

R-5869 Merger Screening-20260121_131305-Meeting Recording

January 21, 2026, 6:13PM

1h 10m 16s

- **Headrick, Hannah S** started transcription

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

The decision making here.

So.

We'll start with introductions in the room and then I'll go on my I am Morgan Weatherford with the environmental policy unit at dot.

And Seth Welcher from Federal Highway administration.

Anna Hedrick, policy and deity.

Just Nancy, environmental planner with PHP.

Lauren trebert.

Environmental planning lead at PHB.

Maggie Gracie. Tea.

Skip Gillespie with NCDOT and project manager.

I was saying the foster everybody calls me bird managing with the project management and Matt Seymour team project management unit.

All right.

Online, which John Jameson from EPU and Marissa Cox from EPU.

Joshua.

HA **Hunter, Joshua A** 1:10

Is Joshua Hunter HBCU fellow from PME.

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

Thought I could have here Polly.

SH **Snider, Holley** 1:22

Holly Snyder, DWR 401 buffer permitting branch.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:27

Our second meeting together today. Ali, thanks for joining by the meetings. Adam.

AE **Adam Efird** 1:35

Hey, I'm Adam Efird.

I'm an environmental consultant with VHB and I'm actually in the field today, so I'm definitely going to keep myself muted.

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

Hey say dedication.

AE **Adam Efird** 1:43

OK.

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

Jessica.

JK **Jessica Kim** 1:49

Hello, my name is Jessica Kim.

Environmental planner with BHP.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:54

And Dimitri?

GO **Gambrell, Dimitri O** 1:57

Dimitri Gambrell, Project management unit.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:01

All right, So what we're going to do is I'm going to take it over to Lawrence and she can go through the just a short presentation and then we'll open it up for discussion. If anybody has any questions.

Again, we're just gonna decide whether this project should be in, in murder or not.

So.

Right.

Screen share here.

And I think Brooks just joined too.

From Division One. Thanks, brooks.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 2:44

Sorry I'm late.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 2:46

No worries. We we we were getting the lights started anyway.

Good. All right.

Well, I will walk us through the project.

Some background, some history.

Some of us in the room and on the phone know the project really well.

Some may have seen it a few years back when it was in the project development process pre COVID.

There's been some changes to it, so just going to walk through the alternatives.

And some of the preliminary screening work that we've done, then we will talk at the end about those resources and that are in the area.

So this is step number R5869.

It is upgrading US17 in Purkimens County from South of Edenton Road to north of Wiggins Rd. So currently a four lane divided and we are upgrading this to Interstate standards with interchanges.

So again, our purpose today is to determine.

Herman, if this project should enter the merger process or not, we did some pre screenings on the alternatives.

Throughout the the project to this point, and they're kind of on on the edge of should they or shouldn't they? So we're having this meeting to get everyone on the same page there.

So we'll run through the overview and some existing conditions.

I'll talk through the improvements, the environmental screening and some quantitative impact evaluation that we've done and then we'll open for discussion.

And this is I like to keep these sites of presentations as informal as possible.

If you have questions, need clarifications, please jump in and ask those questions.

I'm happy to to answer those as we go along.

OK project overview. So again we are in Proimons County.

The project is US17 just east of town of Hartford.

It does cross the porch limits river.

Right now.

The project is currently in the STIP in three sections.

An A and AB and AC.

And so that is really more for the the funding and constructing construction phasing. However, as we were restarting this project and I think right about the time it was put down previously due to funding, the question was raised about if a bypass had been considered over upgrade existing.

Because there are some known conflicting resources that we'll get into.

So right now we're at the stage where we've done a planning level look at the impacts associated with the two alternatives.

And the so the a portion is.

A new interchange at Harvey Point Rd. but also includes a grade separated crossing just South of that at Wind Fork Rd.

The the B portion is a new interchange.

New Hope roads are north of the bridge and then this sea portion is upgrading the entirety of the corridor itself.

So we've got the two interchange pieces and then tie them together with the Interstate typical section as as part C.

Out there today we have primarily A4 lane divided shoulder section.

It is median divided with generally a 23 foot grass median and it is posted at 55 mph. One of the the major components of this project will be the bridge over the Perkins River.

You can see just in this quick aerial it's a very large bridge.

And it is actually two different structures.

And they were built at separate times and are at slightly different elevations.

So when we were thinking about ways to replace that bridge, we can't really tie them together because their their elevations are different.

And those and according to the bridge inspection reports.

The southbound bridge.

Is slightly lower in its efficiency rating than the northbound bridge.

But neither are currently support an Interstate typical section in terms of.

Shoulder width and clear widths and things like that.

So.

OK.

So what are we proposing to do out here?

We actually have two alternatives and one of the alternatives has two variations.

Don't get confused with the A and the B that was on the original slide.

That's that's different. We're talking about alternative one is upgrade existing and alternative two is a bypass alternative.

So alternative 11A, excuse me, is to just widen essentially on the existing alignment.

With a new interchange.

At New Hope Rd.

So that is the pink alternative that you see here. And then if you can see my little little pan hand there, we have an interchange at New Hope Rd. This is how it's programmed in the STIP.

Here's the interchange at Harvey Point Road and the great separation at Winford so you can cross 17.

At Winford you can't access 17 at Wind Fork.

Alternative 1B.

Is what you see in blue.

It is inclusive of the pink as well. Up until the point where the blue is visible. Kind of the bridge while we were working through some of the alternative development earlier in this process, some of the resources that were going to look at in a minute. Severely impacted by the new improvement alternative and so the idea of looking at a different.

Location for that interchange came about and so Wiggins Rd. is basically the Cross Street of Alternative 1B to the north. It provides direct access into.

Windfall, as opposed to kind of bringing folks down to New Hope Road and funnel and then back up north.

So there's a lot of reasons why there's some.

Property ownership dot owns some land.

That we can utilize for the B option.

So lots of reasons for it.

That's alternative B1B excuse me.

And then alternative two is the bypass.

So essentially completely new location pulling off.

Of the existing US 17, between Hertford and windfall, and then a new crossing of Perkins River.

Crossing the railroad twice as well.

And then tying back into.

The existing US 17.

South of Edenton St.

Any questions about the alternatives?

Everybody kind of clear on 1A versus B and then two.

All right, so.

Just a little more detail about each of these in terms of the environmental features that we came across, everything that you're going to see in this packet of information is desktop screenings only.

So we used available information in terms of wetlands and streams.

You know, we looked at ipaq for species instances.

Use chipot for cultural resources. Things of that nature.

None of this, while it is kind of field verified, we've been out to the field a time or two. They are not delineations that would come in the next step, but I think they're when we compare them 1A to 1B to bypass, they are relative to.

One another in terms of the magnitude of impact.

So we've got a number of things on alternative 1A.

Obviously we are crossing the Procimons River at the existing bridge where there is a high likelihood of bat habitat.

And then you can see in the kind of green and blue hatched those are going to be your nwi wetlands and then you can see the the blue streams as well.

And then to the north of Paquimans river, you've got the shaded blue area where you see old neck Rd.

That is a historic district.

So it is the entirety of that boundary.

It is not just one property, it is part of the old neck historic district.

Which has.

Protections in terms of being able to impact that property as it is a recognized cultural resource.

So we have the interchanges as shown that we talked through.

To the alternative also includes frontage roads along a lot of 17 because.

At current, the way you 17 works now, there are driveways along it and so we would be providing frontage roads.

To funnel those property owners to the interchanges, since they would no longer

have direct access to 17.

Any questions or thoughts on alternative 1A?

OK, alternative 1B very similar.

As discussed, however, as you get north of Procriminis river here, you can really see the different location of that interchange to the north.

So we have that partial Clover leaf in 1A and while the footprint of the WIGGENSFORD interchange is bigger, it really goes a long way in avoiding direct impact to the historic district. There is still some impact to the historic District. This includes the realignment of Old Neck Rd. to tie into the interchange. We do still have.

Some frontage along.

US seventeen that is adjacent to the historic district, but the bulk of the interchange is actually in an area that is sort of chunked out of of that property boundary or that district boundary.

Another item to note is that was not affected in one A is going to be the green parcel with the blue dot that is Purplemans county athletic fields.

So I believe it's 2 baseball fields.

It is active and currently in use, so that is.

This.

This area.

Right here.

And so we would have to either work to maybe change change that alignment, tighten it if we could some sort of minimization and go. That would be a a 4F property that we would need to address impacts to if this was a preferred alternative, but so it.

Is it is active?

I believe Hannah and I both gave them a call.

And and chatted with them.

And they actually just put in a new sign in October.

So very active. It is something we want to be aware of and have to consider that in terms of it's not a game changer.

I mean, it's not a total fatal flaw, but.

Just something to deal with along the way.

You know, there are a number of gas stations and other historic resources along the way, but again, nothing that kind of rises to the level of fatal flaw.

Questions on Charter 1B.

Then we'll look at the bypass alignment.

This has very minimal impact to the historic district, with the primary impact being old.

Neck Rd. also gets realigned in this alternative, so the bypass pulls off right around Wiggins Rd.

Runs, runs to the I guess North and then West of Hertford again on new location.

You can see here.

That were running by the new crossing of Proclaim's River.

Would definitely be an impact to the that river itself, but also the wetlands on either side.

So there's a there's a lot of jurisdictional resource that we know would be there, but we are doing a lot to minimize the cultural resource impacts with this 12 crossings at the railroad and and the three access points.

Along the bypass.

All right. So one of those I've already kind of talked through.

This shows all three alternatives on the same environmental screening map, with kind of the highlights of the resources to be concerned with in terms of permitting and concurrence between agencies. There are a lot of wetlands and streams and ponds there. I mean, we are out.

East Eastern, North Carolina.

And there's a lot of wet out there.

We've got the old neck historic district.

All three alternatives have some involvement with bat habitats due to bridges that would be along the alignment and then the catfish Hunter ball fields that women's county athletics field site.

Yeah. Did we confirm viewers? Coast Guard?

At this bridge.

Coast Guard regulates this purge.

I have not gotten response from Coast Guard.

We reached out a couple of times that started a study and then.

Again, I think when we kind of did the project management change over, we reached out again and I've just not gotten hold of anyone. Now we did have.

Like hydro?

Kind of look at.

The clearance and whatnot and we wouldn't be changing that now.

So I guess we have to figure out.

Is it?

Is it navigable waters?

Is that where Coast Guard would come? Yeah, so.

It's Yep, go ahead, John.

JJ **Jamison, John** 17:56

I think it's safe to assume that it's going to be considered navigable for the Coast Guard and will require require Coast Guard permit until they tell us differently.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 18:06

Oh, and the swing bridge to the north, I think, is a newer project.

So that's along in Hertford and I believe.

Since this is down the river from that, it would relate that permitting and not that coast guard's process.

But so just open the buildings.

Yep, good point. Although they will.

But if it goes to murder, yeah, they would be part of the murder.

They would be at that screening process.

OK.

So yeah, potential, since they're permitting agents another agency, even if we get that same elevation, if it's Coast Guard regulated.

Bridge, we still have to live in process.

I have questions revolve around the merger screen that they're asking anyway. Just out of curiosity and sorry I could have missed it.

Sometimes I'm just thinking in my head.

And I always track, but so if you've already said this, I'm sorry, but what is the problem here? That we're looking to fix?

Is it that the bridge needs replaced because it's in bad shape?

Is it congestion?

Is it not?

It's actually not congestion based at all, so 17 is is a strategic transportation corridor.

So it's standard to Interstate standards in order to.

Speaking client with that strategic forward or plan.

I also think there's some economic development may be tied to the interchanges at Harden Point, there's.

Some industrial opportunities South of South of the corridor here, but ultimately the the purpose here is upgrade to Interstate standards.

For the strategic yeah, to add it's a, it's one of many congressionally designated priority chord inclusion, so.

Yeah. And I don't know if that's something that I've seen as a different ways, but like something that's stated as part of the purpose of meeting, I don't know. But yeah, we would need to definitely. If it's not, then there there's not a congestion.

OK, through here that helps.

The other question I had is, are there some?

I know it's early, but any preliminary cost estimates for yes.

Yes, I'm guessing the bypassing.

Way more expensive for that, it's worth asking.

So if you're, I'm actually.

I've said that I didn't put that where I'm going with that is.

And we can debate it if we need to. But in general, I've always been advised that never to advance something forward as an alternative, that you don't think you would realistically build, right. And one of those reasons would be exorbitant. And if it's close. Yeah, like advance it.

That if it's double or triple, then I've just warned against.

Keeping that in the mix, if it's not really an option because then.

It could be less environmentally.

Damaging and the poor's gonna want you to go after that, right?

And you're gonna have to get in with that cost battle.

So right, just put on that out there and I appreciate it realistically.

That new location is probably.

I.

I don't think we're going to change that one, yeah.

And part of the so where we are are where we are right now is.

The.

Moving forward with just upgrade existing, there were questions about had an alternative even or had a bypass been considered?

So this first task order that we're doing is a planning level constraints analysis really.

To.

Essentially, document that one of the two, which is the bypass umm is really not a viable option.

But if it goes into merger, it would.

It wouldn't make it 362, so.

I'm probably gonna.

I'm getting ahead of myself, right?

It's just questions.

I'm thinking so if it was in merger, I think your alternatives are gonna be 1A, yeah.

OK.

Yeah, but just I was gonna pull the the cost here.

So these are just construction costs?

And we're looking at so it's doesn't have the titles at the top, but one A1B and then bypass.

So you get stuff off now, and part of that is both of the.

1A and 1B include the replacement of the propulsive bridge.

So that the that's a huge cost, whereas there are other costs associated with the bypass.

That that bridge is going to need to be replaced regardless.

Yeah, that was another thing.

I was wondering if you did did that bypass, but you still leak that bridge in place or when you removed it or no it would.

That would still stay in place, but but one of the two is.

Is really approaching the end of its useful life, and it's gonna need to be replaced so.

The I think the alternative 1A's are slight 1A1B or slightly inflat.

Able of the existing bridge.

No, because the bypass leaves the.

Existing alignment as is, it has a new bridge across the bridge.

It has two crossings of.

Railroad and three interchange points.

So it's got its own new crossings and structures, but the the cost and the impacts do not have, do not account for the existing route replacement.

All that being said, the point of the meeting is conflicting resources, right?

So I don't wanna side track us too much, but I was curious, yeah.

That's the discussion I kinda wanna to get into a little bit.

I mean, when you talk about competing resources, the competition I guess is gonna

be a little bit different if you consider a bypass versus if you just have.

Alternatives on existing? Yeah and no.

No, we really don't have a.

I'll take me up stomping for a bypass here, to be honest. So.

Not that we don't have issues that we're gonna have to work through on upgrade and testing some sort, but.

You know it's it's a different animal starting.

I'm not new location so.

And that it was requested to county right to study the bypass so.

I think.

So it's just \$1,000,000 question. The county does not want to bypass.

And I think so. When the project was put down, it had a different project managers on both the dot side and the VHP side.

And no one has raised their hand and said I asked about the bypass, but everybody's like, why aren't we looking at it?

So I don't actually know who originated this question.

I thought we found it silly.

Yeah, it's in some meeting minutes.

I thought it was county.

I couldn't be mistaken.

OK. But somebody asked.

Might have been OK and so like, you're getting that Morgan question is, have we done enough?

Conceptually, of design to dismiss it, and then the question is the upgrade existing with these interchange alternatives or options?

Is there enough there?

To move forward in the merger process or did we take both, you know upgrading and bypass into the merger process to officially dismiss the bypass?

So there's a couple of different ways I think that we're gonna set the carbon's perspective.

The bypass seems to be more impactful than we have an alternative that is upgrade existing that satisfies our purpose.

So.

The goal with the bypass doesn't seem like it transportation decision.

So just quantitatively to kind of run through some of these other numbers, we've got

some of the water resource impacts streams and and wetlands.

There are no AEC's, no K my ECS here.

There are we mentioned the potential for F resource.

The Alternative 1A is the one that doesn't seem to affect that.

And then there are a number of known historic properties, whether it be.

The old Neck Historic district.

Or the bypass also has some, probably less impactful, but still would require some shippo coordination.

And then similarly there all three alternatives are likely to have a number of T&E species habitats present.

Again, we have not done deep and field verification of those, but I think the magnitude of those impacts.

Of a new location versus an upgrade existing is where.

Is where the real differentiator comes in in terms of the amount of impact, right?

And so I think our our competing resources, if you will, really fall.

In the.

In the area just north of the bridge, where we've got a number of water, sorry.

Jurisdictional wetlands streams that would be there directly across from the National Register Historic District.

OK.

Anybody, Johnson.

FYI.

OK.

So those thank you, John, for the Coast Guard links.

OK.

Where are the ball fields in the ball fields? Are this green patch up here?

Just off the bypass slash Wiggins Rd. interchange.

And.

The aerial here.

But just to show you guys.

This is the.

Area we're looking at down from about where the 17th Shield is north to Wiggins Rd. at the Wiggins Rd. Interchange location, one of the main reasons that came about this is an existing NCDOT maintenance facility.

And we're all over it with that interchange alternative.

But there is discussion of of relocating that. And so that's from a right of way perspective. It's already state owned.

So there's a benefit there in addition to.

The lessened impacts on the historic district, which you could this tree area.

South of 17 in this triangle.

That's essentially the part that's not.

In the historic district.

So it's that kind of triangle right there that wouldn't be the first time.

So it needs to spend time, right?

I'll pay you one for the team. Thanks for checking.

Get a new office out of it.

Yeah. So I mean, I guess the question is, is the?

The idea of these historic resources versus the Army Corps jurisdictional features.

I think that's where we're in most contention.

We don't know where these species habitats.

Maybe so that could also come into play, but what's the and?

I mean, I don't know.

It looks like the sort district is agricultural based.

Does it seem like thousands of acres in the we're only taking a couple acres and yeah, it may not be that big of a deal and I cannot unless there's something really important to the district that's right on the end of the road.

And I cannot jump too far ahead.

But this is the start of. Not sure how concerning that is.

Zoom in a little bit here for you to see a little little more closely.

So this is obviously the upgrade existing.

The Performance Ribbon bridge is just off page left here and.

Below the inner the roadway here, that's the historic district.

So we are not infringing much on it, but it is within.

It's likely going to be right within the actual district boundary.

In order to.

Maintain as much of the existing alignment as possible, and would you guys be doing?

A bridge on the same alignment.

So we've worked through.

The constructibility of that and ultimately.

It would end up on the same alignment with potentially a long term temporary bridge on the Northside.

But yes, the intention would be to put it back on system alignment.

I can't find out that.

And.

Replacement to the noise and then perform.

Once OK because.

Because you still are able to impact it still properly.

And it's again eliminate the cost of.

The bulb bridge.

Again.

Temporarily.

OK.

I'm sorry, it would also limit my construction time in the river itself.

You know, one other thing? Mm-hmm.

Well, this might be something too.

We have to evaluate as we get into paramount view because it's more peers and water.

What species?

Are in dangerous critical applications.

What are limitations with moratoria, right?

Yeah, it's 100 and I know we talked through multiple options of that. I can pull that back up if we want to, but I do think that's that might be one of the.

Alternative you know, in addition to what we're doing it, alternative A versus B at Wiggins and New Hope?

You may have multiple alternatives here just at the so that would that if we are in merger.

The lead pipes looking at.

Pretty sure we can probably.

Live in egypt.

PT, So here's.

I guess I can't say 7 but sure. I mean, I think they're like 12 and one now.

To get rid of a few.

I think.

One of the I'm trying to remember where we landed.

I think we ended up having to.

We were place in place.

We were still fully replacing both structures, at least at this level. We were assuming that because.

The staff. Sorry, the northbound bridge, which is the bottom side here is the newer bridge and is in better condition which would be the one that would go away if we rebuilt to the north.

But.

There was.

We looked, started looking at some options for how far out can you really Cantt lever on the existing Piers?

I don't think you would have to get a design exception of of note like to in order to go as far as we can.

You still don't meet the Interstate typical section requirements.

But This is why you'll see a big differentiation. Yes, toss.

Er about cost goes in there a very existing.

Yes. Yeah, no, I think that's exactly right.

And if it's remains open to traffic, I think eventually that becomes a cost to the state regardless.

So that's where I think the cost for 1A and 1B are. It is part of the cost of the project.

So we don't leave it out, but it's likely at least part of that, whether it's just replacing one of the bridges.

Would be a project at some point, even if it's not bringing it up to Interstate standards, it's because it's it's deficiently, you know, it's it's an insufficient bridge.

So.

Yeah. So I don't.

I don't know the answer to this.

The reason I ask the question of the the Prime Farm plan, I thought conversion of Prime farm land involved.

A demonstration of avoidance. Immunization.

Before that conversion, should actually be approved, but it might be distinct in a long time, since it's very rare that we run into that, right.

I don't know if that's.

An issue and there's lot looks like farmland around here.

Yeah, but potentially something that's that might be, yeah.

So that's that's looking to see what we see limits or?
I can hardly sense that sense of designated census area.
It might.
It might not be an issue, I just.
Thinking about continuing resources, yeah, I recently thought some of the historic property was on the southern side of the bridge, southern side of the river was over.
Correct. OK.
Nope. There are a few that are like study list.
Resources, but none that are in the the pathway or directly adjacent that we'd be concerned about.
Yes, I don't know how far we can get into discussion without Kyle.
But I do want to ask hypothetically if we if that bypass was not an option.
Would everybody agree or what would?
What would your feelings be on merger?
And if not.
It's Eileen to me. Just looking at you said about who else to look at but.
What is that?
Right here.
I'll link a minute.
I mean, I don't see any big red flags.
But yeah, it'll be really helpful to have Kyle to see over the lens.
How that that you've got an opinion on that, Holly, for not.

 **Snider, Holley** 39:12

You guys mentioned that there was no cama AEC involved.
I'm I'm wondering how that is with with the bridge replacement.

 **Headrick, Hannah S** 39:25

I think we were just looking at desktop.
Yeah, I mean, I just looked.
Yeah, I was just looking.
I just went to see the existing AE CS that was that were, yeah, were there and there weren't any here.
So look it it's it's possible that they could be there.
That would have, you know, this week, maybe along.

SH Snider, Holley 39:52

Yeah, I mean, based on the you know, water quality classification that you know would I really would probably defer to Kyle just because I've not not that experience with this process. But I can tell you, I mean there probably is some, some cama AEC involved just because of.

The 20 coastal counties in the bridge replacement so, and I don't know if that coordination.

Excuse me, this required with Coast Guard would trigger, you know, would keep it in merger or not.

Over.

HS Headrick, Hannah S 40:28

Yeah. I mean, are we at a point where just the number of potential permitting agencies is a reason to consider even if they're not in direct conflict with one another?

Yeah, I'm looking at the class of action.

There's a piece of this too. I know. We'd like to use the merger process to minimize, but if we've got to get a Coast Guard permit, individual portal for a permit.

You know that's that's too.

More right there, like like we had in my way of some sort with shippo and so I.

I asked that question because.

If we've got multiple agencies of jurisdiction, I still want to get to a point, progress down a path in terms of Deepa and go to apply for permits. If there's at that point disagreement.

With a neat flash or.

If one see prints out, you know says they're gonna progress their own.

Yay or whatever because the impacts are so substantial that there's opportunity to get through the emerging process.

I think that may come down to that bypass, right?

Like I think if you were just sticking with the.

Testing a lineman.

That's ACE. If you're doing that bypass, you would need to consider an EA.

Yeah, that's my. Yeah, I mean, that's my feeling.

Initial hunt? Don't get me down on that, but that's where I would that's what I feel

right now is is that based on?

Having miracle alternatives that need to be go through the deep alternatives analysis or is that based on you?

More unknowns and more impacts on new alignment.

But that way, son and that bridge replacements, so like we feel comfortable with the CE because we've done.

Dozens, if not hundreds of them at this point, and rarely ever have a significant impact. So we feel comfortable with that. History tells us that we do that.

And do it with the C.

But that's just more unknown.

So the new alignment.

Right. So what's your entire?

I don't know.

I think my I wanna make sure before we move forward.

With progress and the need to process that, we've got consensus on.

A class of action, obviously.

The scope project very differently. We have progressive PA or we have progress with the CE.

Try and button up this concept term analysis if you will. Yeah.

To demonstrate why the bypass is not reasonable and then roll rated environmental review of upgrading existing.

I just don't want to get to a point later and applying for inventory 04 permits or Coast Guard departments.

That the agency says, well, this action is big enough that our typical desktop environmental review CE checklist is not because I don't know. No, no, no.

And then we're waiting potentially on a Coast Guard to do an EA.

Not that that's probably not the case.

I think it's just something I'm looking to get with you guys with guidance on.

Well.

Even if the bypass was sort of put to rest as part of this task, order and button duck, if you will, are the 1A versus 1B.

Or the. Are those different enough?

That they can be handled within ACE because it is a bridge replacement, but it's also to interchange locations.

And where?

Not said on one of those so that that's I think the bigger issue is fortunately Coast Guard or Army Corps is not on but if those options for the interchange. Are significant enough in terms of impacts to their jurisdictional resources. Where they would want to see a merger process to minimize should decide between the two of those alternatives.

Or if it's, if it's not important to them and we can do it through a CE environmental review and come to a conclusion and it's not gonna affect their permitting process, then I would say let's stick to what it's saying, yeah.

So I think that's we're having his input.

It's almost more like if it is a CE. I feel better about it in the merger process.

Because we are gonna have to make some documented decisions between resource impacts between an 8 between the A&B. Whereas if it's if it were to be an EA, those are documented regardless because the CE technically only documents the preferred alignment, even though we might support it.

With alternatives dropped from consideration.

But that that to me is like if it's acei feel better about having concurrence points a long way.

But I mean, I think we could still documentation that's needed outside of the process.

That's just a matter of everybody signed off on it.

Sure, sure.

And the reason I say that is because we've been.

We recently had.

One vest.

We're experiencing more project and got in there.

Because we still have to go to the point specification on ramps and everything.

I don't understand.

It's that's the purpose, right?

Is that something we could do, like an informal concurrence with?

The core as we as we progress starting evaluating this one alternative would be options.

I don't have.

I don't have my phone in terms of early permitting. If they're able to weigh in without actually having entered their permanent review process.

That they would provide input on just kind of be at the table to have some early buy in.

And you guys know, I think I mean we should like any sort of.
Judgment right now be gone.

All we've talked about without Kyle, so you know, that's good that we're recording
this and he can listen.

And.

That's a big day for him to chew on.

Yeah, I think that's.

That's probably a wise idea.

I guess just for documentation purposes.

So the question is, at what time is it appropriate and allowable this perspective for us
to drop dead, drop it on that alternative, right.

That's if we do it now, right?

I would do it, CP2.

Just ideas?

Keep looking at, yeah.

Oh, it's like it's John still on the Tom.

JJ **Jamison, John** 48:10

Yeah, I'm here.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 48:11

How about you?

You're thinking something right, John?

JJ **Jamison, John** 48:16

Ha ha ha.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 48:17

I'm bringing in the spot, sorry.

JJ **Jamison, John** 48:19

Now you're good.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 48:21

What do you think Kyle would say if he was here? You'd know him well.

JJ **Jamison, John** 48:24

Oh, I I don't know.

This one.

Is a bit odd.

I think it.

I think it fits pretty cleanly under a Type 3 CE if if we drop the bypass discussion.

That being said, you know it's hard to say what Kyle's permitting scenario is going to be on this from a four O 4 standpoint. If it's going to rise to the level of an IP.

Then I definitely wanna be a merger to back that up and.

If he's thinking that this might fit nicely in a general permit, then.

Merger may not be really warranted.

All that being said, I mean I.

The safe assumption is to keep it in, to put it in merger, to start with, get concurrence on CP1 and CP2, and then assess whether we really needed a merger or not.

That, you know, gets us far enough down the line where we've done a lot of our analysis and we can pretty clearly say what our impacts are looking like for.

Any viable alternatives?

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 49:48

I think that tied it in the bow very well for us to now put in Kyle's lab for his feedback.

Thanks John.

JJ **Jamison, John** 50:03

Sure.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 50:08

So.

So we're hopeful that we're gonna drop the bypass from consideration and move forward in the merger process as a Type 3 CE.

Until a point where it may be considered or determined that we could drop it out of the merchant process, is that sort of a summary of where we landed, what John was saying?

I think we need, we need several things.

OK.

So corrections, sure. Big data is kind of rob 'cause that that could very well influence what we're choosing.

The CER the the need by action. OK so.

We'll meet with him.

Thanks Jenny.

And then we'll either reconvene this or send out an e-mail.

You have a preference on that in the.

I get to help and install it on.

8 minutes.

Yeah, let's hear from him first and then decide.

Is there enough information?

It was provided for you guys to have that conversation.

Just asking is there anything additional we need to provide?

I don't think so.

We do have like that tech memo with a little more detail in terms of the construction cost and and things that were considered was a little more background information, but we could, it's all summarized here too.

Other than the construction costs and check it out in.

Kyle feel strongly about the bypass as a as an alternative, if that's something that we could just do. If everybody here agree with that.

Got something?

Still still have to Be's off board.

Yeah, and we can document it with some or something for the files is scoping, yeah.

What's saying one? Just make sure it's clear. Right now, we're scheduled the complete meeting for A&B.

Oh, by April 2028, so I guess that's what we're having.

This conversation route is the route that we're going down.

Let me just figure that out fast, right, so.

Would we do it for just A&B?

This is a discussion point too.

Do we do it for AB and C? Yeah, so?

On my notes, I know there's the the addition process of watch for termini.

Yes. So I'll I think it is that.

I would like to do it for all three.

AP and C and have the document prepared. However, I believe before we talked

about it for us, you correct me if I'm wrong, we just said that just to pay a big if it was a C document, it would see document.

That is that correct?

Do you remember that Brooks?

Stallone.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 53:38

Yeah. Oh, yeah. I'm here.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 53:40

Thank you.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 53:42

All right, there's. I make sure we're talking in the same terms.

Or you've got an A and AB project, and you've got an A and AB alternate.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 53:52

Sorry A&B project for the STIP.

So basically we would not do, we would do a CE document for a, a subsection of alternative one, right?

Because right now we're discussing it as a full corridor.

But when it comes to the neighbor document, do we break it up and just do the interchanges and not?

The corridor upgrade because there's no funding for that.

Again, I think it goes back to our purpose and need is centered around progression only designated. Then it needs to get rolled out.

We have. How do we make the independent?

Utility argument. I think the logical term and I argue is yes.

Because it's not supported by congestion.

A congestion need at those interchange points.

So it can't.

Is it just this kind of train tracks OK.

So we have solved without the upgrading of the portal. If upgraded and extend.

Is is part of the purpose?

JJ **Jamison, John** 55:12

I couldn't really hear bird there at the end, but.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 55:16

Sorry.

JJ **Jamison, John** 55:16

Just my my two cents.

I think we could go either direction.

I think you can lump A&B into a single nipa document and cover C in a later one, or you can cover all three in one.

I think you can come to a a reasonable argument for independent utility for any of them.

I mean we we break up long Interstate corridors all the time for strategic.

Transportation, for our purposes to you know, replace interchanges and make other improvements along the way to to build out an Interstate corridor.

This is no different than that.

It's, you know, we're planning it the best we can, realizing that we don't have funding for every piece at the same time.

So we can lump or split as needed.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:04

So bird that take care of what you were saying or do you need to yeah, say it again.

So Kyle and well, I guess my my only the only thing I'll say is if if.

I'll keep my mouth shut.

Well, I want to find out to say what you're about to say because I'm going to keep my mouth shut if we do. If we do it as A&B and then C later, like really, what is the difference in level of effort?

As far as like.

You know, if we just do A&B, then there's no Coast Guard involvement.

Oh, that's what I was getting there.

There we go.

Eliminate a major permit action which we have to revisit it later, but.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 56:47

Oh, oh, just one second. If if you're talking about just A and AB stand alone, I still need the decision for New Hope and Wiggins.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 56:50

Yep.

Correct. So the BB would have say B's up there.

So B the New Hope versus Wiggins, we would have an alternatives comparison, which we've kind of art, which we've already done here, but we would refine it with field data and.

If it's in the merger process, then it gets decided.

That which one's the lead Poe. But if not then.

If it's not in merger, we just have that informal kind of concurrence.

But we would decide on that. I think just like.

We would which way we're gonna?

Replace the fridge right in terms of Constructibility, but it's at. Would that be enough, Brooks?

Or do you need it sooner because you will?

You wanna change the description in the step?

Because it doesn't read that way. Now if we were to go Wiggins.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 57:52

Right. I mean if if the the overall document suggests that we need to be at Wiggins, I've got a step that's telling me to build an interchange at New Hope.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:05

Right.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 58:05

I need. I need something to stand on to, to move New Hope to Wiggins.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:11

Great.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 58:17

I mean, I understand the idea of breaking it up.

Yeah, it is simpler to do just the interchanges as a document, but that doesn't solve my issue with the overall corridor.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 58:46

Brooks, the last bit you were just saying. I was trying to get my mic to my speaker, so I think I heard the end of that where you said even if we decide between A&B that doesn't give you an answer on the overall corridor.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 59:04

Right. I mean the apparently we've got two projects separate standalone A&B interchanges at New Hope and Harvey's point.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:09

Yep.

Babe.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 59:16

But we're looking at a corridor that's moving New Hope to Wiggins.

Yes, I could build those two interchanges, but I I may be building one that is not warranted.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:31

Right. Or would be better.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 59:32

And and those and those two interchange projects are well, I hate to say funded and and available to me because if we've been moving them around a little bit through the funding, but early early on they were standing on projects that I could have moved forward with end.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:43

But they are.

Mm-hmm.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 59:49

This decision.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 59:56

Yeah.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 59:56

So to to sideline the decision of whether this corridor stays on the new line or sidelining the decision of moving New Hope to Wiggins doesn't benefit me.

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

So we need, sorry, we need to study the whole not just two sections that relate to the.

CEO, which A&B?

Well, if you, I mean, why can you not evaluate?

Two alternatives for B without without.

Evaluating CI mean the main line still stays the same for all intents and purposes.

It's not like we're trying to decide if we're putting an interchange at Wiggins or, you know, on new location.

And so if we're saying that we can do, if we're saying that Type 3 CE.

Handle A and BB being inclusive of a decision on Wiggins versus New Hope. I think it it would play. It would give you an answer I think.

Brooks on in terms of what the STIP would say because the the essentially the alignment of US 17 as a corridor isn't going to change based on that decision.

Right.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 1:01:23

OK.

I mean I I can.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:23

Just.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 1:01:25

I can live with that.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:26

Yeah, I'm just talking it out.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 1:01:27

It is.

I just don't want us.

Somehow circumventing the decision and I'm going to be right back here at the same at the table again with the same group asking to move from New Hope to Wiggins.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:46

Great.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:01:47

Oh I.

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 1:01:47

Within short term.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:01:50

So we'll study A&B, but B will be studied as either it'll be at Williams or it'll be at and we will have to at some point make a decision between the two.

Yeah, we can do that, right?

BN **Braswell, Brooks N** 1:02:01

Yes.

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

And we can do that. Yeah. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

Welcome.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:02:09

And we're we're going to be taking C into account all along, at every decision point. It's not like we're gonna kick the can completely on C.

We have to consider the fact that C is out there as a foreseeable project and you know we're gonna be upgrading it at some point, and we're gonna have to do enough work to to make sure we're not constraining A or B in a bad way cause of.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:02:34

Right, I think.

JJ **Jamison, John** 1:02:34

C.

HS **Headrick, Hannah S** 1:02:35

I think the the only place that gives me pause about that is what we decided to do with the bridge.

Because if the bridge is on existing alignment, so you you don't have a whole lot of room to get back onto existing and if we go with Wiggins, the bridge is less important.

But if we if the interchange stays at New Hope you've got a decent amount of of distance before it.

But if you're having to shift an alignment.

And maybe that's just an exercise.

As that we ask our roadway designers to look at what is that shift distance to get back to existing and can we do that before the New Hope location?

That's not only pause about.

About that, what was the construction process to make upgrading system?

We had.

A at 377 and B at 467.

Interchange.

377.

Yeah. So that second, the second option, you get close to 500 million.

Dollar K So a A is the interchange at.

Plus, yes, and so that includes the C upgrades, yes. So that's the sort of thing to

consider as far as.

Class we we go about 500 million.

We trigger a major project, right?

Environments and that's based on the document.

Or alternative.

So we're included.

So in there we can write them out from a funding standpoint.

You're you're much likely much more likely to stay below the 500 million.

So keep C in mind.

But we're still looking towards an AMB.

It not precluding Steve from happening down the line.

Sounds good.

Yes, yeah, yeah, that makes sense.

Maybe we'll change the the alternatives for.

Yeah, I will say for someone that hasn't been in the weeds on this project that's making my head hurt a little bit. Yeah. Yeah, so.

On 17 will be shown cause other than maybe as part of the impacts or the cost estimate, do we wanna get Army Corps buy in on this approach before we head down?

I think that I think 100%, yeah.

But again, we would, you know, include that.

We make sure that our pine to existing is taking into account where that.

Alignment could likely be in the future, and I think that again, the only real pinch point on that is going to be.

Well, on either side of the bridge, really.

We're gonna pull off of existing.

Remember, we can just.

Keep that in mind.

Bye.

So we, me, Kyle.

To kind of weigh in on kind of weigh in on.

Keeping the bypass in or out and the approach of doing a document for just A&B and what that class of action would be.

If it can be done as AC type 3.

I mean, I think that's something we consider doesn't have to be necessarily excited

about ****.

What he needs to get passed.

He needs to sign up his requirements. OK.

Yeah, and. And then it's you guys are comfortable, you're comfortable and all that information's important for us to understand.

Talk about scope and scope, right?

Absolutely, absolutely sure so.

Everybody agrees with class how it's gonna be studied in terms of environmental review.

Whether or not we're gonna enter merger to screen out the bypass, or just evaluate the project, those are all I think the decisions.

Are scope.

We have a fun meeting minutes.

Let me tell you what.

Sit around to couple different people.

Sure, we understood.

Yeah. Is there anything?

And we're gonna send.

Nothing else you guys need for your conversations with omnicore.

Do that in the technical memo, but.

So I did that file logs, you know, it's been reviewed a couple of times, but it's not like posted on kind of the spinal, yeah.

Start.

Oh.

I mean, it would have gone.

We're sort of holding on to it, I think because it a lot of it could be repurposed for NEPA document and so do we.

I mean but there.

But again, it's just desktop at this point, so we still have some environment to deal with.

But if I mean it's got a lot of good information in it, yeah.

So yeah, I mean, we can raise the cloud on your app.

The drafts water filters.

Yeah. So we don't decision.

Something.

That'll be good.

Yeah, let him listen to this and.

One he gives us go in that he's listen to K maybe we should skip.

Stop. Watch for us to do it so.

OK.

Does anybody else have any further comments on this or any?

Questions or anything you want to listen to.

All right, to be continued. But we'll get back out to the team when we know more.

Thanks everybody.

Thank you. Thank you.

 **Snider, Holley** 1:10:10

Thank you.

● **Headrick, Hannah S** stopped transcription