

R-5869 - CP2 Meeting-20260514_100333-Meeting Recording

May 14, 2026, 2:03PM

47m 14s

● **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 0:04

Yes, I'm not sure. I can't say. Supposedly get it done the other way.

All right. Thank you everybody for joining us today for the R5869 CP2 merger meeting. We'll kick it off with introductions in the room and then we'll go online and introduce folks who are joining us.

virtually. I'm Morgan Weatherford from the NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit.

Oh, Hannah Hedrick, DMT Environmental Policy Unit. I'm Lauren Treebur with BHB Engineering, acting as consultant.

Kim Gillespie with project management.

No, Paul, I now call over to DEQ for water resources. Jason Bilday, DOT Environmental Coordination and Permitting. Brooks Brazel with Division One. Paul Williams with Division One.

I made it in on the summer intern with Division One.

Kyle Barnes, Corps of Engineers. Gary Jordan, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Martha Hodge with PMU. I'm Alexander Foster. Everybody calls me Bird. I am also with PMU. South Wiltsburg Federal Highway.

Sure, helps. Thank you. All right, online. When I call your name, if you would please introduce yourself. Start with Kathy.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 1:45

Good morning, this is Kathy Brudingham with the Division of Coastal Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:51

Hold on just one second.

Could you say, could you say that again, Kathy?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 2:02

Good morning, this is Kathy Brittingham with the Division of Coastal Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:06

I appreciate you.

We're fixing some sound issue, Catherine. One moment. I'm going to email that.

Keep talking. Deja vu all and very good at them. Was it me or my?

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 2:13

That's okay, I'll say it as many times as you want. If you can hear me, if you can hear me say that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:23

Which one? Which one is the email? Yeah, it's, yeah, it's Cortana. She put this one, I guess.

One more time, Kathy. Thanks. So just for those online, the issues right now, we're only getting out of the PC in the corner of the room, not in the room audio.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 3:00

Good morning, this is Kathy Brittingham with the Division of Coastal Management.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 3:11

So, we're just trying to make it so that folks around the room are going to be able to hear. Now, it works. Try this one. Try one more time. Go up to the three dots at the top. Up at the very top, Richard, very top. Go down to the problem settings.

And you want to select that permanent application. OK, let's try again. Let's go. My biggest hold up on things lately is just been trying to get, making sure. OK, we had it. Could someone on lunch do a test for us? Yeah. All right. Thank you, Catherine. I promised it worked, but we tried to.

CL **Cannady, Lee** 4:07

Testing.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 4:07

Hi, this is Kathy. Test, test, test. Can you hear me?

You're welcome.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:25
All right, uh, Lady, there you go.
Lee Kennedy.

CL **Cannady, Lee** 4:35
Hey, good morning guys. This is Lee. I'm with CAMA and I do, I'm a field rep for
Division One DOT projects.
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:44
Thank you, Lee. Ethan.

ES **Ethan Sommers** 4:48
Hey everybody, I'm Ethan Somers from the Albemarle PO.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:53
Christine.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 4:55
Hey, Christine Farrell with the Environmental Policy Unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 4:59
Right.
Okay.
Well, it's Renee Gladhill Early from State or Preservation.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 5:12
Ohh.
Yes, Renee Glide Hill Early State Historic Preservation Office.

CL **Cannady, Lee** 5:18
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:18

Thanks for that.

Baby.

HE **Harville, Katie E** 5:24
Katie Harville, Environmental Policy Unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:28
Nick.

HM **Hooper, Nicholas M** 5:29
Hey everybody, this is Nick Cooper with Environmental Coordination and Permitting.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:35
Jay.

JT **Jay Twisdale** 5:39
Morning everyone, Jay Twisdell with TGS Engineers supporting the hydraulics unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:46
And Justin.

JH **Justin Hensley** 5:48
Morning, everybody. Justin Hinsley, working with Lauren Treebert, representing VHP.

CL **Cannady, Lee** 5:51
Okay.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 5:54
Right, for reason.

SP **Sarzaeim, Parisa** 5:56
Good morning, Harissa Sarzaim from DWR.

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

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 6:04
Good morning, everyone. This is Amineta Somerville with EPA Region 4.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:11
Steve.

SG **Steve Giordano** 6:14
Good morning, everyone. This is Steve Giordano. I'm with NOAA Fisheries Southeast Region and the Habitat Conservation Division.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:22
And Travis.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 6:26
Travis Wilson, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:31
Thank you, everybody. Unless anybody had anything to start off with from the agencies, we'll take it everybody.
from Marine Fisheries on the line today. Oh, sorry, sorry, I just missed that. Make sure.

SG **Steve Giordano** 6:54
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 6:56
Sorry about that. No, it's good.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 6:57
Well, correction, this is Kathy. I think Steve is with NOAA Fisheries, which is different from, yeah, different from Division Marine Fisheries.

SG **Steve Giordano** 7:01
Yes, I am the official.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:05

Yeah, I have Charlie Deaton as our contact for that. Yeah. OK, sorry. Yeah, we don't. We invited pretty sure Charlie Deaton, but we'll just. They were.

SG **Steve Giordano** 7:06

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 7:26

There was an add from last times, right?

Okay.

So yeah, I'll just kick it over to you, Lauren, and the project team if you want to go through the packet. Sounds good. I will.

share my screen and we'll just walk through the target and the talking points.

All right.

Should be everybody good online? Can you can see that alright?

JH **Justin Hensley** 8:05

Yep, we got you.

FE **Farrell, Christine E** 8:06

Yes.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 8:07

Thank you. All right. So again, my name is Lauren Schrebert. I'm working with Kim and project management unit on the R5869 project. So this is the widening or upgrade, excuse me, of US 17 to interstate standards from south of Edenton Road Street to north of Wiggins Road.

And we're here today to go through concurrent point #2, the detailed alternatives to be carried forward in the project. So we're going to get started with just a quick review of CP1 and the decisions made there. We'll do a presentation of CP2 information and then open it up for discussion.

and then we can review the CP2 form to be reviewed.

Right. Left this in from the last couple of times we've been together. Just as a reminder, project overview. So you can see here, we are talking about US 17, which is

the future I-7 corridor of Ormond County. And We are looking to, on the southern end, we are starting south of Edenton Rose Street, and then heading north, crossing the Perkins River and ending the project just north of Wiggins Road. So we're looking, we'll get into more detail, but currently you see an upgrade existing corridor alignment, which is in the solid blue and a bypass alignment. in the dash blue. But the primary reason for showing them this way is just to explain currently the project is programmed in the SIP as three sections under 5869. And so there's section A and section B are the two interchanges. A is the interchange at Harvey Point Road and B is going to be an interchange at New Hope Road-ish. And then alternative C would be the corridor parts to connect Um, those interchanges and fulfill the rest of the board work since.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 10:23
Yeah.

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

Any questions on just a private overview?
But I think we've we've all been through this one a couple times, so...
So our review of concurrence.1, where we concurred on the purpose and need for the project, which is to improve mobility and connectivity on US 17, and also to comply with the Congress approved future I-87 desk.
Designation of the of the groups.
And then in terms of study area, you can see here the shaded areas are the study areas associated with the alternatives that we are currently considering. Generally, it's about a 900 foot corridor with expanded areas along wire lines and interchanges. So, we've got some wiggle room in there for avoidance and minimization, but we are still kind of defining a general corridor, especially for the new location, so that we can get some reasonable.
preliminary impacts for comparison purposes.
So now getting into concurrent point 2 information, some of this we touched on previously just to help give an understanding of the project and so you could really understand purpose and need and what the study area needed to be. But we have some additional impacts, quantitative and some qualitative impacts to share across

the various and alternatives.

So what's being considered is alternative one, which is to widen and upgrade the existing alignment of US 17 and adding new interchanges. And the variation within alternative one is A&B. This is different from STIP.

A&B, just to be clear, we're looking at this as an entire corridor in terms of the merger process. So alternative 1A is the, as it is programmed essentially in the step with the interchange north of Perquimans River occurring at the New Hope Road intersection.

Whereas, excuse me, alternative 1B shifts that interchange to Wiggins Road slightly further to the north. So still within the extent of the STIP project, but as we were kind of working through some ideas early in the process, we noticed some opportunities to go ahead and start in on avoidance and minimization and use of existing right of way, things of that nature. So alternative one has two variations, just where that interchange falls. Everything else about the corridor, which is in pink here, is the same between two. And then alternative two is our bypass option shown in the orange outline here.

a new location bypass west of Hertford that would cross for Women's River at a new, excuse me, at a new location.

So just to go a little more into detail, we won't spend too much time on these, but the 1A again has the Newhook Road interchange. And we've got also a grade separation at Windform Road, which is just south which falls just south of Harvey Point Road. So we are allowing access across US 17 there, but not to US 17. And so that goes as part of the Harvey Point Road Interchange Project, would be that separation. And then in general, there are frontage roads proposed along the way to see.

US 17 corridor to facilitate access when we go to a controlled access facility 17.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 14:37
Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 14:38
Alternative 1B, and very much the same as 1A, with the exception being moving the interchange location slightly to the north on Wiggins Road. You can see one of the reasons that this came to be an idea was the blue shaded area here is a historic district. And so we've got this

triangle of area on the south side, east side of US 17 that is not part of that district. And then also on the north side in that area is an existing DOT maintenance facility. that it turns out we may have the ability to repurpose for the purpose of this project, along with some other DOT projects that would relocate that maintenance facility. And so what this alternative does in comparison to 1A really is just going to be to work to

go ahead and minimize what the impact is to that.

that historic district. It also moves the interchange slightly away from the Perk Women's River, just a bit further, which is not that thing either in terms of impacts to sensitive jurisdictional water resource features.

Any questions, just clarifications on 1A versus 1B?

With the New Hope intersection or interchange is to when we're talking A&B and trying to put together these alternatives to move forward and to TP3, you know, we're looking at what I understand and

What you put together is...

3 alternatives that we're going to discuss. The bypass, or excuse me, the preferred is 1, the bypass is 2, and the no build is 3. Correct. Within one,

It sounds like to me in the discussions that we've had, we're looking at the Wiggins Road interchange and the New Hope Road, or intersection, excuse me. And

It's going to be one or the other. One or the other. Should we have that as a, as looking at those and bringing in that alternative to give us more alternatives to have that discussion on, because in coming up with the level.

So instead of having alt one, a no build, alt one, alt 2, have a no build 1A and 1B and two. Yeah, we can definitely. I just, I think that gives the group the opportunity to weigh impacts and look at.

more than just the preferred alternative with alternatives inside of it. We're picking an alternative that shows all of the impacts. And we're excluding an alternative and not just alternative within alternative, because in the

the merger handbook, we need to identify a better alternative, a very specific alternative when we call it the lib. When we call it the lib. And we don't need to have so many.

Sub alternatives within one one route. OK.

So if this goes forward, and this has yet to be fully determined, we talked about it some in the last couple of meetings though, but should this go forward as a CE document?

then how would we handle multiple alternatives there? Or does that basically guarantee that this has to be an EA given multiple alternatives? You can have alternatives in the CE. So it's a little better to answer that one on that side of it. OK, just wanted to clarify that we can do that. Yeah, that's good. So, we have we have three builds and one ignorability.

Essentially, that's what the suggestion is. I think that would be fitting the merger handbook a little better.

Two pretty much supports that, but how about indicating that we have those three laid out. Yeah, and we do have the impacts of all three laid out, which we will get to. And yeah, it probably makes sense to do that here in some of our other kind of urban like.

Capitol Boulevard and we've got a ton of interchanges and we have more into that sub-alternative type. But since this really is just the one primary difference, it's the only difference between the two. Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you.

I'm good with that. I'm I know that changes that that means. Well, we're still studying regards. We were still studying 3 build alternatives regards. Yeah, sure. And now we're just defining them and comparing them as separate alternatives. Right. But we will decide if we are going to study all three.

here at this meeting. That gives me that. But now we have a no build. So if we go this route, we have a no build and three builds, and we can decide if all three weren't going forward to CP2A, because this is just two, this is not a combined 2A meeting. Or if we just carry

two of the three build alternatives to the next level of evaluation, which involves all the field work, the delineations, the TV surveys, the cultural resource reviews, things of that nature. So I think you're correct, it gives us three to choose from in terms of moving forward instead of just the two.

with what have you variation.

Okay.

All right, so then also the two is the bypass alignment. A couple of high level notes about this is to the west of Hartford. It involves a new bridge over Performance River.

One, sorry, 2 new

one new interchange location in terms of access, but three new interchanges in terms of when you add the two on the end that will connect you back to the existing US 17. It also involves 2 grade separated crossings of the railroad. I just want to make that clear. They're not really shown.

in detail here, but the railroad does run just west of Hertford as well. And so we would have a crossing on the north side of the river and on the south side. And in this scenario, the US 17 corridor as it is today would remain as it is today with Um, median divided for facility, um, but having write-in, write-out access and some of those fully move across over locations.

So we did a little bit of updating of the environmental screening since since the last time we were together. And I have can also pull this up and zoom in and around if we need to. But what we what we added here really was some revised wetland data. We pulled in the NC Cruise data. And so we could really get a better idea of what's out there in terms of the coastal designations when it comes to the wetland. And

Soil types out there.

Specifically, talking about aquatic resources, we don't want to stack this until the same map because it gets a little busy. But in terms of identifying likely AECs, we have the supply resources map, which shows us where we have things like submerged aquatic vegetation, where we have fish habitat and then also it shows the wetland functional assessments. This is estuarine waters, inland trust waters, things of that nature, so not here. So it just gives a better idea of where those AECs would likely occur if that alternative slower.

So, and we need to zoom in on certain lines here for more visibility we can, but here is a quantitative.

somewhat qualitative impact evaluation of 1A, 1B, alternative 2, and then the no build. So just walking through at a high level the alternative to the bypass, it is much heavier in terms of stream impacts as well as wetland impacts.

We have a few more potential AECs on that one, but somewhat similar there. And then...

Outside of the water resources, farmland and VADs is also higher on the bypass option, which comes because it's on the location grade. So that's to be expected. I think.

the improved mobility line here that is critical to the function of these alternatives in terms of purpose and need. I think we're showing here that alternative one, whether it's A or B, it eliminates

at grade intersections and improves connectivity to land uses that would be

supported by interstate use. So our economic or industrial centers, there's one specifically south of US 17 on Harvey Point Road, so this would provide very direct access to that.

Of.

And then...

Stop.

Otherwise, you know, in terms of potential species habitats, until we get out there and do assessments, we're likely to have the same types of species if I did for each.

And then there's also a, I think, a slight

Of.

edge to the bypass in terms of cultural resources, because we do stay completely off of the large blue historic district that we showed earlier. But there are other features that it does come close to that would be considered. So high level, that's, I'll let you guys take a minute to.

Maybe, so this is in.

before we open it up for discussion.

So with that, I guess I just want to open up to the group discussion about when looking at these impacts.

in terms of relative to one another. If we see the need to carry all three alternatives forward to those detailed studies, again, that's going to involve all the field work for natural resources, hopeful resources.

The community studies, the noise analysis, things of that nature, so...

Okay.

Can't do that.

I know what you wanted to see on that.

On this.

Compared.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 27:35

Oh yes, I was just, yes, that I really appreciate all the extra information. That's really helpful.

It looks good. It looks good.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 27:44

Yeah, yeah, and thank you for working with us on this and getting us information and

feedback. Again, we want to make sure that anyone on this team has what they need to feel comfortable when representing their agency and jurisdiction of the region. Those resources, so thank you, Kathy.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 28:07

Yeah, looks good. I appreciate it. I think as everyone knows, the SAV beds are not field verified, so they could end up being different from what's shown on the map, but at least it gives us a starting point to know that there are some potential for SAV beds out there.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:14

Okay.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 28:24

And then I guess the only question I had was if you could talk about the footnote in the table about totals do not include impacts for the proposed procurements River Bridge crossings because design details were not available. And I guess just confirm what I think is true is that we'll have those design details at CP2A.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 28:48

Yes, we would have those details at 2A. So at this point, we just had not gotten, we have not gotten to the design level of detail where we would have really looked at what the structure approach, you know, what that looks like if we're replacing in place, if we're putting it on a new location, but we have some ideas on that, but we just didn't feel like we were at a point at this desktop level of review and design. We're only at about 15% design on this. We're not at the RPS. We're not, we haven't gone to that level yet. So

It's that between A&B, they would essentially be a wash, right? They're going to be the same. And so we just felt that that was okay without here. And for those of y'all that don't know, DRPS is design.

Recommended plans, plans that does that, so that twenty-five percent plans, that's the point where we would base the NEPA document on those designs in terms of impacts by alternative, that's the starting point for for prompting and things like that, so we get to that point, that's what you generally show to the public if you're.

public involvement, but it's a little more refined than what we have at this point. But we do still feel like relatively speaking, comparing these alternatives to one another, the design is enough that we can make some decisions on what's feasible and needing to go forward.

Yeah, the DRPS would be our benefit for C. Yeah.

Yeah, that initial CE or EA would be based on that and then consultations happen as the design is refining goes through the process.

Do do the totals shown for the bypass alternative?

Clear assumption of a new structure, though.

Yes, yeah, so I guess the other thing about the...

the totals for the bridges. So when you're looking at like a stream or wetland impact for a bridge or a culvert crossing, whatever, right? We see your feature runs perpendicular, let's say, conversation to the facility. And so we're looking at Of length, and so that length would be.

In the case of the existing bridge, the length is actually the width of the bridge, right, or the length of a culvert. And so if we're going to change that, it would be, it's not a length along the bridge, it's the length across it. So we don't know necessarily what we would need to do.

battery way across the bridge. So similarly, yes, it accounts, it does not account for like an additional stream length for either of the bridges, whether it's on the bypass or the new alternative.

That answered the question.

You know, generally, yeah, I was, it was really conscious with Jacob, I was just wondering if...

the impacts shown take into consideration impacts associated with constructing a new crossing versus it. Whereas the other two, 1A and 1B are not taking into consideration replacement of the existing. I'm wondering if. I mean, it does in terms of everything outside the banks.

of the crossing of the river itself. So what would impact would definitely be included in what we're showing here. That would be new impact since it's a new location.

Ohh.

Renee. Renee, you have your hand up.

Here, I'll be if you're talking right now.

I.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 33:11

Yeah, thanks. Yes, I do have a question and I might be late in raising it, but how can you eliminate the no build if this project is intended to upgrade it to interstate facility?

which appeared from what was listed that that's going to be a federal requirement. So, am I missing something here? Because I don't see how we can not build it if there's going to be a requirement that this be upgraded to interstate design for I-87.

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

Because somebody.

Yeah, so the no build is in there. I mean, it obviously in pretty much any case, a no build alternative is not going to meet purpose in need, but we do provide that as like, I guess, a baseline for comparison for what the...

new alternative would be in the event that we didn't do anything. That's the definition there of the new build. So.

You know, it's not going to be purpose in need, therefore it's not going to be a WETF, but it is included in the alternatives evaluation, just as that baseline of fully could do nothing, but if we do, we won't be meeting the purpose of the project. It's more of just that statement of fact, I think.

Right, yeah, it gives us a comparison point, but it a no bill would rarely, if ever, meet the purpose and need, but it serves as a baseline.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 35:00

Thanks, Seth. That helps.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 35:12

I guess if there are other questions or clarifying comments about the what's presented here in terms of the impacts by alternative. I'd like to hear any of those. We need more clarification. If not,

I have the big question is, do we need to take all three of these to the next level, or does this impact evaluation give us justification to drop an alternative for further consideration based on the magnitude of differences across?

Various resources.

So does the bypass present itself as an alternative that is just never going to

compete in terms of impacts and with an upgrade existing? And I think that's really what we need to get to the bottom of.

Today.

That's Federal Highway and kick it off by saying no in favor of dismissing the five hats alternative.

because of higher impacts, higher costs.

And it just it doesn't seem to make sense in terms of the wisest piece of our taxpayer money when we would then probably have to replace the existing bridges over the rivers at some point as well. Yes. Yes. Yes. I just want to clarify that's you stands as well. Our purpose would be to.

To drop a box pass alternative at this time.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 36:57

And while and while the bypass alternative does the best job of avoiding historic properties, having been through the replacement of the Hertford Bridge and the building of the new one that we're looking at,

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

Okay.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 37:17

servicing as part of A1 and AB, I'd say drop the alternative as well. It really does not make sense.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:26

Big.

Renee, are you very familiar with that historic district there?

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 37:33

I am very familiar with it, yes.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 37:35

Okay, I was kind of looking up the national register forum during the meeting. I think, you know, at the end of the day, so this is probably not related to our conversation. I'm just going to throw it out there while you're talking. It looks like

we're, you know, we're going to be on the fringe of it there. I see it looks like probably irrigation ditches. It's kind of what I'm seeing as the potential impact we'd have there. Is that what you're thinking.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 38:02

I'm thinking that we could, we could with some some work, get to a no adverse effect.

For this, yep.

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

And maybe a shifting of the ditches, but that's a conversation for a different day.

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 38:16

Yes.

Day for a day, yes.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 38:19

Good, sneak peek, great preview to come.

And with the Corps view of it, it's going to be with the quite resource impacts, it's going to be really hard to see a LEPA in that, that, right?

Okay.

So, then I think...

It sounds like in combination of the magnitude of difference between the bypass alternative and either of the alternative 1A versus 1B, magnitude of differences in various alternatives including jurisdictional water resources and

GR **Gledhill-earley, Renee** 38:55

Yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:06

put that alongside of really getting to the purpose of the project, which is connectivity, in addition to the federal legislation of it being an interstate. The group was in favor of moving forward with alternatives 1A and 1B to detailed study. and removing the bypass from the alternatives considered at this point.

The U.S. is my service.
All do you? Yeah, clicker with them.

WW **Wilson, Travis W.** 39:44
WRC can concur with dropping a bypass alternative.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:48
Before we go all the way down the line of concurrence, I want to...
Just to look at the form real quick, because I think we're gonna, I'm gonna need to
make a revision based on.
showing 1A and 1B as separate alternatives. It's not quite worded that way.
So...
Simple.
Issue.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 40:23
Hi, this is Kathy. While she's doing that, DCM also supports dropping the bypass
alternative, and I also wanted to add that there's a lot of wetlands there, as you all
know, where the bypass alternative would cross, and that would probably include
some significant amount of bridging that we would be looking at. So there's also the
cost associated with the bridging.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:43
Hi.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 40:45
that might occur over those wetlands for the bypass as an additional rationale for
dropping it.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:47
Hi.
In addition to just the river itself, there's extensive bridging for the web province.
Thanks.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 40:57

Yeah, I'm not sure that a filled causeway through those wetlands on new location would be permissible. I don't know, but I'm just raising that point.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 40:58

Sorry.

Yeah.

Great. Thank you, Kathy. Yeah, thank you. Okay, so I think in terms of the concurrent point, the form itself, the way it's drawn up at the moment is alternative one moving forward, upgrade on existing alignment. And

I will need to revise this to show upgrade on existing alignment 1A. I think that's just going to take a little bit of wordsmithing, which I can either do in front of you right now, or I can revise this and send it out to this group for comment and then once we're in agreement on it, send it out for signature.

Good. What? What?

Thanks.

Oh.

No, no.

Not true. Yeah, I was thinking for us, I guess. I missed the, I missed the whole of it. Unless there's a strong opinion, I like the ability to kind of digest it and maybe, you know, make any track changes. I'm totally agree with that.

But if people really want to do it right here, we can do that too.

Yeah, I don't think we're really questioning what the changes is. It's just giving me some time that, like, reword it, yeah, we pull in, like, reformat the table, basically. So, yeah, if that's all right with everyone, I will do that ASAP and get that out to you so that we can get any comments back, get that one approved by the group.

Anyone online have any issue with that?

Right, I'm seeing none. I think sometimes when you're trying to type with 20 people watching you, it's just a little pressure packs. I see here. I type a lot worse than people. It's the formatting.

Table.

But is there anybody we have? Aminetta, did you have any comments or any issues with moving forward as we discussed in here?

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 43:21

UK doesn't have any issues with removing alternative to the bypass as an all possible alternative.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:30

Okay.

Ethan, do you have any comments?

Or issues, what's that?

ES **Ethan Sommers** 43:37

No, I think you actually hit it on the head for most of it, so, but the bypass is, I would say the RP also agrees that it probably needs to go, but yeah.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 43:53

Ohh, you are, you are.

Yep.

Yeah, and National Marine Fisheries is not on this list, but Steve, did you have any comments?

SG **Steve Giordano** 44:04

No.

I do. I do not have any problems with eliminating.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:12

Go on.

Yeah, and we'll, Kathy, we'll get up with Charlie separately.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 44:22

Great, thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 44:22

Oh, yeah.

That, I think we have accomplished our goal of deciding detailed alternatives to carry forward. And unless there are additional comments or questions about what's to come, we can. What was the, what can we expect for the next?

Do we have a date? So for CP2A, yes, I have that as not probably in the winter of

2026. So assuming we can get out into the field and collect all of the field work that's needed to

to get avoidance and minimization efforts over the summer and into the fall. And we would hopefully be able to bring the group back together. Probably the earliest would be winter 26, essentially early 2027.

Well, with that, we'll revise the current form and send that out. And if you have any comments or questions, just let the group know.

Yeah, we'll revise as needed, otherwise we'll put signatures on it. It'll be it'll be sent around as a final version before it comes to you via DocuSign once I if I get any comments. So we'll make sure everybody's good with it.

Okay, I'm just going to let y'all know.

Martha is here today.

We are swapping projects.

There's a whole lot of stuff going on. I apologize. I'm just going to tell you right away. So I'll go ahead and sign off on this. But just in some very soon, probably.

We're gonna slash as the as the PMU project management point of contact. Yeah, OK. Which one do you take? All my OK.

Yeah.

Good, cool.

So, we'll keep your name on the C.P.2 form, yes, but 2A. I'll have Martha and then I'll start working with you on, keep keep keep both, just keep both, yeah, as long as we need to, until until February. Sounds great, yeah, for those online who didn't hear that, Martha Hodge will be the new P.M.

on this project. Starting at about one. OK. All right. Well, thank you all. Thanks, everybody.

BC **Brittingham, Cathy** 47:06
Thank you.

SA **Somerville, Amanetta** 47:06
Thank you.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 47:06
Be gone soon.
Okay.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription