all the updates for the emails or those tiles into that weigh in and then get those paragraphs together for for the group about what the Bridges and Covert like all the other alternates.

Even though I think we all know, but we will, we will definitely that and yeah, back that up with some data. I don't, I don't want me to have to guess at it. So yeah, once once you guys do the the rest of concurrence points, we'll look at that.

The packet, Yeah, yeah, the packet will be updated and and so and the concurrence points will be consistent with the packet and with the math and everything along those lines. OK, that's um.

Generally, the merge point merger team asked you to add the avoidance and minimization. This is primarily from that meeting that we had with Eric and Rob back in the day. I cleaned it up a little bit for some of the language.

But that's where the avoidance and minimization is is about and the Barber Mill added added the the discussion that we had about Barber Mill and the historic and the school and the skew into that so.

If you all take a look at this and and let me know if there's any comments about where we are with avoidance and minimization documentation at this time.

That's it.

We still have a half hour. Thank you all. I have no more. I have no more slides, but

one that says questions. Apparently I didn't have one that said questions. See, I was thinking ahead and and trying to avoid that. So so just to recap, I mean, I think we can easily get there with personee. I think that's supposed to sit out around. Sounds like we got a little bit of design work or at least drawings and stuff in and. And let Hydro look at that there from the bridge. So we'll we'll work on that. But those are the drafts to more for the packet sale. We'll probably go ahead and try to get out personally within a couple of weeks once you'll look at it. OK.

Yeah, right. So we're and yeah, just to verify what?

Gary was asking about and that's a good thing. I was hoping I hadn't made those made those comments for four years ago. Yeah, looks like we'll be we'll be staying all three so programmatic. We'll we'll hold Gary. Thank you. But anyway, yeah, we'll we'll clean up.

OK. First one fairly quickly and then we'll probably incorporate everything else to the document. I'll let y'all. OK. Thank you. Is everybody online clear with that or have any questions?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:32:20

So just to be clear, we should expect I guess the revised documents in a couple of weeks or so.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:32:26

Yeah, the the design part might take a little while. I'm hoping it'll be quick, but we'll we'll probably go out and throw that person need out fairly quickly since we it's just a sentence or two or clean it up and let and let that kind of be out there by itself and we'll we'll clean up two and two day.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:32:38

Evening.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:32:43

And then all the above be in in in the loop back if that's OK, but.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:32:47

OK. That sounds awesome. Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:32:50

Yeah, the physical drawing work will take that much time. It's more reformat and then pulling the back together will take the most time.

Alright.

But getting there, yeah, this first couple steps will be like that. And then the the main goal here is is for A and that's that's where the yeah, all that plans and have to talk about something, alright.

Thank you all for your time. Really appreciate it. Thank you for everybody online. We we appreciate you sitting through this and we appreciate your comments. Thank you.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 1:33:32

Thank you.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription