

# R-3410 - CP1 Pre-Meeting-20260318\_130655-Meeting Recording

March 18, 2026, 5:06PM

42m 58s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

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

Yeah.

We've had so many technical difficulties in this room today. We had to call IT and everything else. I've been so there he is. There he is. Look who we have all sidetracked there. He got lost in the in the maze too around here.

Keep the map and my thing here. Oh my God.

OK.

**MR** **Martha Register** 0:33

All right. So now now that we got a full quorum, we'll we'll let's, we'll let's sit down again, Chad or Russell, if the two of you just want to introduce what we're doing here and then I can sort of move forward.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:35

Good job, Morgan.

**MR** **Martha Register** 0:52

Going through the packet and general project information and we'll just randomly answer. Not randomly, but the right people will answer as we get questions.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 1:04

All right, Martha, I appreciate it. See you again. This is Chad \*\*\*\*. I'm one of the project managers on this project. The way dot busted this one up was basically 2 project managers and three sections. And we'll we'll say it over and over again so everybody understands we're not building this thing as three separate projects. It is one project, but from a design standpoint it made sense to kind of break it up into three different sections. VHB is doing section A with me and then Mott Mac is doing the B&C section. So this is NC 42.

From NC 50 to US 70 business, so 8 miles of urban widening essentially 2 lane, 3 lane section to a full lane divided, you know the old term Super St. basically. And yeah, so we we we're different levels of design which we'll talk about with Martha.

But the goal here is to get everything on the same page and definitely have it all wrapped up nice neat for you know 4A4B when we get down to permit and and the deeper level hydro talks will all be at the same design level at that point.

And see the same through the finish line. So early on we were talking about taking one of these sessions Kyle to that 4B meeting me and Kyle Barnes looked at a little bit and we opened up this this discussion that we're having today of maybe taking the same back through merger.

To kind of clean up the permit inside, document some of the the concurrence points in more formal way and using that GP31 as a potential, you know, permit and mechanism versus a a full-blown IP.

This does have a a sign C document as of 2018. A lot of public meetings have been documented as well. A lot of this preliminary work has already gone into this project, so we can lay out all that and pull all those documents in as as needed.

Any other comments, Russell or Addison? I'm working from my car, so I don't have any notes in front of me, but I think that's the theme. The let dates out in 2031, I believe.

**GA** **Gainey, Norwood A** 3:16

Yeah, Chad, I was just going to add that the the the actual TIP description for this will be updated cause the road names have changed so that can get confusing. But it's no longer NC42, it's a combination of NC 36 and Veterans Parkway so.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 3:18

Yeah.

Yeah.

Sure.

Right.

**GA** **Gainey, Norwood A** 3:36

That is, uh, it's still our project R 3410, but the the step description is going to be updated.

**CC Coggins, Tony C** 3:42  
Yeah, good point, good point, so.

**MR Martha Register** 3:46  
And and I will throw in there just another confusing thing because this is in the STIP, not in AB and C and we don't want people to get the impression that we're we're working on three different projects. I think we have generally settled on West area, Central.  
Area and E area as designations and I would I would appreciate it if everybody would go there so that I don't get confused since I have to write all of this up.

**CC Coggins, Tony C** 4:09  
OK.  
Understood. So yeah, hopefully that made sense to everybody of kind of why we're here and I will turn it all to Martha and kind of walk through the packet if that's if that's the next step.

**MR Martha Register** 4:32  
Did anybody else FHWA Corp of Engineers or DWQ want to make intro comments?

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 4:33  
Yeah.  
No, I'm good with you carrying on. Yeah, the more the the core sent some comments ahead of time. We can kind of get through those at some point during the meeting if you guys want to do that after you're running through the the document.

**MR Martha Register** 4:48  
All right.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 5:01  
But that's fine with me. I guess one comment as we get through the document is the majority of your hyperlinks didn't work for regulatory agencies.  
Paul.

**MR Martha Register** 5:16

Yeah, I think that they're in the the internal SharePoint and that's my bad. I used that so I can move a lot of the that documentation and coordinate with Hannah and make sure I get it in the right place.  
So that y'all can see what I was.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 5:34

I think you you sent me a lot of them which helps. What what I was hoping is if I think when we signed the concurrence points it it'd be great if that document was updated was updated but but but but you did have access I I was able to review it for the for the sake of this but when we sent it that's essentially like our our record of the decision we.  
Or signing on to. So it'd be great if if that was legible for future critics of my decision.  
Uh, that.

**MR Martha Register** 6:01

No doubt. Yeah, no. The hyperlinks in the draft packet that I sent can be updated and then I guess what I need to use Hannah, let me confirm that is the the external folder for everything for merger. Is that correct?

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 6:03

OK.  
Yes.

**MR Martha Register** 6:18

OK.  
Um.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 6:23

How many people that you have access to the external lab? Sometimes I can't get into the external. OK, yeah, sometimes I just. OK, yeah, because there was some some stuff was was in there that was, you know, easier, like next time CE was in the external collab and um, some other documents. OK.

And then you you were able to share a lot of them with me that helped me when I just make sure I can give you guys a good review point at this meeting.

**MR** **Martha Register** 6:51

Much appreciated. I didn't. I didn't. My apologies. I didn't mean to make that any harder than it needed to be. So let me just share what we're all talking about. So we're all on the same page. I put together a draft packet.

As Chad has said and others have alluded to, we signed a CE for this in July of 2018. Um.

Moved the project forward pretty fast and we were actually at the time looking at a construction date, I think of 2021. Of course, with everything that's happened, this project has moved at its own schedule like a lot of things do in life. And so now we're back in a situation where we.

We want to start looking at permitting and hopefully using the the regional general permit that that Chad mentioned. So we're hoping that with this first meeting, formal meeting that's I believe scheduled for about a month from now we can get through purpose and.

We need alternative and bridging, so that's why we have the hydraulics and the roadway teams here. I tried to lay out for you in this, you know what the project history was and the.

You know where we had been and as you've noticed, like there's some things that I updated intentionally and mentioned that we're using Veterans Parkway or I-142 and then.

In one of the cases, I actually dropped a memo in here that had never been formally put in the project record, and this was an internal purpose and need memo that we created and utilized. So that's why that's in here in italics.

And I didn't update that to current nomenclature because it was something that was created for the CE in 2018 and I wanted it recorded that way.

So I think getting to.

The US Army Corps of Engineers comments in specifics, so I had put in.

Some information in regards to, well, let me get his comments. That would be easier. Um.

So you were you were, um, asking about changes or um?

A little bit of of update to language for the purpose and need. Um.

From my point of view, I saw some of those edits as more just taking out supporting,

supporting language that supported the purpose and need. Does anybody object? Anybody else? FHWA?

FHWA if we change the purpose and need going forward, I know I have to do. I'm planning to do a consultation document and so that can be updated.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 10:13

It it seems to me that it has to be based on the increased.

Development in the area and all of the other changes since then. Yeah, I think kind of the the root of the course comments was we were concerned that the purpose of need was really narrow if your purpose is just to add additional capacity to 42.

It's kind of presumptuous where we're going. So that was the biggest thing we took out of here. A lot of the the additional text that I struck through was more of evaluation criteria of how are we going to judge an alternative meth person need.

And if people are saying, Matt, you're crazy right now, it's it's fine to to tell me that there's a lot of people that have done meatball a lot longer than me. So is is that an unusual purpose and need for a widening project or is that?

I'm open to being talked out, but.

I'm OK with it. I I don't as long as there's no concern that that we kind of or we use a double negative. I'm hoping we have no challenges meeting that criteria.

Right. It it is the same criteria that you guys use I I think right. So like a logical question will be like So what that so we change the words, does it change the reasonable range of alternatives? I don't think so. Yeah, I think that's that was where I was.

Yeah, it doesn't appear there's there's a road parallel in 42 that could be something that would need to be studied. I don't know that a new location Rd. is reasonable.

So.

I guess that's.

Yeah, that was my thought. And again, this is, you know, for the purposes of core permitting. OK. So it has it. It wouldn't have any bearing on the C or anything like that. Yeah, and I understand that. Sorry not to get too prescriptive at this point.

Yeah, you're kind of defining, you know, when you write a person need, you you start with the need and then what? What problem are we solving? Not necessarily how are we solving?

Does that make sense? Does division have any concern with that?

Charter.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 12:44

No, it sounds reasonable to me. I mean like you said the the So what question was the point. I mean it doesn't really change anything we're we're necessarily doing. And yeah, I'm I'm no expert on purpose and need but by no stretch. But and my other question was does it reopen the CE? Can we handle it in a consultation? That type of question was where the division was going with it.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 13:07

Good question.

We so we know, like once said, we know we're gonna have to do consultation. Um. Given the given uh the.

The scenario here, can we explain that change?

I mean, I I think so because you're you're not, it's not like a substantive change, right. It's it's more just kind of how we phrase it. That's right. Yeah. OK, shifting around. So it's and what you added was it was listed later as like a primary objective. Wasn't that how it was?

And what was lined out. Oh, maybe I I know I had taken. Yeah, see that there by the objective. So it it felt like to me it just kind of got I think got moved around more than and this might just be that Matt's head works different than whoever written and.

You know that NEPA's as subjective as things get. Yeah, I don't really see in that wording change. I think our alternatives analysis in of itself, right? And there could be other things, but not this.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 14:28

Right. That's that's what the division cares about, not reopening you know alternatives, but but so much. I mean we can easily explain away why we did what we did. We have great documentation of all of that, but we don't want to start over or or back up much with with going through merger.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 14:46

That makes sense.

Sounds like we're good with that first point, OK.

**MR Martha Register** 14:53

OK.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 14:55

Oh.

I guess for the the second bullet on there, it you know it. I just noted that there were some some design changes from the sign C.

So.

**MR Martha Register** 15:08

And and allow me to I I'll I will um handle a couple of those just real quick and and um.

So working on where's my OK working on trying to get all of this together and and I missed a couple of of edit pieces.

And I'll go, I'll go jump down to at least two of them.

So what we wanted to do when we originally did the document.

The study area, and this is the central area and this isn't US or excuse me, what is currently labeled as as Hwy. 70, but this is I-42. We extended the study area through the interchange.

And in in talking to a lot of people, we just felt that we didn't want to do that because we didn't want to imply that we were changing the interchange at all or that we were looking to upgrade that bridge. So I asked my GIS tech to.

Truncate the study area and that gave us the the east, excuse me, the West section, the central, the West area, the central area and the east area and in the process of doing that this one.

Portion of the study area going to the east got shifted back a little too far. So originally the study area was through the interchange and I think that any of those cut and fill slopes and Mike you can.

Come in and and tell me that I'm wrong. Those cut and fill slopes are in existing right of way and they were in the existing study area. It just doesn't look like it at the moment and we will readjust that. So the study area goes through the interchange and captures those cut and fill slopes.

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

OK, yeah, I I kind of noted just the the areas throughout where I noticed that the cut and fill exceeded the study area. I think the the core is only concern there is to make sure that the the studies associated with.

**MR** **Martha Register** 17:19

The other, yeah.

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

The permitting process would extend to the extent of the work you're proposing. It's, you know, we we wouldn't want to miss a a feature out there.

**MR** **Martha Register** 17:47

Understood, understood. So I will go back through with Chad and Russell and we'll take a look at these and and discuss what might be needed to pick up these pieces. So here's the here's the 70 business.

We've got cut and fill slope that looks like it's extending outside of our study area there.

You mentioned Anna Drive, I know is one of them. These two pieces right here at US 70 I 42.

Here's Anna Drive. Here's a little piece right here. So yeah, we can look at those and and talk about those and make sure that everything is either properly contained or that we go out and re-evaluate it if we need to.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:40

OK, sounds good. That one, is that the Barbara Mill or no, not yet.

**MR** **Martha Register** 18:45

So Barber Mill, so that all of these maps are are laid out West to east. So I'm gonna scroll, I'm scrolling down. So here is the the realignment of Barber Mill Rd.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 19:01

OK.

And this one kind of parlays to the other question of I I I guess I called it the guy Rd. extension. It might be a realignment of that Barbara Mill, but just can can you make it clear somewhere in the document or maybe it was and I missed it?

Just that that that road extension is tied into your purpose of need.  
Assuming it is.

**MR** **Martha Register** 19:30

It is the so a couple things that were going on here and why back in the day we discussed this and Mike, if you have recollections on this you can bring into it. So obviously Barber Mill Road and Veterans Parkway is a very skewed.

Intersection and and so that's that's not preferred for a lot of reasons, particularly just sight distance. And so when we were looking at for instance issues with the school and getting school buses and people doing morning drop off.

An afternoon pickup in the school. There was try quite a lot of traffic congestion right there in that vicinity that was that was impacting how the roadway function because again, one lane in each direction.

And so it really made sense on a lot of levels to realign Barber Mill so that we had a full movement intersection that we could control a lot better, improve sight distance and things and it just got the excess traffic away from the school.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 20:43

OK, I know that's.

**MP** **Mike Pekarek** 20:43

Yeah, and it was a there was a safety concern with it at the school also because of the the entrance and the angle and I I know there were discussions of the.

There was a safety analysis done with it. The town also had been hoping for it to be area aligned and there were two versions that shifted on both sides of their facility.

And then right at the corner where Barber Mill ties in, there's actually a historic.

Property and the contributing element actually is a wall that turns the corner, so it helped to keep the Y line work away from that.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 21:31

OK. And do you want that discussion in more of the CP1 portion of the packet or I think that makes sense to even the CP1 portion because it would just help justify it with the purpose of need.

I I know we mentioned safety in there, but just try to tie it to the the purpose of need for this document. If if safety is one of your, you know needs for the project, it just

wasn't mentioned before. So it's but it it sounds like it also helps with congestion which was.

All three.

We try as a rule of thumb to not have safety. That's in the purpose I need, because we find that despite our best efforts, we don't always see results. Sure, because there's human factors at play too, so.

**MR** **Martha Register** 22:12

OK, perfect.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 22:28

Sometimes we list it as like a secondary and a bit maybe, but that's just kind of a Federal Highway stance on that, OK.

I guess keep it to congestion. So yeah, I would, I would say, I guess steer it back towards the congestion element.

**MR** **Martha Register** 22:47

I can do that. That's, I mean it's it's a really relatively straightforward problem with with lots of little bits and pieces. So I can work that into into the the consultation and and we can work that into the packet, no doubt.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:04

So it just if you do mention set to just call it a secondary benefit, not not the purpose.

**MR** **Martha Register** 23:11

And do.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:18

And then the last point I made for the CP1 portion was just, I just kind of wrote up what I understood the evaluation criteria to be after reading the document. And that was kind of an opportunity for you guys. No, Matt, you read it wrong. You forgot these ones.

**MR** **Martha Register** 23:18

OK.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 23:35

So if there were other evaluation criteria, I misinterpreted something. Feel free to let me know.

**MR** **Martha Register** 23:44

Um, no doubt I will say the.

north-south and best fit the the traffic criteria is not going to change and the functioning criteria is not going to change.

By moving the intersection, you know, 50 feet One Direction or 30 feet One Direction or the other, it's it's how the the traffic forecast is going to tell us how we need to create the intersection. You know, two lanes here.

This many turning movements, this, you know, a through flow lane. Um.

So in this particular regard, even if I wanted to, all of these, the 1st 3 columns here will all have the same information.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 24:34

Agreed. Yeah, I yeah, I think all three of your alternatives meet the purpose of need, right? So.

**MR** **Martha Register** 24:41

OK, is that what you want me to show?

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 24:45

Essentially, yeah, it it's just that's just a way to to kind of test it and be like, oh, they all meet the purpose and need great. So then you continue on.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 25:03

Yeah, I mean this is essentially a build, no build, you know, black and white build, no build. It's just broken up in the best fit North and South. So I I think we can easily provide you with those, those criteria for sure.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 25:19

Oh.

**MR** **Martha Register** 25:25

OK.

Evaluation criteria and then so.

Where we get Matt, where we're going through your concurrence .2 and then we're we're on to your concurrence .2 a comment.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 25:47

We can, yeah. So for the concurrence point too, I was.

You know this this is somewhat optional, but it was it was just encouraging you to to use that evaluation criteria to to judge your alternatives and conference points to you. It seems like that's that's kind of part of the purpose of the two is to just test them to make sure they all meet that purpose and need like you talked about. So that that seems to be the appropriate.

So I have to do that.

**MR** **Martha Register** 26:13

OK.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 26:16

2A that comment was I didn't notice any. The only major hydraulics conversation I saw in there was about the preferred alternative, which was the best fit. Just from reading the the merger guidance, it sounds like we would normally.

You would discuss if there was any variation between the different alternatives.

Again, I recognize that the the three alternatives on this one are remarkably similar.

The answer might be what we would do the same kind of structures for all three. I I just.

I don't know that unless you tell like.

**MR** **Martha Register** 26:52

Not a problem.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 26:54

And I I don't know if there's any variation of that Swift Creek Bridge depending on north-south dust fit it it that bridge might not be impacted depending how if your north-south dust fit.

**MR** **Martha Register** 27:13

I did include the avoidance and minimization discussion that we had in early 2018 with the agencies in FHWA on why we selected.

At some of those locations, one side of the road versus the other for where we positioned the new lanes.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:34

OK.

**MR** **Martha Register** 27:38

So yeah, it would. Some of those would make a difference, particularly like at Swift Creek.

Let me get back to these maps.

Um.

So for instance, here you're seeing the best fit alignment, which is widening to the South, and you can see if we were to realign the roadway to the north, there's just more, there's more wetlands and more probability for impact.

If we were realigning to the north. So yeah, there there are differences. We are going to need a new bridge or well, two new bridges, replace the existing and add a new one at Swift Creek, White Oak Creek and Little Creek.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:18

But.

**MR** **Martha Register** 28:34

But then you know which which direction we decided to to move forward with.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:35

Thank you.

**MR Martha Register** 28:43  
was based on previous discussions.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 28:48  
Understood. Yeah, that that may have been one of those links. I wasn't.  
So wasn't 100% sold out. Was that with Eric in 2018-17? There was one I read.

**MR Martha Register** 28:54  
I I think, yeah.  
Yes, yes.  
There's there's two sets of meeting minutes and I think I put them in the regular folders and we can shift those over. One is from September 2017 where we originally talked about the project and what we wanted to do and then one from January 2018. Where we walked core.  
The state and FHWA through where we believe the best fit should go and our reasoning. And so those meeting minutes had to do with, you know, their agreement or suggestions for us to try and minimize a cut and fill slope here or.  
Could we shift the shift the alignment just slightly to the east or to the West at various locations and ultimately?  
What you're seeing on the maps now is incorporating those those suggestions to the best that we can. So yeah, I'll make sure those are in the external folder if they're not already, so you have access to that kind of information.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 30:17  
Understood. Yeah. And hopefully, um, you know, a lot of these comments I would put more in like a housekeeping world. These hopefully aren't that abrasive. Uh, they're certainly not meant to be so.

**MR Martha Register** 30:28  
No, you're good. That's why we're having this meeting so that your your questions are answered.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 30:37  
Yeah. At the end, we just want to make sure we have the documentation that sure

makes the permitting. So I guess we so you got whatever on that end helps us. OK, about it.

**MR Martha Register** 30:49  
OK.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 30:54  
I guess one part in one of those meeting minutes I read um and unfortunately I don't remember which it was 2017 or 18 there was discussion of an onsite mitigation. Is that still a dream or a hope?

**CC Coggins, Tony C** 31:11  
Pretty much a dream. I I got Leilani and her crowd to look at it at some point and I just know the the the feelings of of where we are. You know DMS is going to be the preferred out there. Yeah, land value and the the cost benefit of us purchasing land and putting restoration or conservation.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 31:23  
Yeah.

**CC Coggins, Tony C** 31:31  
Is. I mean, DMS is plenty high, but compared to land in Johnson County, I think we're gonna go with DMS.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 31:33  
Yes.  
It I think that would be the core preference too. Um.

**CC Coggins, Tony C** 31:42  
Yeah, no doubt.

**HS Headrick, Hannah S** 31:44  
OK, well cool. If you if there's, I guess that that covered all the questions I had it kind of pre-screening it. I know I've kind of hijacked the beginning of your presentation. If if there's anything else you you want to run through in your your document, you

know we're happy to see it.

Oh.

**MR** **Martha Register** 32:05

From my point of view, I didn't really have a presentation today. This was more to let you all tell me what additional information you needed to see in this packet so that when we meet with you formally, you have what you need to make your decision.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 32:08

OK.

That sounds good. Yeah, we can.

Yeah.

**MR** **Martha Register** 32:30

So Rob, did you have any comments on the packet?

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 32:38

At this point, at this point, you know the only one I could think of.

It it's usually not a requirement and because of what the federal agencies require, but you have this.

Table 3 and potential impacts to streams and potential impacts to weathers. If there's a way to get an estimate for buffer impacts, it might be too early in the process for you to get them, but we always like seeing them as early as possible just because.

When we start narrowing down those alternatives, we do. We like to consider them when we can.

Hmm.

**MR** **Martha Register** 33:23

So the the only the only thing I would say to that is we do have the best fit alignment. Each of the three sections are areas are at different stages. So West and E have 40 foot buffers on them and I believe I put a 15 foot buffer on.

On the central section. So at this time I can get you those quantities for the best fit alignment so that you have some idea of of what we think we're going to be looking at and and that's I can add that table.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 33:45

But.

Yeah.

Yeah.

That'd be appreciated, yeah.

**MR** **Martha Register** 34:03

OK.

FHWA, do you have any comments that you'd anything else you'd like to see?

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 34:18

No, I'm good.

We'll make sure these guys at the table on the other side here are happy, said.

Sounds like we're on track for that.

**MR** **Martha Register** 34:29

OK. Let me just, I'll point out a couple things to you since they were, they potentially could be of concern.

So just starting on the East End, you know we've got new, new construction here that was not there or excuse me, I'm on the West End, my apologies by NC50, new construction there and then.

Of course, Cleveland Road and Old Drugstore Rd. Those those projects were handled on with the I-40 widening.

And as we're going this way in the middle, the Food Lion here at Ford Meadows Dr. is brand new and that just opened up a year or so ago. So that was not there originally.

The Sanders Hare House is a National Register historic property and it's located down Cornwallis Rd. We do know it's there and the engineers have worked very hard to make sure that.

Anything that we have to do to this intersection and adding lanage and things like that does not impact the the property on the West side of of Cornwallis Rd.

Um.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 35:58

Yeah, I'm fairly sure we got a no adverse effect on that. I'm not 100% sure, but that's good. OK, right.

**MR** **Martha Register** 36:02

We did. We did.

What they were really concerned about, and it's very hard to see, is this little orange BLOB here at the end of Barber Mill Rd. is the keeper, the home of the Keeper of Records and Seals.

And there there's a house here on a small lot. And then as Mike Pekarek mentioned, there is a rock wall that runs along the frontage and and just curves around to onto Barber Mill Rd.

That created a lot of heartburn for us cause the school is right across the street, but we coordinated with the SHPO and we do have a no adverse effect call on that on that eligible house.

Um. And I'm trying to figure out what else is is potentially around. Um.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:03

Does anybody know the story of the home of the keeper of records and seals? Oh, that's pretty cool. I was good one right now, 'cause I've got to know. I know I've consulted on that thing before. It was like a cell tower. Oh, a minute near there.

**MR** **Martha Register** 37:12

It's.

The There used to be a boys and girls school. Um.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:20

So that's.

**MR** **Martha Register** 37:26

Orphans farm here, one of one of the larger farms around. And so they had various buildings, one for the boys, one for the girls, and then they also had homes for some of their administrative staff.

This is the last remnant of that whole, that whole property, that whole farm. I I one of the things I get to do when we work on these projects is is every once in a while I get to read some of the historic documentation and that's what that house is.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 38:09

Things that changed a bit in the area, it looks like.

**MR** **Martha Register** 38:11

No doubt, no doubt. Oh, and one other thing that I do want to mention, 'cause I think I mentioned it is, you know, we we're talking about.

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

OK.

**MR** **Martha Register** 38:24

Excuse me, we're talking about development. This parcel right here across the street from the hospital is what's going to be the Copper district. So there's 300 acres here. That was the Penny Farm.

And they should be starting construction on a residential and mixed-use development in that on that farm parcel. I believe it's going to start at the middle of the summer is when they're going to be looking at constructions.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 38:59

Yeah, but my understanding is that's that's a pretty big thing.

**MR** **Martha Register** 39:06

Yeah, a lot. I mean, yeah, 300 acres. And if you start putting apartments and things like that, you you have a fair amount of of new, new traffic coming into this corridor and then the hospital keeps expanding too, so.

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

It.

Or.

**MR** **Martha Register** 39:22

That's a heavily used corridor.

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

There previously I was the Johnson County PM and there's one other across from the Walmart that there's a lateral stream you guys have.

And unless plans have changed, but I at least permitted some impact to that stream.

I think I mentioned that to across Veterans Parkway from the Walmart. I don't know if you have.

**MR** **Martha Register** 39:50

Trying to see if I what I have.

Which map does it best justice? Um.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:01

If you go to the one that had the jurisdictional features also, uh.

**MR** **Martha Register** 40:04

Yup, that's where I'm gonna go next.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:13

That that stream that kind of parallels your.

**MR** **Martha Register** 40:18

Right here.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:18

Not that one, but across the road on the north side.

**MR** **Martha Register** 40:22

OK.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:24

Yet there was a development I, you know, permitted over there. Whether they've moved forward and built it, I don't know.

**MR** **Martha Register** 40:33

OK, OK, I I think.

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

Oh, and like it's somebody drives by and doesn't see the stream there as it is now, but that may be why.

Um.

**MR** **Martha Register** 40:46

OK.

Those are the major things that I know that have gone on in the corridor and those the historic points of interest were things that we were very cognizant of the the one school and and its concerns.

We did a fair amount of talking to the hospital to make sure that any widening that we do, they maintain their emergency entrances and their flow of traffic for their ambulances that there was a lot of that taken into consideration, so.

Anything else that I can tell anybody? Any more comments around this packet? I think I've got some little bit of work to do, but that's not a problem.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 41:47

No, I I think we just mentioned, you know, just ensuring that we're clear that we're making three distinct concurrent points with this packet.

**MR** **Martha Register** 41:57

Yes, I know I my apologies. I have to write the um.

The signature pages for you and so I will have those when I when I update this packet.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:07

Gotcha.

I I figured you knew that. I just wanna know.

At that point, thank you.

**MR** **Martha Register** 42:16

It's all good.

I'm done. If nobody else has anything else today, I thank you for your time.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:30

Thank you. All right.

**MR** **Martha Register** 42:31

Much appreciated. We'll talk to you soon.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:33

The the recording and the transcript may not get posted today, but it will be tomorrow.

**MR** **Martha Register** 42:43

Thank you, Miss Hannah. We appreciate you.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:45

Yes, ma'am. Welcome.

**MR** **Martha Register** 42:49

All right. Goodbye, y'all. Talk to you later.

**HS** **Headrick, Hannah S** 42:49

Uh, I found, uh, all right. Architectural survey report.

**MP** **Mike Pekarek** 42:50

Thank you.

**CC** **Coggins, Tony C** 42:51

Thank you.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription